



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
FRIDAY MAY 18, 2012, 12PM ET

A Global “No” To a Nuclear-Armed Iran

Divisions on Sanctions and Use of Force

Andrew Kohut,

President, Pew Research Center

Pew Global Attitudes Project:

Richard Wike, Associate Director

Juliana Menasce Horowitz,
Senior Researcher

Katie Simmons, Research Associate

Jacob Poushter, Research Analyst

Cathy Barker, Research Assistant

Pew Research Center:

James Bell,

Director of International Survey Research,
Pew Research Center

Bruce Stokes,

Director of Pew Global Economic Attitudes,
Pew Research Center

Elizabeth Mueller Gross,

Vice President, Pew Research Center

For Media Inquiries Contact:

Richard Wike

Vidya Krishnamurthy

202.419.4372

<http://pewglobal.org>



A Global “No” To a Nuclear-Armed Iran

Divisions on Sanctions and Use of Force

A 21-nation Pew Global Attitudes survey finds widespread opposition to Iran obtaining nuclear weapons. And in most countries, there is majority support among opponents of a nuclear-armed Iran for international economic sanctions to try to stop Tehran’s weapons program. The Chinese and the Russians are notable dissenters in this regard. The poll also found majorities in Western Europe and the United States disposed to taking military action to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Again, the Russians and Chinese disagreed.

The U.S., Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China – known as the E3+3 – are currently negotiating with Iran in an effort to keep Tehran from crossing a threshold that would enable it to quickly produce a nuclear bomb. But there are differences between these negotiating partners in their opposition to the Iranian nuclear weapons program, in their support for economic sanctions and in their willingness to resort to the use of military force if necessary to blunt Tehran’s nuclear ambitions.

Nine-in-ten people or more among the transatlantic E3+3 partners oppose Iran’s nuclear weapons aspiration. But just over half (54%) of Chinese agree. There are even greater differences among the negotiating partners over economic sanctions. Among those who oppose Tehran’s nuclear armaments program, about eight-in-ten Americans, Germans and British back sanctions, but only 38% of Chinese and 46% of Russians are in agreement.

The military option is even more divisive among those who are against Iran’s nuclear weapons program. A solid majority (63%) of Americans would turn to military force to prevent Iran

Differences Between E3+3 Members on Iran

	Fav opinion of Iran %	Oppose Iran nukes %	Back tougher economic sanctions* %	Military option to prevent nukes* %
U.S.	13	94	80	63
Britain	16	91	79	51
France	14	96	74	51
Germany	6	96	80	50
Russia	36	77	46	24
China	21	54	38	30

* Asked only of those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q8d, Q104, & Q104c-d.

from going nuclear. Roughly half of Washington's European allies would support such a move. And there is very little Chinese or Russian support for a military strike.

These are among the findings from a survey by the Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project, conducted March 17 to April 20, 2012.

No To a Nuclear Iran

There is almost universal opposition to Iran acquiring nuclear weapons across the 21 nations surveyed by the Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project.

Among the United States and its fellow European negotiating partners, the opposition is overwhelming: 96% of the French and the Germans, 94% of Americans and 91% of the British oppose Tehran's nuclear ambitions. Other Europeans have similar sentiments. Fully 95% in Spain, 94% in Czech Republic and 91% in Italy do not want Tehran to have an atomic bomb. This opposition is effectively unchanged since the first Pew Global Attitudes survey on this issue in 2006.

Russians and Chinese, whose governments are the other two partners in the E3+3 process, also oppose the Iranian nuclear weapons program, but less strongly. Roughly three-in-four Russians (77%) are against Tehran acquiring nuclear armaments. In China, 54% oppose Tehran's nuclear weapons ambitions, down 15 points from 2007.

Iran's regional neighbors generally would rather not see an Iranian nuclear arsenal. But opinions do vary and they are fluid. About three-in-four Jordanians (76%), two-in-three Egyptians (66%) and 54% of Turks oppose

Widespread Opposition to Iran Acquiring Nuclear Weapons

	Favor %	Oppose %	DK %
U.S.	2	94	5
Germany	3	96	1
France	4	96	0
Spain	4	95	1
Czech Rep.	3	94	3
Britain	4	91	4
Italy	4	91	5
Poland	7	88	4
Greece	9	87	4
Russia	11	77	12
Turkey	29	54	17
Jordan	21	76	3
Egypt	23	66	12
Lebanon	35	62	3
Christian	31	61	7
Shia	73	26	1
Sunni	5	94	0
Tunisia	42	43	16
Japan	4	94	2
China	25	54	21
India	15	34	51
Pakistan	50	11	39
Brazil	5	91	3
Mexico	9	86	5

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q104.

Tehran acquiring nuclear weaponry, while Tunisians are divided (42% favor, 43% oppose). Half of Pakistanis back Tehran's nuclear ambitions, while just 11% oppose them. Nearly four-in-ten Pakistanis (39%) have no opinion.


Lebanon is an interesting sectarian case study. Overall, the Lebanese oppose Iran having nuclear weapons by a 62% to 35% margin. But there is a deep cleavage in opinion among religious groups in the country: 94% of Sunni Muslims are against the Iranian nuclear program, as are 61% of Lebanese Christians. Nearly three-in-four Shia Muslims (73%), however, support it. Iranians are mostly Shia Muslims.

And views within the region are changing. Since 2006, opposition to Iran's nuclear ambitions is up 34 percentage points in Jordan and 24 points in Egypt. While 54% of Turks still oppose their neighbor Iran having nuclear weapons, that opposition is down 11 points since last year. And opposition in Lebanon is also down seven points since 2006.

Opposition to Iran's nuclear program among its neighbors generally tracks public fears of the threat an Iranian atomic bomb might pose to their country. A majority of Lebanese (57%) see a nuclear Iran as threatening. A majority of Tunisians (57%) and Pakistanis (57%) do not.

The outlier is Jordan. A very strong Jordanian majority opposes Tehran's nuclear ambitions, but a majority (55%) also say that such an Iranian force would pose no danger to their safety.

Is a Nuclear-Armed Iran a Threat?



PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q104b.

Opposition to the Iranian nuclear armaments program is overwhelming in Japan (94%), Brazil (91%) and Mexico (86%).

Divisions Over Tougher Economic Sanctions

Economic sanctions have been imposed on Iran by the international community in an effort to dissuade Tehran from continuing its efforts to build a nuclear arsenal. Additional EU sanctions are scheduled to be put in place July 1, 2012.

Among those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons, Americans and citizens of their European negotiating partners in the E3+3 talks with Iran strongly support tougher international economic measures against Tehran to try to stop its atomic weapons program. This includes 80% in the U.S. and Germany, 79% in Britain and 74% in France.

In some of the negotiating partners, there is a bit of a generation gap among those who oppose a nuclear-armed Iran. Sanctions are generally supported by the young. But in Britain, people ages 18-29 are 17 points less likely to back sanctions than people 50 years of age and older. Similarly, in France the young are 14 points less likely than their elders to be supportive. And in the United States they are 13 points less likely.

The Chinese and Russians do not agree with their negotiating counterparts on economic sanctions. Moreover, support for sanctions is eroding in these two pivotal members of the E3+3 talks. Just 46% of Russians who oppose the Iranian nuclear program back new sanctions, down from 67% in 2010. In China, 38% favor more sanctions, a drop of 20 percentage points over the last two years.

Other Europeans are generally supportive of sanctions, including 79% of Czechs who oppose the Iranian program and 78% of Italians. But only 55% of Greeks agree. Some publics whose governments are further removed from the current negotiations with Iran are also somewhat less supportive: the Brazilians (62%) and Japanese (61%).

Iran's regional neighbors are fairly sympathetic toward sanctions, including 74% of Lebanese who oppose Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons, 70% of Egyptians and 68% of Jordanians. The Turks, with a lively cross border trade with Iran, see sanctions in a different light. Roughly

Many Approve of Tougher Economic Sanctions Against Iran

	Approve tougher sanctions	Disapprove tougher sanctions
	%	%
E3+3		
U.S.	80	16
Germany	80	18
Britain	79	18
France	74	26
Russia	46	42
China	38	54
Czech Rep.	79	17
Italy	78	15
Spain	72	25
Poland	71	21
Greece	55	39
Lebanon	74	20
Egypt	70	21
Jordan	68	28
Turkey	34	52
Mexico	73	23
Brazil	62	36
Japan	61	34

Asked only of those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

Pakistan, India, and Tunisia are not shown since fewer than half oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q104c.

half of those who oppose Iran's program in Turkey (52%) disapprove of tougher economic sanctions against their neighbor.

Divisions Over Military Action

Among those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons, Americans are the most willing to take military action if necessary to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapons program. The British and Germans lean toward the use of military force, while the French are split. The Russians and the Chinese show no support for a military strike and lean toward accepting a nuclear Iran.

If necessary to keep Tehran from developing nuclear weapons, 63% in the U.S. are willing to go to war. And that proportion has not changed significantly since 2010. Only 28% are ready to accept a nuclear-armed Iran.

Only about half of those who oppose an Iranian nuclear program among America's European allies in the E3+3 talks agree: 51% in Britain and France and 50% in Germany. This sentiment is unchanged in Britain and Germany, but down eight points in France since 2010. Thus there is a significant 12-13 point transatlantic divide on whether to take military action if the E3+3 talks fail to end the Iranian weapons program. Roughly two-in-five or more of the British, French and Germans could live with a nuclear-armed Iran.

Use of Force Generally Supported

	Use military force to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons	Accept a nuclear-armed Iran	Neither/Both/DK (Vol)
E3+3	%	%	%
U.S.	63	28	8
Britain	51	40	10
France	51	48	1
Germany	50	41	9
China	30	39	31
Russia	24	41	36
Czech Rep.	55	31	13
Spain	53	37	10
Italy	52	22	26
Poland	51	22	28
Greece	27	30	43
Egypt	52	17	31
Jordan	50	25	26
Lebanon	46	36	18
Turkey	26	42	32
Brazil	55	31	14
Mexico	54	34	12
Japan	40	49	11

Asked only of those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

"In your opinion, which is more important- preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons, even if it means taking military action OR avoiding a military conflict with Iran, even if it means they may develop nuclear weapons?"

Pakistan, India, and Tunisia are not shown since fewer than half oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q104d.

Within the E3+3 countries there are significant political differences on resorting to force. In the United States, among those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons, Republicans (79%) are more supportive of turning to military force if necessary than are Democrats (61%) or independents (58%).

In France there is also a left-right split. Only 43% of the French on the left of the political spectrum favor military action to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. A majority (56%) could accept a nuclear Iran. French conservatives take exactly the opposite view: 56% back military force. In Britain and Germany there is no significant ideological division on the issue.

For the most part there is no generation gap among the E3+3 over the use of force, except in Britain. Younger British, ages 18-29, are 19 points more likely to support military action than British 50 years of age and older.

Publics in Russia and China, the other two E3+3 negotiators with Iran, definitely do not back a military solution to the Iranian nuclear challenge. Only 30% of Chinese who oppose Iran's nuclear ambitions support the use of force. In Russia 24% hold this view, down from 32% in 2010. Roughly four-in-ten Russians (41%) and Chinese (39%) want to avoid war, even if that means Tehran gets the bomb. But 36% of Russians and 31% of the Chinese volunteer that they reject both options or have no opinion.

Sentiment in other parts of Europe is comparable to that among the European E3+3 participants. About half or more of Czechs (55%), Spanish (53%), Italians (52%) and Poles (51%) who oppose an Iranian nuclear program would back a military strike to halt it. The outlier is Greece, which is deeply divided: only 27% support a military solution, 30% would accept a nuclear-armed Iran and 43% reject both options or express no opinion.

U.S. Party Divide on Military Action

	Use military force to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons %	Accept a nuclear-armed Iran %	Neither/Both/DK (Vol) %
Total	63	28	8
Republican	79	15	6
Democrat	61	31	9
Independent	58	33	9

Asked only of those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q104d.

Less European Ideological Difference on Military Action

	% Saying prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, even if it means taking military action			
	Total %	Left %	Center %	Right %
Britain	51	50	50	51
France	51	43	51	56
Germany	50	48	52	52

Asked only of those who oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q104d.

By considerable margins, Egyptians and Jordanians who oppose Tehran acquiring nuclear weapons would support military action against Iran. Fully 52% in Egypt and 50% in Jordan back the use of force, only 17% of Egyptians and 25% of Jordanians say they can live with a nuclear Iran. And that sentiment has not changed much in the last two years.

In Lebanon, a plurality (46%) would approve resorting to armed intervention. The Turks, for their part, are very leery of the use of force. Barely a quarter (26%) would agree to military intervention in Iran, while 42% want to avoid a military conflict even if that means the Iranians develop a nuclear weapons capacity.

In other parts of the world, the Brazilians (55%) and the Mexicans (54%) would back the use of force. But only two-in-five Japanese (40%) would agree to do so. Sentiment in Japan seems to be shifting somewhat. In 2010 a majority of Japanese (55%) supported avoiding conflict at all cost. Today only 49% hold that position.


Iran's Negative International Image

Overall ratings of Iran remain largely negative across much of the world. Solid majorities in the United States and the European Union have an unfavorable opinion of Iran, including more than eight-in-ten people in Germany (91%), France (86%), Italy (85%) and Spain (84%).

Negative assessments are also common in E3+3 member China (62%). In Russia, however, views are divided, with 38% expressing a negative and 36% a positive view. Iran's image has declined slightly in Russia since last year, when 42% had a favorable opinion.

Iran is also unpopular in many predominantly Muslim nations who are its neighbors. Roughly six-in-ten Lebanese (61%) give the

Iran Widely Disliked



PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q8d.

Islamic Republic a negative rating, although views are sharply divided among the country's major religious communities.

About nine-in-ten Lebanese Shia Muslims (91%) hold a positive view of Iran, compared with just 5% of Sunni Muslims and 32% of Christians.

In Turkey, where diplomatic tensions with Iran have increased over the last year, 55% of the people have an unfavorable opinion about Iran, while only 26% express a favorable view.

Sharply Divided Views in Lebanon

	Fav %	Unfav %
Lebanon	40	61
Shia	91	9
Sunni	5	95
Christian	32	68

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q8d.


Jordanians (79% unfavorable) and Egyptians (76%) give Iran especially poor marks. Moreover, ratings for Iran have declined precipitously since 2006, when 59% of Egyptians and 49% of Jordanians expressed a positive view.

There is also a generation gap on this question in some countries in the region. Young people in Tunisia, ages 18-29, are 16 percentage points more likely to have an unfavorable view of Iran than are people 50 years of age and older. In Turkey the generation gap is 14 points, while in Lebanon it is ten points.

Pakistan sees its neighbor quite differently: 76% of Pakistanis give Iran a positive rating.

Meanwhile, Tunisians are roughly divided (43% unfavorable, 39% favorable).

Iran's Stature Falling in Egypt and Jordan



PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q8d.

Ahmadinejad Unpopular

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad receives largely negative reviews in most of the predominantly Muslim nations surveyed. However, Pakistan is again a major exception. About half of Pakistanis (47%) express a favorable opinion of Ahmadinejad, while just 6% give him an unfavorable rating (47% do not offer an opinion). Also, a plurality of Tunisians (42%) hold a positive view of the Iranian leader.

Once more, Lebanese opinions are split along religious lines, with nearly all Shia (95%) expressing a favorable view of Ahmadinejad and nearly all Sunnis (92%) offering a negative rating. Nearly six-in-ten Christians (57%) also see him in a negative light.

About half of Turks (48%) and large majorities of Jordanians (83%) and Egyptians (73%) have an unfavorable view of the Iranian president.

Limited Support for Ahmadinejad

	Favorable %	Unfavorable %	DK %
Pakistan	47	6	47
Tunisia	42	34	24
Lebanon	42	55	4
<i>Christian</i>	34	57	9
<i>Shia</i>	95	5	0
<i>Sunni</i>	6	92	2
Turkey	35	48	18
Egypt	23	73	5
Jordan	13	83	5

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q44a.

About the Pew Global Attitudes Project

The *Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project* conducts public opinion surveys around the world on a broad array of subjects ranging from people's assessments of their own lives to their views about the current state of the world and important issues of the day. The project is directed by Andrew Kohut, president of the Pew Research Center, a nonpartisan "fact tank" in Washington, DC, that provides information on the issues, attitudes, and trends shaping America and the world. The *Pew Global Attitudes Project* is principally funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Since its inception in 2001, the *Pew Global Attitudes Project* has released numerous major reports, analyses, and other releases, on topics including attitudes toward the U.S. and American foreign policy, globalization, terrorism, and democracy.

Pew Global Attitudes Project team members include Richard Wike (Associate Director), Juliana Menasce Horowitz, Katie Simmons, Jacob Poushter, and Cathy Barker. Other contributors to the project include Pew Research Center staff members James Bell (Director, International Survey Research), Bruce Stokes (Director, Pew Global Economic Attitudes), and Elizabeth Mueller Gross (Vice President), as well as Bruce Drake, Neha Sahgal, Carroll Doherty, and Michael Dimock. Additional members of the team include Mary McIntosh, president of Princeton Survey Research Associates International, and Mike Mokrzycki. The *Pew Global Attitudes Project* team regularly consults with survey and policy experts, regional and academic experts, journalists, and policymakers whose expertise provides tremendous guidance in shaping the surveys.

Pew Global Attitudes Project Public Opinion Surveys

<u>Survey</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Interviews</u>
Summer 2002	44 Nations	38,263
November 2002	6 Nations	6,056
March 2003	9 Nations	5,520
May 2003	21 Publics*	15,948
Spring 2004	9 Nations	7,765
Spring 2005	17 Nations	17,766
Spring 2006	15 Nations	16,710
Spring 2007	47 Publics*	45,239
Spring 2008	24 Nations	24,717
Spring 2009	25 Publics*	26,397
Fall 2009	14 Nations	14,760
Spring 2010	22 Nations	24,790
Spring 2011	23 Publics*	29,100
Spring 2012	21 Nations	26,210

* Includes the Palestinian territories.

The *Pew Global Attitudes Project's* co-chairs are on leave through 2012. The project is co-chaired by former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, currently principal, the Albright Stonebridge Group, and by former Senator John C. Danforth, currently partner, Bryan Cave LLP.

All of the project's reports and commentaries are available at www.pewglobal.org. The data are also made available on our website within two years of publication. Findings from the project are also analyzed in *America Against the World: How We Are Different and Why We Are Disliked* by Andrew Kohut and Bruce Stokes, published by Times Books. A paperback edition of the book was released in May 2007.

For further information, please contact:
Richard Wike
Associate Director, Pew Global Attitudes Project
202.419.4400 / rwike@pewresearch.org

Methods in Detail

About the 2012 Pew Global Attitudes Survey

Results for the survey are based on telephone and face-to-face interviews conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates International. Survey results are based on national samples except in China. For further details on sample designs, see below.

The descriptions below show the margin of sampling error based on all interviews conducted in that country. For results based on the full sample in a given country, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is plus or minus the margin of error. In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

Country:	Brazil
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by Brazil's five regions and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Portuguese
Fieldwork dates:	March 20 – April 19, 2012
Sample size:	800
Margin of Error:	±5.1 percentage points
Representative:	Adult population
Country:	Britain
Sample design:	Random Digit Dial (RDD) probability sample representative of all telephone households (roughly 98% of all British households)
Mode:	Telephone adults 18 plus
Languages:	English
Fieldwork dates:	March 19 – April 15, 2012
Sample size:	1,018
Margin of Error:	±3.3 percentage points
Representative:	Telephone households (including cell phone-only households) (roughly 98% of all British households)

Country:	China
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by China's three regional-economic zones (which include all provinces except Tibet, Xinjiang, Hong Kong and Macao) with disproportional sampling of the urban population. Twelve cities, 12 towns and 12 villages were sampled covering central, east, and west China. The cities sampled were Beijing, Shanghai, Qingdao, Nanjing, Haikou, Qinhuangdao, Wuhan, Shangqui, Xiangtan, Neijiang, Guilin, Chongqing. The towns covered were Zhangjiagang, Suzhou, Jiangsu; Dashiqiao, Yingkou, Liaoning; Jimo, Qingdao, Shandong; Gaoan Yichun, Jiangxi; Dali, DaliState, Yunnan; Shaowu, Nanping, Fujian; Xintai, Taian, Shandong; Gaobeidian, Baoding, Hebei; Ji'an, Tonghua, Jilin; Zaoyang, Xiangyang, Hubei; Guiping, Guigang, Guangxi; Yicheng, Xiangyang, Hubei. Two or three villages near each of these towns were sampled.
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Chinese (Mandarin, Hubei, Shandong, Chongqing, Hebei, Liaoning, Guangxi, Shanghai, Jilin, Jiangxi, Sichuan, Henan, Yunnan, Jiangsu, Hunan, and Hainan dialects)
Fieldwork dates:	March 18 – April 15, 2012
Sample size:	3,177
Margin of Error:	±4.3 percentage points
Representative:	Disproportionately urban (the sample is 55% urban, China's population is 50% urban). The sample represents roughly 64% of the adult population.
Note:	Data were purchased from Horizon Research Consultancy Group based on their self-sponsored survey "Chinese People View the World."
Country:	Czech Republic
Sample design:	Random Digit Dial (RDD) sample representative of all adults who own a cell phone (roughly 91% of adults age 18 and older)
Mode:	Telephone adults 18 plus
Languages:	Czech
Fieldwork dates:	March 17 – April 2, 2012
Sample size:	1,000
Margin of Error:	±3.4 percentage points
Representative:	Adults who own a cell phone (roughly 91% of adults age 18 and older)

Country: **Egypt**
 Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by governorates (excluding Frontier governorates for security reasons – about 2% of the population) proportional to population size and urban/rural population
 Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
 Languages: Arabic
 Fieldwork dates: March 19 – April 10, 2012
 Sample size: 1,000
 Margin of Error: ± 4.2 percentage points
 Representative: Adult population (excluding Frontier governorates or about 2% of the population)

Country: **France**
 Sample design: Random Digit Dial (RDD) sample representative of all telephone households (roughly 99% of all French households) with quotas for gender, age and occupation and proportional to region size and urban/rural population
 Mode: Telephone adults 18 plus
 Languages: French
 Fieldwork dates: March 20 – March 31, 2012
 Sample size: 1,004
 Margin of Error: ± 3.5 percentage points
 Representative: Telephone households (including cell phone-only households) (roughly 99% of all French households)

Country: **Germany**
 Sample design: Random Last Two Digit Dial (RL(2)D) probability sample representative all landline telephone households (roughly 91% of all German households) stratified by administrative districts proportional to population size and community size
 Mode: Telephone adults 18 plus
 Languages: German
 Fieldwork dates: March 19 – April 2, 2012
 Sample size: 1,000
 Margin of Error: ± 4.0 percentage points
 Representative: Telephone households (excluding cell phone-only households [8%] and households without telephones [1%])

Country:	Greece
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by region and proportional to population size and urban/rural population excluding the islands in the Aegean and Ionian Seas (roughly 6% of the population)
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Greek
Fieldwork dates:	March 20 – April 9, 2012
Sample size:	1,000
Margin of Error:	±3.7 percentage points
Representative:	Adult population (excluding the islands in the Aegean and Ionian Seas – roughly 6% of the population)
Country:	India
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample in the 14 most populous states (excluding Kerala and Assam) and the Union Territory of Delhi (86% of the adult population); disproportional sampling of the urban population (sample 50% urban/population 28% urban)
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Hindi, Bengali, Tamil, Kannad, Telugu, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya
Fieldwork dates:	March 19 – April 19, 2012
Sample size:	4,018
Margin of Error:	±3.9 percentage points
Representative:	Disproportionately urban. The data was weighted to reflect the actual urban/rural distribution in India. Sample covers roughly 86% of the Indian population.
Country:	Italy
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by four regions and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Italian
Fieldwork dates:	March 19 – April 10, 2012
Sample size:	1,074
Margin of Error:	±4.4 percentage points
Representative:	Adult population

Country: **Japan**
Sample design: Random Digit Dial (RDD) probability sample representative of all landline telephone households stratified by region and population size
Mode: Telephone adults 18 plus
Languages: Japanese
Fieldwork dates: March 20 – April 12, 2012
Sample size: 700
Margin of Error: ± 4.1 percentage points
Representative: Telephone households (excluding cell phone-only households [roughly 9%] and households with no telephones [roughly 5%])

Country: **Jordan**
Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by region and Jordan's 12 governorates and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages: Arabic
Fieldwork dates: March 19 – April 10, 2012
Sample size: 1,000
Margin of Error: ± 4.8 percentage points
Representative: Adult population

Country: **Lebanon**
Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by Lebanon's seven major regions (excluding a small area in Beirut controlled by a militia group and a few villages in the south Lebanon, which border Israel and are inaccessible to outsiders) and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages: Arabic
Fieldwork dates: March 19 – April 10, 2012
Sample size: 1,000
Margin of Error: ± 4.2 percentage points
Representative: Adult population

Country: **Mexico**
Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by region and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages: Spanish
Fieldwork dates: March 20 – April 2, 2012
Sample size: 1,200
Margin of Error: ± 3.8 percentage points
Representative: Adult population

Country: **Pakistan**
Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample of all four provinces stratified by province and the urban/rural population. (The Federally Administered Tribal Areas, Gilgit-Baltistan, Azad Jammu and Kashmir were excluded for security reasons, as were areas of instability in Baluchistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa [formerly the North-West Frontier Province] – roughly 18% of the population.)
Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages: Urdu, Pashto, Punjabi, Sindhi, Hindko, Saraiki, Brahvi, Balochi
Fieldwork dates: March 28 – April 13, 2012
Sample size: 1,206
Margin of Error: ± 4.2 percentage points
Representative: Sample is disproportionately urban, but data are weighted to reflect the actual urban/rural distribution in Pakistan. Sample covers roughly 82% of the adult population.

Country: **Poland**
Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by Poland's 16 provinces and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages: Polish
Fieldwork dates: March 24 – April 16, 2012
Sample size: 1,001
Margin of Error: ± 3.7 percentage points
Representative: Adult population

Country:	Russia
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by Russia's eight regions (excluding a few remote areas in the northern and eastern parts of the country and Chechnya) and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Russian
Fieldwork dates:	March 19 – April 4, 2012
Sample size:	1,000
Margin of Error:	±3.6 percentage points
Representative:	Adult population
Country:	Spain
Sample design:	Random Digit Dial (RDD) probability sample representative of telephone households (about 97% of Spanish households) stratified by region and proportional to population size
Mode:	Telephone adults 18 plus
Languages:	Spanish/Castilian
Fieldwork dates:	March 20 – April 2, 2012
Sample size:	1,000
Margin of Error:	±3.2 percentage points
Representative:	Telephone households (including cell phone-only households) (about 97% of Spanish households)
Country:	Tunisia
Sample design:	Multi-stage cluster sample stratified by governorate and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode:	Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages:	Tunisian Arabic
Fieldwork dates:	March 22 – April 20, 2012
Sample size:	1,000
Margin of Error:	±3.9 percentage points
Representative:	Adult population

Country: **Turkey**
Sample design: Multi-stage cluster sample in all 26 regions (based on geographical location and level of development [NUTS 2]) and proportional to population size and urban/rural population
Mode: Face-to-face adults 18 plus
Languages: Turkish
Fieldwork dates: March 20 – April 11, 2012
Sample size: 1,001
Margin of Error: ±5.2 percentage points
Representative: Adult population

Country: **United States**
Sample design: Random Digit Dial (RDD) probability sample representative of all telephone households stratified by county
Mode: Telephone adults 18 plus
Languages: English, Spanish
Fieldwork dates: March 20 – April 4, 2012
Sample size: 1,011
Margin of Error: ±3.5 percentage points
Representative: Telephone households (including cell phone-only households)

**Pew Global Attitudes Project
2012 Spring Survey Topline Results
May 18, 2012 Release**

Methodological notes:

- Survey results are based on national samples except in China. For further details on sample designs, see Survey Methods section.
- Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100%. The topline “total” columns show 100%, because they are based on unrounded numbers.
- Since 2007, the Global Attitudes Project has used an automated process to generate topline. As a result, numbers may differ slightly from those published prior to 2007.
- Spring, 2011 survey in Pakistan was fielded before the death of Osama bin Laden (April 10 – April 26), while the Late Spring, 2011 survey was conducted afterwards (May 8 – May 15).
- Trends from India prior to 2011 are not shown because those results were based on less-representative samples of the population. Since 2011, the samples have been more representative of the Indian population.
- Trends from Brazil prior to 2010 are not shown because those results were based on a less-representative sample of the population. Since 2010, the samples have been more representative of the Brazilian population.
- Not all questions included in the Spring 2012 survey are presented in this topline. Omitted questions have either been previously released or will be released in future reports.

		Q8d Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of: d. Iran					
		Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused	Total
United States	Spring, 2012	1	12	26	42	19	100
	Spring, 2011	3	16	28	39	14	100
	Spring, 2010	3	15	29	38	15	100
	Fall, 2009	1	10	25	52	12	100
	Spring, 2009	4	17	28	35	15	100
	Spring, 2008	5	15	27	37	16	100
	Spring, 2007	2	12	26	45	14	100
	Spring, 2006	8	17	26	31	18	100
Britain	Spring, 2012	1	15	32	36	15	100
	Spring, 2011	4	19	32	26	19	100
	Spring, 2010	2	20	33	25	19	100
	Spring, 2009	4	25	33	19	19	100
	Spring, 2008	3	30	30	16	22	100
	Spring, 2007	2	22	33	24	19	100
	Spring, 2006	3	31	24	15	28	100
France	Spring, 2012	1	13	32	54	0	100
	Spring, 2011	3	18	37	41	1	100
	Spring, 2010	1	17	37	44	0	100
	Spring, 2009	2	21	44	32	1	100
	Spring, 2008	2	17	45	37	0	100
	Spring, 2007	1	13	41	43	1	100
	Spring, 2006	1	21	47	30	0	100
Germany	Spring, 2012	1	5	46	45	4	100
	Spring, 2011	1	8	48	38	5	100
	Spring, 2010	0	8	49	37	6	100
	Spring, 2009	1	10	55	27	7	100
	Spring, 2008	1	11	53	29	6	100
	Spring, 2007	2	8	45	40	5	100
	Spring, 2006	1	11	50	32	6	100
Spain	Spring, 2012	3	6	34	50	7	100
	Spring, 2011	3	8	39	43	7	100
	Spring, 2010	2	11	48	25	13	100
	Spring, 2009	1	13	46	24	15	100
	Spring, 2008	1	10	36	41	13	100
	Spring, 2007	1	14	40	32	13	100
	Spring, 2006	3	19	34	32	11	100
Italy	Spring, 2012	0	5	28	57	9	100
	Spring, 2007	1	11	41	36	11	100

		Q8d Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of: d. Iran					
		Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused	Total
Greece	Spring, 2012	2	25	34	28	11	100
Poland	Spring, 2012	2	18	43	26	12	100
	Spring, 2011	1	23	41	15	20	100
	Spring, 2010	4	22	42	20	12	100
	Spring, 2009	1	19	42	19	18	100
	Spring, 2008	0	16	46	22	15	100
	Spring, 2007	2	15	43	25	15	100
	Spring, 2007	2	15	43	25	15	100
Czech Republic	Spring, 2012	1	8	39	38	14	100
	Spring, 2007	1	12	47	33	7	100
Russia	Spring, 2012	6	30	28	10	26	100
	Spring, 2011	9	33	27	8	24	100
	Spring, 2010	7	29	30	15	20	100
	Spring, 2009	5	33	28	7	26	100
	Spring, 2008	6	34	29	10	22	100
	Spring, 2007	6	31	33	7	23	100
	Spring, 2006	10	33	29	9	20	100
Turkey	Spring, 2012	8	18	16	39	19	100
	Spring, 2011	6	18	25	37	15	100
	Spring, 2010	5	21	15	43	16	100
	Spring, 2009	4	15	12	46	23	100
	Spring, 2008	6	18	11	45	20	100
	Spring, 2007	5	23	18	38	16	100
	Spring, 2006	18	35	15	20	12	100
	Summer, 2002	5	17	17	44	17	100
Egypt	Spring, 2012	4	18	42	34	1	100
	Spring, 2011	3	19	38	37	2	100
	Spring, 2010	5	28	34	32	1	100
	Spring, 2009	7	28	25	37	4	100
	Spring, 2008	9	37	34	20	1	100
	Spring, 2007	6	42	39	11	1	100
	Spring, 2006	13	46	30	9	1	100
Jordan	Spring, 2012	3	15	38	41	3	100
	Spring, 2011	3	20	35	37	5	100
	Spring, 2010	11	26	34	29	1	100
	Spring, 2009	5	25	24	42	4	100
	Spring, 2008	10	31	29	27	4	100
	Spring, 2007	8	38	32	21	1	100
	Spring, 2006	12	37	33	18	1	100
Lebanon	Spring, 2012	26	13	13	48	0	100
	Spring, 2011	25	14	12	47	2	100
	Spring, 2010	23	16	13	47	1	100
	Spring, 2009	23	12	8	54	3	100
	Spring, 2008	19	15	10	56	1	100
	Spring, 2007	17	19	14	50	1	100
Tunisia	Spring, 2012	14	25	26	17	17	100
China	Spring, 2012	2	19	43	19	16	100
	Spring, 2011	3	26	41	13	18	100
	Spring, 2010	3	24	47	13	14	100
	Spring, 2009	2	23	47	10	17	100
	Spring, 2008	2	22	42	11	23	100
	Spring, 2007	2	24	46	9	19	100
	Spring, 2006	2	24	40	8	26	100
India	Spring, 2012	4	15	15	13	54	100
	Spring, 2011	3	14	15	14	54	100
Japan	Spring, 2012	0	15	48	28	8	100

		Q8d Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of: d. Iran					
		Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused	Total
Japan	Spring, 2011	1	19	44	13	24	100
	Spring, 2010	1	11	53	22	13	100
	Spring, 2009	1	15	48	19	17	100
	Spring, 2008	1	16	51	19	12	100
	Spring, 2007	1	13	46	24	15	100
	Spring, 2006	3	20	53	15	8	100
Pakistan	Spring, 2012	40	36	4	4	15	100
	Late Spring, 2011	33	38	5	3	22	100
	Spring, 2011	35	38	5	5	18	100
	Spring, 2010	35	37	6	3	19	100
	Spring, 2009	33	41	4	4	18	100
	Spring, 2008	39	28	7	5	21	100
	Spring, 2007	38	30	4	6	21	100
	Spring, 2006	41	31	6	4	18	100
Brazil	Spring, 2012	2	11	41	33	14	100
	Spring, 2011	2	18	40	21	20	100
	Spring, 2010	1	17	46	19	16	100
Mexico	Spring, 2012	3	13	21	32	31	100
	Spring, 2011	2	19	38	20	21	100
	Spring, 2010	1	15	27	19	38	100
	Spring, 2009	3	17	27	23	30	100
	Spring, 2008	2	11	24	32	32	100
	Spring, 2007	6	18	33	25	17	100

		Q44a Now I'd like to ask your views about some additional political leaders. Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of: a. Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad					
		Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused	Total
Turkey	Spring, 2012	11	24	22	26	18	100
Egypt	Spring, 2012	4	19	37	36	5	100
Jordan	Spring, 2012	2	11	35	48	5	100
Lebanon	Spring, 2012	29	13	9	46	4	100
Tunisia	Spring, 2012	13	29	18	16	24	100
Pakistan	Spring, 2012	22	25	4	2	47	100

		Q104 Now thinking about Iran, would you favor or oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons?			
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Refused	Total
United States	Spring, 2012	2	94	5	100
	Spring, 2010	3	94	3	100
	Spring, 2007	3	93	4	100
	Spring, 2006	3	92	5	100
Britain	Spring, 2012	4	91	4	100
	Spring, 2010	3	90	6	100
	Spring, 2007	7	86	7	100
	Spring, 2006	5	89	6	100
France	Spring, 2012	4	96	0	100
	Spring, 2010	5	95	0	100
	Spring, 2007	6	94	1	100
	Spring, 2006	7	92	0	100
Germany	Spring, 2012	3	96	1	100
	Spring, 2010	1	98	0	100
	Spring, 2007	3	97	1	100
	Spring, 2006	2	97	1	100
Spain	Spring, 2012	4	95	1	100
	Spring, 2010	3	94	3	100
	Spring, 2007	5	89	6	100
	Spring, 2006	0	95	5	100
Italy	Spring, 2012	4	91	5	100
	Spring, 2007	4	87	9	100
Greece	Spring, 2012	9	87	4	100
Poland	Spring, 2012	7	88	4	100
	Spring, 2010	8	87	5	100
	Spring, 2007	3	93	5	100
Czech Republic	Spring, 2012	3	94	3	100
	Spring, 2007	3	95	2	100
Russia	Spring, 2012	11	77	12	100
	Spring, 2010	7	81	12	100
	Spring, 2007	8	80	12	100
	Spring, 2006	11	82	8	100
Turkey	Spring, 2012	29	54	17	100
	Spring, 2011	20	65	14	100
	Spring, 2010	21	63	17	100
	Spring, 2009	21	65	14	100
	Spring, 2008	21	67	11	100
	Spring, 2007	25	59	16	100
	Spring, 2006	23	61	16	100
Egypt	Spring, 2012	23	66	12	100
	Spring, 2011	26	63	11	100
	Spring, 2010	26	66	9	100
	Spring, 2009	26	64	9	100
	Spring, 2008	26	61	12	100
	Spring, 2007	24	57	19	100
	Spring, 2006	44	42	14	100
Jordan	Spring, 2012	21	76	3	100
	Spring, 2011	22	70	8	100
	Spring, 2010	39	53	8	100

		Q104 Now thinking about Iran, would you favor or oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons?			
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Refused	Total
Jordan	Spring, 2009	34	56	10	100
	Spring, 2008	29	61	10	100
	Spring, 2007	32	55	13	100
	Spring, 2006	45	42	12	100
Lebanon	Spring, 2012	35	62	3	100
	Spring, 2011	34	64	3	100
	Spring, 2010	34	64	2	100
	Spring, 2009	31	66	3	100
	Spring, 2008	28	69	4	100
	Spring, 2007	29	69	2	100
Tunisia	Spring, 2012	42	43	16	100
China	Spring, 2012	25	54	21	100
	Spring, 2010	20	65	15	100
	Spring, 2007	17	69	14	100
	Spring, 2006	18	52	29	100
India	Spring, 2012	15	34	51	100
Japan	Spring, 2012	4	94	2	100
	Spring, 2010	2	96	2	100
	Spring, 2007	1	93	5	100
	Spring, 2006	4	96	1	100
Pakistan	Spring, 2012	50	11	39	100
	Late Spring, 2011	61	11	28	100
	Spring, 2011	64	13	23	100
	Spring, 2010	58	10	33	100
	Spring, 2009	59	16	24	100
	Spring, 2008	60	19	21	100
	Spring, 2007	58	13	29	100
	Spring, 2006	52	15	33	100
Brazil	Spring, 2012	5	91	3	100
	Spring, 2010	5	85	9	100
Mexico	Spring, 2012	9	86	5	100
	Spring, 2010	3	86	10	100
	Spring, 2007	11	81	9	100

		Q104b If Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons, would this represent a very serious threat to our country, a somewhat serious threat, a minor threat, or no threat at all?					
		Very serious threat	Somewhat serious threat	Minor threat	No threat at all	DK/Refused	Total
Turkey	Spring, 2012	25	21	19	18	16	100
	Spring, 2010	32	17	15	20	16	100
	Spring, 2009	32	27	7	21	13	100
	Spring, 2008	45	20	6	19	10	100
	Spring, 2007	37	22	9	17	15	100
Egypt	Spring, 2012	27	27	32	14	1	100
	Spring, 2010	29	23	30	15	2	100
	Spring, 2009	18	26	33	19	3	100
	Spring, 2008	13	30	29	27	2	100
	Spring, 2007	17	32	25	26	1	100
Jordan	Spring, 2012	22	20	30	25	4	100
	Spring, 2010	21	20	33	25	1	100
	Spring, 2009	19	17	19	40	5	100
	Spring, 2008	20	21	15	39	6	100
	Spring, 2007	29	19	8	41	4	100
Lebanon	Spring, 2012	41	16	11	29	3	100
	Spring, 2010	41	16	12	29	2	100
	Spring, 2009	39	17	13	27	4	100
	Spring, 2008	43	18	8	27	4	100
	Spring, 2007	42	21	11	24	1	100
Tunisia	Spring, 2012	11	20	13	44	13	100
Pakistan	Spring, 2012	7	6	6	51	29	100
	Spring, 2010	8	7	9	47	28	100
	Spring, 2009	13	7	9	52	19	100
	Spring, 2008	11	7	10	52	20	100
	Spring, 2007	9	12	8	47	25	100

		Q104c ASK IF OPPOSES IRAN ACQUIRING NUCLEAR WEAPONS: Do you approve or disapprove of tougher international economic sanctions on Iran to try to stop it from developing nuclear weapons?				
		Approve	Disapprove	DK/Refused	Total	N=
United States	Spring, 2012	80	16	3	100	948
	Spring, 2010	85	11	3	100	951
Britain	Spring, 2012	79	18	3	100	924
	Spring, 2010	78	18	4	100	683
France	Spring, 2012	74	26	0	100	962
	Spring, 2010	76	23	0	100	709
Germany	Spring, 2012	80	18	2	100	959
	Spring, 2010	77	21	2	100	732
Spain	Spring, 2012	72	25	3	100	958
	Spring, 2010	79	18	3	100	706
Italy	Spring, 2012	78	15	7	100	983
Greece	Spring, 2012	55	39	5	100	871
Poland	Spring, 2012	71	21	8	100	878
	Spring, 2010	72	17	10	100	656
Czech Republic	Spring, 2012	79	17	3	100	943
Russia	Spring, 2012	46	42	12	100	770
	Spring, 2010	67	22	11	100	813
Turkey	Spring, 2012	34	52	14	100	546
	Spring, 2010	44	40	16	100	628
Egypt	Spring, 2012	70	21	9	100	656
	Spring, 2010	72	15	13	100	659
Jordan	Spring, 2012	68	28	4	100	760
	Spring, 2010	66	28	6	100	527
Lebanon	Spring, 2012	74	20	6	100	621
	Spring, 2010	72	21	7	100	657
Tunisia	Spring, 2012	43	53	4	100	425
China	Spring, 2012	38	54	8	100	1797
	Spring, 2010	58	32	10	100	2022
India	Spring, 2012	56	38	6	100	1601
Japan	Spring, 2012	61	34	5	100	660
	Spring, 2010	66	27	7	100	670
Pakistan	Spring, 2012	33	53	14	100	148
	Spring, 2010	19	62	19	100	221
Brazil	Spring, 2012	62	36	2	100	728
	Spring, 2010	65	31	4	100	839
Mexico	Spring, 2012	73	23	4	100	1034
	Spring, 2010	71	23	6	100	1123

In 2010, question read "Would you approve or disapprove..."

		Q104d ASK IF OPPOSES IRAN ACQUIRING NUCLEAR WEAPONS: In your opinion, which is more important...						
		Preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons, even if it means taking military action OR	Avoiding a military conflict with Iran, even if it means they may develop nuclear weapons	Neither (Volunteered)	Both (Volunteered)	DK/Refused	Total	N=
United States	Spring, 2012	63	28	1	0	7	100	948
	Spring, 2010	66	24	1	0	9	100	951
Britain	Spring, 2012	51	40	2	1	7	100	924
	Spring, 2010	48	37	4	2	9	100	683
France	Spring, 2012	51	48	1	0	0	100	962
	Spring, 2010	59	41	0	0	0	100	709
Germany	Spring, 2012	50	41	3	1	5	100	959
	Spring, 2010	51	39	2	1	7	100	732
Spain	Spring, 2012	53	37	5	1	4	100	958
	Spring, 2010	50	34	7	2	7	100	706
Italy	Spring, 2012	52	22	14	6	6	100	983
Greece	Spring, 2012	27	30	32	6	5	100	871
Poland	Spring, 2012	51	22	10	7	11	100	878
	Spring, 2010	54	25	5	4	13	100	656
Czech Republic	Spring, 2012	55	31	4	0	9	100	943
Russia	Spring, 2012	24	41	15	8	13	100	770
	Spring, 2010	32	32	14	5	17	100	813
Turkey	Spring, 2012	26	42	7	3	22	100	546
	Spring, 2010	29	37	8	8	18	100	628
Egypt	Spring, 2012	52	17	20	4	7	100	656
	Spring, 2010	55	16	19	0	10	100	659
Jordan	Spring, 2012	50	25	19	0	7	100	760
	Spring, 2010	53	20	18	0	8	100	527
Lebanon	Spring, 2012	46	36	10	5	3	100	621
	Spring, 2010	44	37	9	6	4	100	657
Tunisia	Spring, 2012	22	69	5	1	3	100	425
China	Spring, 2012	30	39	6	8	17	100	1797
	Spring, 2010	35	43	4	10	8	100	2022
India	Spring, 2012	53	26	6	1	15	100	1601
Japan	Spring, 2012	40	49	6	1	4	100	660
	Spring, 2010	34	55	7	0	3	100	670
Pakistan	Spring, 2012	28	29	24	2	17	100	148
	Spring, 2010	21	34	21	3	20	100	221
Brazil	Spring, 2012	55	31	9	1	4	100	728
	Spring, 2010	54	33	8	1	5	100	839
Mexico	Spring, 2012	54	34	4	3	5	100	1034
	Spring, 2010	49	32	8	4	8	100	1123