



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Braghiroli, S. & Salini, L. (2014). How Do the Others See Us? An Analysis of Public Opinion Perceptions of the EU and USA in Third Countries. *Transworld*, 33(33), pp. 1-19.

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/13676/>

**Link to published version:**

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

---



# TRANSWORLD

THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP AND THE FUTURE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

ISSN 2281-5252

WORKING PAPER 33 | JUNE 2014

The European Union and the United States are global actors involved in intense relations with third countries and the outside world, which pertain economic, political, diplomatic, and security-related aspects. The US has been facing in recent years a growing number of challenges from non-Western rising powers. The EU has for a while played a more assertive role vis-à-vis the outside world following

a process of internal consolidation of its own institutions and structures and these developments seem to reflect a wider process of regionalisation of global relations. This study provides a comprehensive review of the existing surveys addressing the external perceptions of the EU and the US, thereby contributing to drawing their external image in its different shades: their role in the global economy, international security, human rights and democracy promotion.

## How Do the Others See Us? An Analysis of Public Opinion Perceptions of the EU and USA in Third Countries

Stefano Braghiroli  
and Luca Salini



THIS PROJECT HAS RECEIVED FUNDING FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION'S SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION UNDER GRANT AGREEMENT NO 290454

# How Do the Others See Us?

## An Analysis of Public Opinion Perceptions of the EU and USA in Third Countries

Stefano Braghiroli and Luca Salini\*

---

Latin America   Africa   Asia   Public opinion   EU   US

---

### Introduction

---

The EU and the USA both represent global actors involved in intense relations with third countries and the outside world, which involve economic, political, diplomatic, and security-related aspects.

Following the end of the Cold War the USA have emerged as the only remaining superpower with global interests to promote and protect. While during the 1990s the primacy of the USA appeared virtually unchallenged, in the last years a growing number of challenges has been emerging. Recently, a number of non-Western rising powers have been seen by pundits and policy-makers as potentially challenging the foundations of the current world order. In particular, the emergence of alternative and competing models has allegedly challenged the global US leadership as a projection of the current economic system and international order.

The EU is increasingly playing a more aware role *vis-à-vis* the outside world following a process of internal consolidation of its own institutions and structures. As part of the institutional changes introduced by the recent treaty reforms,<sup>1</sup> the EU has gained power exponentially, while showing greater activism within the sphere of external relations. This does not necessary imply that such activism is fully reflected in the official prerogatives of the Union, but that its substantial influence in relations with third countries has undeniably grown. EU's role is particularly strong in areas such as trade, international aid and democracy promotion.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Treaty on the European Union, as amended by the Lisbon Treaty, the European Union defines and pursues common policies and actions with, among others, the objectives of safeguarding its values, fundamental interests, security, independence and integrity; consolidating and supporting democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law; preserving peace, preventing conflicts and strengthening international security; fostering the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries; encouraging the integration of all countries into the world economy; preserving and improving the quality of the environment and the sustainable management of global natural resources; promoting an international system based on stronger multilateral cooperation and good global governance.

\* **Stefano Braghiroli** is **ERMOS Researcher at the Institute of Government and Politics, University of Tartu, Estonia, and Research Affiliate at the Centre for the Study of Political Change (CIRCaP), Department of Social, Political and Cognitive Sciences, University of Siena. Luca Salini** holds a master's degree in International Studies from the University of Siena, where he collaborated as teaching assistant, interviewer and researcher at the Laboratory on Social and Political Analysis (LAPS) and the CIRCaP.

Among the most important actions through which the EU plays a relevant global role we can find peace building in the Western Balkans after the Yugoslav wars, maintaining solid and friendly relations with neighbouring countries through the European Neighbourhood Policy, donating great amounts of money to development aid, working for peace in the Middle East through the Quartet, promoting the respect of human rights in all the facets of its external relations, working closely with the United Nations on a multitude of issues affecting the international community, operating civilian and military missions worldwide under the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), participating to international humanitarian relief in the occurrence of crises and emergencies, when aid is most needed, negotiating legally binding international agreements on climate change, including but not limited to the Kyoto Protocol, promoting a free and fairer international trading system through trade negotiations with international partners, and an ongoing process of enlargement of its own borders to new member countries, provided that they comply with the requirements imposed by the *acquis communautaire*.

In the last decade, what was defined in Maastricht terminology as the Common Foreign and Security Policy has been one of the most compelling factors in helping shape the EU's external image and the perception of its identity held by the rest of the world, constituting the lens through which it is identified and evaluated by outsiders worldwide. In the post 9/11 world, the EU has come a long way in strengthening its international voice and in differentiating itself from its transatlantic partners, as will be shown in the following paragraphs.

Perceptions of the European Union, unlike those of the US, have mostly been studied from an internal perspective, producing a wide range of contributions on topics such as EU's self-identification, Euroenthusiasm or Euroscepticism inside the European boundaries.

On the other hand, external perceptions of the European Union are still an underexplored territory: empirical data are often patchy and fragmented and few theoretical studies have been published. The novelty of this area is even more evident when compared to the rich and ever-growing literature on how the United States are seen abroad, which has created over time a mature research tradition.

Among the few projects recently conducted on these issues two are worth noting, namely, the ongoing project on the "External Perceptions of the European Union" (National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury, New Zealand), centred on the Asia-Pacific region, and the survey on "The External Image of the European Union", directed by Sonia Lucarelli within the framework of the GARNET Network of Excellence, which took into account surveys conducted in countries from different parts of the world.

Particularly relevant to our discussion appear the concepts of "capability-expectations gap" (Hill 1993), i.e. the discrepancy between what the EU can deliver on the international stage and what the other stakeholders expect it to accomplish, and "expectations deficit", which reverses the direction of the gap in major countries characterized by low awareness of the EU (Tsuruoka 2008:7).

In this respect, Tsuruoka highlights the gap between actual EU policy and actions and its external perceptions: the latter are not influenced only by the former, "but also by factors unrelated to what the EU is doing in its own territory and in the world" (Tsuruoka 2008:3), that is to say, in the perspective of third countries, "exogenous" and "endogenous" sources. In that view, the EU is only accountable for its exogenous influence on external perceptions, while endogenous factors tend to elude its control as they are only accountable to domestic

characteristics, be they contingent or permanent.<sup>2</sup> In this regard, the EU and EU-related themes are bent and twisted for political purposes which do not go beyond the domestic political arena, much alike to what happens in EU member countries.

Another important point that should be considered involves understanding the relationship between perceptions of the United States and perceptions of the European Union: much of the recent popularity of the EU outside the Euro-Atlantic area is parallel to the declined popularity of the US, which is undoubtedly taken as a reference point by the outside world. That is why differentiating its own international identity is one of the key to a successful European foreign policy, but the process of differentiation cannot put into question the relative proximity between the US and the EU as part of the Western world.

Lucarelli and Fioramonti (2008) highlight some recurring patterns regarding external perceptions of the EU: outside the European continent, and particularly in emerging markets, very few people are aware of the EU; even in industrialized societies, where people have a proved knowledge of Europe, not all the facets of the Union are equally well-known, with economic aspects under the spotlight and political and institutional aspects the least salient. Only a minority of those citizens who do have an opinion about the EU see it as a “politically effective and credible international actor” and even fewer expect it to gain clout in the near future. Some of the factors which were found to be correlated with the degree of knowledge of the EU are the level of education, socio-economic background and professional status. Major European countries such as France, Germany and the UK constitute an important filter that mediates external perceptions of the EU in light of their former colonial ties, bilateral cooperation or trade relations with other countries. In general, there is a significant gap between the EU’s self-representation and its external perception in several of its defining policy areas (Lucarelli and Fioramonti 2008).

The research project “External Perceptions of the European Union”, although geo-territorially defined, has produced a detailed map of Asia-Pacific perceptions of the EU on three different levels of analysis: public opinion, media representation and elite opinion.

Chaban and Holland (2005) showed that the Asia-Pacific public has a reasonable level of knowledge about the EU, which it views primarily in economic terms, assigning more impact to its trade, agricultural, economic and monetary policies; the EU’s international role also attracts some attention, while its internal politics were rated as the least important, with the exception of EU enlargement.

Surveyed Asia-Pacific elites depict the EU as an economic power rather than a normative, cultural, diplomatic or military power, but they do not perceive it as their most important counterpart, while prioritizing other regional powers, the US or Asia as a whole (Holland et al. 2005, Chaban and Holland 2010).

In the light of these arguments the objective of the present paper is to fill the gap existing in the literature, thereby presenting a wide and consistent review of the existing surveys addressing the external perceptions of the EU and the US. The captured perceptions are thought to cover a long time span, starting from the year 2000, and to include a highly diversified geo-territorial range. Analysed items – although part of very different survey projects – are considered in a comparative and consistent fashion.

Our objective seems particularly relevant as the literature has filled some of the existing gaps in describing external perceptions of the EU (and to a large extent of the US), but it has often missed out on investigating the

---

2 For more details on the cases of the United States and Japan, see Tsuruoka (2008).

factors that lie behind these perceptions. In this respect, taking into account disaggregated data at national and regional level allows us to add more nuances to our understanding of the matter. In this respect, it is however worth noting that the available research is still quite limited in time and space, with some areas not being covered and many surveys and specific questions being fragmented and not repeated at regular intervals.

As the literature suggests, when reviewing available surveys on external perceptions of the EU and the US we will consider that – both at public and elite level – they generally reflect a varying balance of functional/ interest-based and identitarian factors; while in the specific countries which were analysed the overall stance is alternatively leaning towards one pole or the other, according to the specific geo-territorial context considered.

Accordingly, contributions in this field stress the relevance of contextual factors, such as religion and culture, in determining dynamics of path dependence affecting current perceptions of both the EU and the US and the nature of current economic and political relations.

The paper covers four main areas reflecting a wide array of dimensions that define as a mosaic the way third countries frame and understand the EU and the US and their role in the world. The four macro-areas analysed here include: 1) the way the EU and the US are understood and framed in the outside world and their perceived role in 2) the global economy; 3) the management of international security; 4) matters related to human rights and democracy.

## 1. Survey Data and Methodology


---

The research presented in this report has the aim to depict how the EU and the US are framed and understood outside their borders. In order to do that, all the relevant surveys available have been collected and reviewed in order to have the widest possible and more precise representation of others' perception of the two actors under investigation.

Figure 1 summarizes the different geo-territorial contexts addressed by the analysed survey waves. In particular, the key sources used include four waves of the Afrobarometer survey conducted between 1999 and 2006, covering in its last edition 18 African countries; two waves of the Asian Barometer survey conducted between 2001 and 2011, including in its last edition 13 Asian countries; two waves of the ArabBarometer survey conducted between 1999 and 2006, including in its last edition 13 Arab countries. The South American context has been explored by two different surveys: Latinobarómetro (from 2000 to 2009, including 17 countries) and LAPOP (from 2004 to 2010, including 26 countries).

Other surveys used in the report are not geographically defined, but include respondents from different geo-territorial contexts and world regions. This is the case for the World Value Survey (WVS) (1999-2004/2005), Global Attitudes Project (GAP) (from 2002 to 2010), and Voice of the People (VoP) (from 2000 to 2011).

• Figure 1 | **Geo-territorial distribution of the surveys included in the analysis**



For the purposes of our analysis we undertook a second round of coding on the 546 questions initially assigned to the “How the others see us” issue area, which allowed us to identify and separate the questions covering the issue areas investigated defined above relating to the perceptions of the EU and USA. The former were used for studying external perceptions in the four issue areas, while the latter formed the basis of our analysis of generic perceptions of the EU/US and their leaders by the world’s public opinion. The available survey data on climate change were deemed insufficient for a thorough analysis of perceptions related to this issue area. Our data presentation for questions related to the three remaining issue areas follows the general structure of the project, addressing the four overarching themes underlined in the introduction wherever available data made it possible; on the other hand, generic perceptions are organised according to different themes in light of their distinguishing nature. All the relevant cross-tabulations that were used for this analysis can be found in the Appendix to the paper.

Before moving on to the analysis, it seems worth mentioning that, depending from the survey taken into consideration, different informative levels and consistency could be observed. The same can be said with respect to the level of compatibility between the surveys analysed and between one wave and the other of the same survey.



## 2. Perceptions of the EU and US in Issues Related to Global Economy

For what regards external perceptions on global economy, the available survey data allows us to take into account three of the four major themes that we identified earlier: namely, general orientations, the role of the EU/US in the area and attitudes towards some of the involved policy alternatives and instruments.

Although the global economy is generally a common theme in surveys, not much can be said about the general orientations of the international public opinion towards the issue area: only some Latinobarómetro surveys (in 2002 and 2003) have been gauging public attitudes on topics such as private investment and private economic initiative, free competition and globalization. The Latin American public shows a moderate appreciation for the impact of private investment, free competition and international free trade treaties on job opportunities (tables 1-3), with positive responses almost always outweighing negative ones, and countries such as Costa Rica, Panama, Paraguay and Venezuela among the most enthusiastic. As for reasons for economic problems in their country (table 4), most people across Latin America put much blame on their national government, followed by globalization (mostly mentioned in Panama, at 35 percent in 2002 and 28 percent in 2003), lack of domestically produced goods (mostly mentioned in Honduras and Uruguay), lack of entrepreneurial and individual initiative (mostly mentioned in Chile, Honduras and Panama); international economic institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and especially the World Trade Organization are less frequently mentioned, with Argentina being a notable exception to this trend.

The impact of EU and US policies on foreign economies was assessed by several surveys, including GAP, Gallup VoP and especially Latinobarómetro. Some of the questions asked in the GAP and Gallup VoP surveys measure the perceived impact of US, in generic terms or through its policies, on the world economy, the gap between rich and poor countries and poverty. Interestingly, some Middle Eastern and Latin American countries such as Jordan, Kuwait, Palestinian Territories and Argentina share the most negative opinions on the effect of US policies on the global economic divide (table 5): in these countries, around or over 70 percent of the surveyed replied that such policies increase the gap. African countries, as well as other significant Latin American countries, such as Venezuela, seem to hold more nuanced opinions on the topic. This trend is confirmed by the Gallup VoP data (from 2004 and 2006) measuring the effect of US on growth of the world economy and on poverty (tables 6-7): in this case the Argentinian and Venezuelan public opinions are constantly separated by around 20 percentage points; on the other hand, African respondents were highly supportive, with the Ghanaian public evaluating the US even better than the US public itself. The Latin American public, as surveyed by Latinobarómetro, is nearly unanimous in accepting the importance of trade with the US (table 8): the Argentinian public, which is the less like-minded, has 53 percent of positive opinions; but when it comes to confidence on US support to Latin American economic development (table 9), only Central American countries show levels of confidence exceeding 50 percent. Two years later, in comparison, more people seem to recognize the US as the biggest actual contributor to the development of their country (up to 70 percent in Colombia and 75 percent in El Salvador) (table 10). Trade with the EU and Japan (tables 11-12) is likewise deemed quite important for the economic health of the respondents' countries, although on a minor level than trade with the US. The previous trends are also confirmed by the approval ratings for the way Barack Obama is dealing with the world economic crisis, as measured by GAP 2010 (table 13): African and Asian countries (Kenya, Nigeria, Indonesia, South Korea) are the most supportive, Latin Americans give lukewarm responses, while critics have a wide majority in Middle Eastern countries such as Jordan and Egypt.

As for who holds the major role in promoting free trade (table 14), the US obtains an absolute majority in several Latin American countries, while the Argentinian and Uruguayan public tend to give more importance to the EU; Japan competes with the EU where the US is mentioned the most and it is trailing in some cases, e.g. Paraguay; the Brazilian public gives the most balanced reply, dividing almost equally between US, Japan, EU and China (which receives a striking 27 percent of mentions). Most of the time, these data reflect the perceived importance of the different trading partners (table 15): a notable exception can be found in Paraguay and Peru, where more than 60 percent of the surveyed public mentions Japan as the most important partner; the EU is not mentioned as the leading partner in any Latin American country, with the higher share of mentions (36 percent) to be found again in Uruguay.

Spain maintains his special relationship with Latin America in light of their historical, cultural and linguistic ties and therefore it has been put under the spotlight by the Latinobarómetro surveys with some questions specifically addressed at assessing the state of their economic relationship. As for Spanish investment in Latin America (tables 16-17), most countries share mildly positive attitudes, albeit with variations in the distribution of support on a national basis. When asked in which sectors Spanish enterprises could contribute most to the development of their countries (table 18), many Latin Americans mentioned education (averaging at 58 percent, with spikes of 73 percent in Bolivia and 72 percent in Honduras), followed by tourism (averaging at 39 percent) and infrastructures and transport (31 percent); among the least mentioned sectors were banking (16 percent) and defense and army (7 percent).

Lastly, for what regards policy alternatives in the economic field, the available data is once again coming from a Latinobarómetro survey (2001): the most relevant question asks for “the most important thing to get the successful development in a country” (table 19) and respondents across Latin America mostly mentioned receiving a good education (averaging at 55 percent, with a spike of 81 percent in Honduras), having industries to export products (averaging at 36 percent, with spikes of 59 percent in Uruguay and 51 percent in Paraguay) having a lot of natural resources (averaging at 35 percent, with spikes of 53 percent in Honduras and 48 percent in Chile), while other options such as a Latin American common market and especially collaboration with the US were mentioned less often, with the exception of Panama in the last case. Central American countries, which show more support for a hypothetical Latin American common market, are also the ones who perceive to benefit the most from their regional trading block (table 20); member states of the Andean Community follow this trend, with the exception of Peru, while other countries from NAFTA (Mexico) and Mercosur (Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay) do not seem to perceive much of a benefit from belonging to their trading block.

### 3. Perceptions of the EU and US in Issues Related to International Security

---

Surveys containing questions on international security are abundant and these data allow us to give a brief account of the salience of the theme for what regards the Latin American public and then proceed to trace a detailed overview of global public opinion on the role of the US in the area in many of its facets and on attitudes towards some of the involved policy alternatives.

Starting with the salience of the issue area with regards to the Latin American public, as evidenced by Latinobarómetro data, we can see how the continent is quite evenly split between people who report to have “some” or “a lot of” interest in international affairs and people who report to have “little” or “no” interest in them

(table 21): the Dominican Republic is the country with the most positive responses (71 percent), while Central American countries and Brazil (65 percent) are leaning more towards the negative end of the spectrum. The 2006, 2008 and 2009 waves of Latinobarómetro contain questions gauging information and knowledge of simple facts related to international affairs, such as the degree of information on Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez and on the US presidential campaign and specifically asking for the name of the current US president (tables 22-24): information regarding Chávez is limited in most Latin American countries, with a fifth of the respondents (up to a third in some countries) not knowing enough to have an opinion on the matter; Colombia and Peru are the most informed countries. The US presidential campaign was followed with more attention, but positive responses are still a minority in several countries, such as Paraguay and Bolivia; Chile is an exception, with 58 percent of the respondents receiving at least some information. As for the name of the current US president, a fifth of the respondents did not know the answer (as much as 39 percent in Paraguay and 34 percent in Bolivia), while who answers the question is usually correct.

With regards to the role of the US in international security and affairs, GAP surveys measured international public attitudes with several questions repeated in their survey waves. A first question, reading “in making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like our country?” (table 25), depicts quite a composite map: North African and Middle Eastern countries (Egypt, Jordan, Palestinian territories) tend to give negative answers, as well as Russia, Ukraine and some Latin American countries (Argentina, Chile); on the positive end we can find other African countries (Ghana, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Kenya), Israel, India, Philippines, Vietnam and other Central and South American countries such as Guatemala, Honduras and Venezuela. Asian countries appear the most variable, with Indonesia and Japan moving between a majority of negative and neutral responses, the Chinese public giving more positive responses over the years and South Korea maintaining a negative stance.

In terms of the US contribution to solving world problems (table 26), responses are quite balanced if considered globally, but tend to split on a regional level, although exceptions exist: for instance, many respondents in Asia (Bangladesh, Indonesia, Japan, Vietnam) tend to think that the US does too much, while several Latin American countries (Bolivia, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico) think that the US does too little; as for who thinks that the US does the right amount, such respondents are a majority in the Philippines, Senegal and Ukraine.

The Central American public shows more confidence in the US as a world power compared to other Latin American countries, such as Argentina (table 27); Central America is also joined by Colombia on the positive end of the spectrum in questions asking to evaluate positively or negatively the US influence in the world (table 28) and specifically in Latin America (table 29). In comparison, the historical influence of Spain in the area is perceived more positively all across the continent (table 30), while the current influence of Venezuela is met with mixed responses, with negative perceptions especially concentrated in Colombia and Peru (table 31).

Other survey questions ask for the amount of influence that the US has on the respondents’ countries (table 32): both Latin American and African public opinions reckon that the US is having at least “a fair amount” of influence, with Brazil, Ethiopia and South Korea in the lead; on the other hand, few Chinese respondents admit the presence of “a great deal” of US influence on their country. And building on this pattern, most public opinions perceive the US influence to be increasing (table 33), with only Bolivia and Venezuela getting mixed results.

When it comes to the US ability in the area of conflict resolution, Central American countries again show more confidence than South American ones, with Colombia in a halfway position and Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil among the most openly critical (tables 34-35). The Latin American public is also sceptical about the prospect

of the US respecting international law, with less than one third of the respondents showing confidence in this regard (table 36).

A Latinobarómetro survey conducted in 2002, shortly after the 9/11 attacks, shows that the Latin American public acknowledges the existence of a world terrorist threat: only Mexico and Uruguay do not follow this trend, with the Paraguayan public showing mixed results (table 37). For what regards dealing with international terrorism, most countries both in Latin America and in other parts of the world tend to favour the US-led efforts to fight terrorism (table 38), with Argentina being a notable exception to this trend; quite predictably, most critics seem to concentrate in North Africa and the Middle East (Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Pakistan); after 2003 and especially in the late 2000s, public opinions seem to polarize even more on their previous positions. VoP surveys asked for the role played by the US in the fight against terrorism (table 39) and with regards to peace in the world (table 40): responses followed the already identified patterns, with critics concentrating in the Middle East and in specific Latin American countries.

As for the way the US are framed and perceived (whether as a partner or as an enemy), we can once again identify a trend of positive (partner) responses in most of Latin American and African countries plus India and Japan, and negative (enemy) responses in Middle Eastern countries (table 41). The Argentinian public is apparently giving different responses between the two surveys. In comparison, fewer people seem to identify China as an enemy (table 42), with the exceptions of India and South Korea. However, the 2002 GAP survey shows that more than two thirds of the Nigerian public is at least worried that the US could become a military threat to their country, along with Pakistan and Indonesia, more predictably (table 43).

With regards to the reasons why the US are perceived negatively, the Latin American public mostly mentions “the omnipotence of the USA in imposing its will on the others” and “the military intervention of the USA in other countries” (table 44).

US president Barack Obama’s policies are met with approval in most of the surveyed countries in 2009 and 2010, while disapprovals tend to concentrate once again in the Middle East (table 45).

VoP surveys asked for the perceived effect of US foreign policy on the respondents’ countries (table 46): majorities in most countries, including Argentina, Japan, Russia and Turkey, perceive it as negative, while few public opinions, such as Georgians, give positive responses. Consequently, the former public opinions would also rather see the US global influence decreasing as a requisite for the world to become a better place (table 47); Russia (table 48) and Iran (table 49) should see their influence decreasing as well, while the EU receives more mixed results (table 50); as for other aspiring powers, such as Brazil, India, China and South Africa (tables 51-54), the results vastly depend on the relations with the surveyed country, with China receiving somewhat more negative responses.

However, when it comes to the safety of a multipolar international system (table 55), most countries would rather not see the rise of any other major military power, with India being one of the few notable exceptions to this trend (45 percent of the Indian public would see the world as safer in that regard, while only 28 percent think it would be more dangerous).

Lastly, for what regards policy alternatives and the support they receive, we can rely on data contained in GAP, ArabBarometer and Latinobarómetro surveys. In 2010, GAP assessed US presidential approval ratings regarding specific Middle Eastern hotspots (tables 56-59): unsurprisingly, Egypt and Jordan constantly rank as

the most vocal critics, with Lebanon joining them on three out of the four surveyed topics (Afghanistan, Iraq and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but not Iran); Kenya and Nigeria are the only countries in which approvals reach an absolute majority, while all BRIC countries share a critical position, with Brazil being only slightly more supportive, exceeding 30 percent of approvals in the cases of Afghanistan and Iran.

Among the Arab public, many agree that the “US involvement in the region justifies armed operations against the US everywhere” (table 60), with Lebanon being the only surveyed country in which an absolute majority does not agree with this bold statement. However, much fewer respondents (around 11 percent) agree that “armed groups are justified in attacking civilians in Iraq in order to resist the American occupation” (table 61). Of course, this does not imply a positive evaluation of US democracy promotion in the region (table 62), but most respondents (overwhelming majorities in Kuwait and Lebanon) are able to differentiate their judgment of US foreign policies and US citizens (table 63). In addition, a majority of the Arab public seems to appreciate traits of the Western culture (table 64). Likewise, only negligible minorities see the US occupation of Iraq as one of the most important problems facing their country (table 65).

Among the Latin American public, three quarters of the surveyed samples declare their opposition to continuing the US embargo against Cuba: responses are equally balanced only in Costa Rica (table 66). Even in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, less than one third of the respondents supported the US military actions undertaken against Afghanistan, with Argentinians and Mexicans among the staunchest critics (table 67); that is even more evident in the case of Iraq, where support is even lower (averaging at 16 percent) and the openly disapproving camp is joined by Brazil and Uruguay (table 68). The 2005 Latinobarómetro survey allows us to contrast the ideal and actual priorities related to the US involvement in Latin America, as perceived by Latin Americans themselves (tables 69-70): majorities across the continent would rather see the US dealing with economic themes (reducing poverty and social inequality, helping to create jobs), followed by promoting good governance and fighting international terrorism; Brazilians and Venezuelans also give some prominence to the fight against drug production and trafficking. Moving to actual US policies, combating international terrorism is perceived as the current top priority, followed by the fight against illegal drug trade; on the other hand, economic themes are perceived to be less prominent than they ought to be, while the promotion of human rights receives a similar share of mentions.

Finally, we can briefly mention the ideal role of the UN as seen by respondents to the 2000 VoP survey (table 71): identifying trends is made harder by the variance of the responses, but the protection of human rights is mentioned often, especially by the Latin American and African public, with China being an obvious exception to this trend; preventing war by intervention and giving humanitarian aid in times of natural disasters are also among the most popular responses, with more than a third of Chinese and Russians mentioning the former; by contrast, only tiny minorities think that the UN should develop into a world government.

## 4. Perceptions of the EU and US in Issues Related to Human Rights and Democracy

---

The third and final issue area which we will take into consideration is related to human rights and democracy: available survey data are quite limited in comparison with the previous themes, but nonetheless they allow us to provide a brief insight on the perceived compatibility between democracy and Islam in Arab countries, as well as giving an account about international attitudes with respect to the degree of democracy in the US and

other countries and about the role of the US in promoting democracy worldwide.

We can start this section by touching on the topic of Islam and democracy, thanks to a question contained in the 2006/2007 ArabBarómetro survey, which asks whether “democracy is a Western form of government that is not compatible with Islam” (table 72): in no country more than a third of the respondents agreed or agreed strongly with this statement, with Palestinians reaching a maximum of 32 percent, while absolute majorities in every surveyed country disagreed, with a peak of 75 percent of Kuwaiti respondents.

When asked to rate the degree of democracy in the US using a 10-point scale (table 73), slightly less than half of the Arab public gave positive ratings (6 to 10), with only a 20 percent of the surveyed acknowledging the US as a “complete democracy” and a record low of 13 percent in Algeria; in Palestine, nearly as many respondents judged them as a “complete dictatorship” (23 percent vis-à-vis 26 percent of “complete democracy”). When comparing these results with similar questions concerning the degree of democracy in Turkey, Japan and China (tables 74-76), the percentage of respondents who “can’t choose” or “don’t know” is more than doubled in the latter (with a record high of 50 percent of Yemeni who could not choose in any of these three cases), while people who choose to reply distribute quite evenly all across the scale: in the case of Turkey, 29 percent of the respondents chose values between 4 and 7; Japan received higher marks, with 44 percent of the respondents choosing values between 6 and 10 and a 14 percent seeing it as a “complete democracy”; China was slightly behind, with a 27 percent of values between 5 and 8, but 7 percent of respondents choosing “complete democracy”, more than doubling the result of Turkey and half of Japan’s share.

When surveyed by Latinobarómetro for its 2004 wave about whether violence would impede the installation of democracy in Iraq (table 77), the Latin American public seemed quite confident about the prospects of democracy in the Middle Eastern country: a majority in most countries expected a positive outcome, but the situation was the opposite in Brazil, where a striking 74 percent declared negative expectations. The Brazilian response was unparalleled in the rest of the continent, with the closest match being Paraguay, where 55 percent of respondents shared negative views (but only 9 percent of them reported to be very much convinced about it).

GAP surveys monitored in 2002, 2003 and 2007 international support for American ideas about democracy (table 78): as remarked in the other issue areas, African countries were the most supportive of US principles and policies, with Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana and Ivory Coast constantly leading the pro-US camp. On the other hand, areas such as Middle East and Latin America show mixed or changeable attitudes: in the former, countries which were initially mildly supportive, such as Kuwait and Lebanon, later seem to have gotten closer to the positions of Jordan, Palestine and Pakistan (ordered by decreasing level of support); the Turkish public opinion follows this trend, too, going from a 50 percent of respondents who disliked US ideas about democracy in 2003 to a much larger 81 percent in 2007; in the latter, some countries, such as Argentina and Bolivia, maintained a steady criticism of US positions, others, like Brazil, see it growing over the years, while Venezuela is a case of its own, going from an initial 67 percent of positive responses in 2003 to a 54 percent of negative responses in 2007. The Latin American and Middle Eastern public is once again among the most disillusioned when it comes to the reasons lying behind the US promotion of democracy (table 79), with 70 to 80 percent of their respondents answering that “the US promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests”. Nigerians and Ghanaians are again the most supportive, with respectively 47 and 37 percent of them affirming that “the US promotes democracy wherever it can”; for reference, only 30 percent of US respondents believed so. Latin American scepticism is also confirmed by data collected in the 2006 edition of Latinobarómetro (table 80), where no country other than Panama reported a majority of positive answers to the question “Do you think



USA promotes democracy?”.

Finally, a question contained in the 2004 Latinobarómetro allows us to draw a comparison between EU, US, Japan and China with respect to democracy (table 81). Interestingly, the Latin American public is split: Uruguay, Chile, Argentina and Mexico perceive Europe as the power helping more to promote democracy, while Panama, El Salvador, Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic show mainly filo-American attitudes; answers are quite balanced in Bolivia, Brazil and Venezuela, with the Brazilian public also giving the highest share to Japan (15 percent) and China (11 percent), which otherwise receive less attention.

## 5. Perceptions of the EU and US and Their Leaders

---

In this section we will compare the way in which the EU and the US and their leaders are perceived by the external world. In particular we will focus on the level of favourability and unfavourability recorded in the different world regions taken into account by the analysed surveys. More specifically, the questions considered in this section deal with the external perceptions of the US, the EU and its member states, of Europeans and Americans, of European and American leaders, of values embodied by America and Europe and their compatibility with other cultures.

GAP assessed the respondents' opinion towards the US from 2002 to 2010 in a number of third countries covering very different geo-territorial contexts (table 84). The average level of support registered by GAP equals 58 percent in 2002 and 55 percent in 2010. However, what appears striking is the variance within the considered period. In particular, favourable opinions towards the US touched the lowest level in 2003, following the beginning of the Iraq war. In 2003 the level of favourability for the US equals 35 percent, thereby marking a decrease of more than 23 percentage points if compared to the datum of 2002.

The variance within the sample is also extremely high, denoting very significant inter-regional differences. In particular, perceptions of the US in the Arab and Muslim world appear very negative, while the level of support appears more moderate in emerging countries, such as Brazil, Russia, India, and China (the so-called BRIC countries). The highest and more stable level of support is recorded in Western or Westernized contexts such as South Korea, Japan, and Australia. Worth noting is, in this context, the extremely low level of support registered by GAP 2003 in Pakistan (12 percent), Jordan (1 percent) and Palestinian territories (1 percent). However, in almost all the cases, the Iraq war negatively affected the perception of the US. On the other hand, the election of President Obama in 2009 clearly determined a generalized growth in the favourability recorded in this respect.

GAP assessed the respondents' opinion towards the EU in 2004, 2007 and 2010 in a number of third countries covering very different geo-territorial contexts (table 85). What emerges is a fairly stable level of support, at around 50 percent (54 percent in 2007, 50 percent in 2010), with the lowest record in 2004 (43 percent). In this respect, the level of favourability towards the EU seems less subject to contextual changes than in the case of the US. Moreover, the level of inter-regional variance, although visible, appears far less relevant. Interestingly, one of the lowest levels of favourability is registered in the Turkish sample. In this case, the percentage of positive responses fell from 58 percent in 2004 – when the country was accepted as an official candidate to EU membership – to 27 percent in 2007, thereby clearly reflecting the growing frustration of the Turkish public for the perceived unlikelihood of Ankara's accession.

Looking more in depth at the different geo-territorial contexts, as depicted by the Afrobarometer and Latinobarómetro survey questions, we can notice two opposed trends concerning the level of support for the EU and the US (tables 93-95). While in the case of the EU the level of support is decreasing, although slightly, in both geo-territorial contexts, in the case of the US the level of support is either increasing, as in the case of the African sample, or remaining stable, as in the case of Latin America. In particular, in the South American context the level of support for the EU marks a decrease of almost 10 percentage points from 2000 to 2009, with lower peaks in 2003 and 2008. In the African sample it slightly decreases from 75 percent to 70 percent between 2006 and 2010. On the other hand, in absolute terms, we cannot ignore the fact that the level of support for the EU is in absolute terms structurally higher than the one for the US and this factors appears fairly stable over the years.

Looking at the level of support for the US in the two contexts some key points need to be discussed. While in the African sample the level of support for the US is marking an almost constant increase of about 20 percentage points from 2003 to 2007, the trends appear more complex in the South American context. In particular, the latter seems to be affected by a negative “Bush effect” and by a positive “Obama effect”, which – in the light of the time span of the survey – cannot be captured by the Afrobarometer data. Following the election of George W. Bush in 2001, the level of support for the US seems to have constantly decreased over the following eight years, touching the lowest record of 65 percent in 2008. In 2009, following the election of Barack Obama, the level of support among South Americans marks an increase of more than 15 percentage points.

A number of observers have claimed that the widespread negative perception of the US in the 2002-2008 period has been mainly determined by the very negative feelings of the world public opinion towards US president George W. Bush (tables 86 and 91). More in general, this perspective suggests that the perception of a country or institution is highly dependent on its representatives. Answers provided by the analysed survey data appear to partially confirm this perspective.

GAP, in particular, assessed the level of popularity of president Bush in 2003, 2005, and 2008 in a number of third countries covering very different geo-territorial contexts (table 91). When asked whether their unfavourable view of the United States was mainly determined by the negative perception of Bush, 54 percent of the respondents answered likewise in 2003, while the percentage slightly decreases to 43 percent (vs. 35 percent) in 2005. Interestingly, at least in the 2005 survey, in all samples – regardless of the geo-territorial context – the majority of the respondents blamed Bush for their negative image of the US. This percentage is also very high in countries generally marked by widespread anti-American sentiments such as Indonesia (67 percent), Pakistan (63 percent), and Jordan (42 percent).

GAP charted the level of support (positive feelings) towards three key Western stakeholders between 2003 and 2006 in a number of different geo-territorial contexts (table 92). In particular, the four waves recorded the level of favourability towards former French president Jacques Chirac, former US president George W. Bush, and former British prime minister Tony Blair. A first datum that emerges is the structurally higher level of support enjoyed by Jacques Chirac. Considering that the analysed time span covers exactly the beginning and the first years of the Iraq war this datum seems to be clearly related to Chirac’s opposition to the Anglo-American intervention against Baghdad. In this respect, it is worth noting that the highest level of support for Chirac is registered among respondents from Russia (ranging from 60 percent to 80 percent). It is indicative that Russia, along with China, was by far the staunchest opponent of the Western intervention in Iraq. For the same reason, patterns of support for Bush and Blair depict very similar trends and show systematically low levels appreciation (in no case above 50 percent). An interesting case is represented by the levels of support registered among the Chinese public in 2006, which appears very high in all the three cases. Worth noting is also the very low level



of support for Chirac among the Turkish public, which seems clearly related to the French president's staunch opposition to Turkish European ambitions.

Looking at a more specific geo-territorial context, Latinobarómetro charts the level of support of American and European leaders among South Americans from 2005 to 2009 (tables 103-107). As predictable, the level of support for George W. Bush presents a constant decline of almost 15 percentage points from 2005 to 2009. The trend of support for Spanish prime minister Zapatero and the King of Spain Juan Carlos I seems interesting: the two patterns are very similar and they seem to present a strong increase in terms of support in 2009, shifting from 40 percent to almost 60 percent. It comes as no surprise that in 2009, the only year in which the level of support for Obama was registered, the newly-elected US president scores an overwhelming level of support of 75 percent.

The contextual negative effect of president Bush on the opinion towards the US is indirectly reflected by the much more positive image of Americans as depicted by GAP data (tables 87-90). In particular, GAP survey asked about the respondents' perception of Americans in the 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 waves. In this respect, the level of sympathy towards Americans seems to be only incidentally affected by the Iraq war, thereby touching its lowest level in 2004 (46 percent). On the other hand, the highest scores are recorded in 2005 (66 percent). Interestingly, although perceptual differences persist between Western and Westernized countries and the rest of the world (mainly Muslim countries and the BRICs), their significance appears clearly reduced if compared to the respondents' perception of the US. This highlights the ability on part of the respondents to clearly distinguish between a country's institutions and leaders and its population.

Beyond the perception of its leaders, generally depicted in more positive colours than American ones, the EU seems to legitimize itself also in the light of its performance (table 82). In particular, the GAP survey addressed the perception of the influence of the EU in the 2002 and 2004 survey. In general, the results seem to reflect a fairly high level of trust in the EU, in terms of its positive influence in the domestic contexts, with a level of positive answers equalling 58 percent in 2002 and 60 percent in 2004. In this case it is worth noting the very high level of trust among the Russian and the Ukrainian public, ranging from 70 percent to 80 percent. Interestingly, Turkey – an official candidate to EU membership – presents a lower level of support, around 60 percent. It comes as no surprise that the lowest level of support is registered among the Pakistani public, scoring around 35 percent.

A comparative assessment of the level of trust in the EU compared to other international organizations in the time span that goes from 2001 to 2008 is possible in the South and North American context (96-98). Specific questions in this respect have been asked within the framework of the Latinobarómetro project. Interestingly, the EU emerges as the most trusted international organization in the area, with a level of support that ranges from 80 percent to 90 percent. What emerges as the most interesting point is that the EU presents structurally higher scores than the most relevant regional organizations such as the Southern Common Market (Mercosur), the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), and the Organization of American States (OAS).

## Conclusions

---

In this final section we will discuss the most relevant trends emerged from the analysis of the different surveys depicting public perception of the EU and the US beyond their borders and their broader implications.

If we compare the general perception of the two actors, what clearly emerges is a generalized more positive vision of the EU, when compared to the US, among the analysed public opinion samples. This seems to hold true in most of the analysed geo-territorial contexts. A partial exception, in this respect, can be represented by the Latin American context where, in the beginning of the 2000s the levels of support for the US and the EU were very close.

In this respect, the EU seems to be perceived as a more “gentle power” characterized by a “missionary approach”, based on spreading wealth and stability through progressive economic and institutional integration. On the other hand, despite this positive image, what seems to emerge in many geo-territorial contexts is also the EU’s perceived ineffectiveness in managing problems such as development of the most disadvantaged areas and peace promotion. The analysed trends show that the US is perceived as more effective in this respect, as well as in promoting trade.

Worth noting is also that the positive perception of the EU goes beyond the comparison with the US. Interestingly, the EU generally emerges as the most appreciated international organization among those considered, including both regional organizations, such as Mercosur and ALCA, and global financial bodies, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. In this respect, the influence of the EU is defined as positive in a number of national contexts, including Russia, Ukraine, and Turkey.

Interestingly, the support for the US seems much more dependent on a number of contextual factors. When it comes to the analysis of the domestic contexts, what emerges is a fairly diversified picture. Worth noting is, for example, that in those countries increasingly emerging as regional powers or as global actors in today’s world, the US leadership is increasingly challenged. Similarly, the favourability for the US clearly suffered from the consequences of the Iraq war and from the negative image of George W. Bush in a number of national contexts, mainly including (but not limited to) Muslim countries, such as Indonesia, Turkey, and Pakistan, and emerging economies, such as Russia and India.

Looking at the way the EU and the US affect global economy, in general most of the survey data show that both are generally perceived as very important actors when it comes to bilateral trade relations. In some cases, such as Latin America, respondents suggest that the role of the EU is clearly outweighed by the impact of the US. On the other hand, in other geo-territorial contexts, such as Middle East, very negative opinions emerge on the effect of US policies on the global economic divide.

In the light of our results, the overall picture emerged seems to suggest that, holding other factors constant, the level of favourability for the EU/US increases as the cultural proximity increases and/or the economic dependence decreases. On the whole, the phenomenon appears stronger in the case of the US than of the EU. In this respect, there seems to be room for further research and exploration, penetrating the nature and the actual relevance of the phenomenon.

## References

---

- Cerutti, Furio, and Lucarelli, Sonia, eds. (2008), *The Search for a European Identity. Values, Policies and Legitimacy of the European Union*, London and New York, Routledge
- Chaban, Natalia, Elgström, Ole, and Holland, Martin (2006), "The European Union as Others See It", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (May), p. 245-262
- Chaban, Natalia, and Holland, Martin (2010), "Perspectives on the Role of the EU: a Study of Asian Stakeholders' Opinion from Six Countries", *IDEA Discussion papers on the EU's role in democracy building*, [http://www.idea.int/resources/analysis/perspectives\\_on\\_eu\\_role.cfm](http://www.idea.int/resources/analysis/perspectives_on_eu_role.cfm)
- Chaban, Natalia, and Holland, Martin, eds. (2005), "The EU Through the Eyes of the Asia-Pacific: Public Perceptions and Media Representations", *NCRE Research Series*, No. 4, [http://www.europe.canterbury.ac.nz/publications/pdf/appp\\_book.pdf](http://www.europe.canterbury.ac.nz/publications/pdf/appp_book.pdf)
- Hill, Christopher (1993), "The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (September), p. 305-328
- Holland, Martin, et al., eds. (2007), *The EU Through the Eyes of Asia. Media, Public and Elite Perceptions in China, Japan, Korea, Singapore and Thailand*, Warsaw, University of Warsaw, <http://www.asef.org/index.php/pubs/asef-publications/1892-the-eu-through-the-eyes-of-asia>
- Holland, Martin, et al. (2005), "EU in the Views of Asia-Pacific Elites: Australia, New Zealand, and Thailand", *NCRE Research Series*, No. 5 (December), [http://www.europe.canterbury.ac.nz/appp/publications/pdf/appp\\_elites\\_publication.pdf](http://www.europe.canterbury.ac.nz/appp/publications/pdf/appp_elites_publication.pdf)
- Lucarelli, Sonia (2013), "Perceptions of the EU in International Institutions", in Knud Erik Jørgensen and Katie Verlin Laatikainen, eds., *Routledge Handbook on the European Union and International Institutions: Performance, Policy, Power*, London and New York, Routledge, p. 429-444
- Lucarelli, Sonia, ed. (2007), "The External Image of the European Union", *GARNET Working Papers*, No. 17/07, [http://www.garnet-eu.org/fileadmin/documents/working\\_papers/1707.pdf](http://www.garnet-eu.org/fileadmin/documents/working_papers/1707.pdf)
- Lucarelli, Sonia, and Fioramonti, Lorenzo, eds. (2009), "The External Image of the European Union: Phase Two", *GARNET Working Papers*, No. 62/09, [http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/garnet/workingpapers/6209\\_alt.pdf](http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/garnet/workingpapers/6209_alt.pdf)
- Lucarelli, Sonia, and Fioramonti, Lorenzo (2008), "Have You Heard of the EU? An Analysis of Global Images of the European Union", *GARNET Policy Briefs*, No. 7 (September), [http://www.garnet-eu.org/fileadmin/documents/policy\\_briefs/Garnet\\_Policy\\_Brief\\_No\\_7.pdf](http://www.garnet-eu.org/fileadmin/documents/policy_briefs/Garnet_Policy_Brief_No_7.pdf)
- Tsuruoka, Michito (2008), *How External Perceptions of the European Union Are Shaped: Endogenous and Exogenous Sources*, paper presented at the GARNET Conference on "The EU in International Affairs", Brussels, 24-26 April, [http://www.ies.be/files/repo/conference2008/EUinIA\\_V\\_1\\_Tsuruoka.pdf](http://www.ies.be/files/repo/conference2008/EUinIA_V_1_Tsuruoka.pdf)

## Data

Afrobarometer, <http://www.afrobarometer.org>

ArabBarometer, <http://www.arabbarometer.org>

Asian Barometer, <http://www.asianbarometer.org>

Gallup Voice of the People (VoP), <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/223>

Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP), <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop>

Latinobarómetro, <http://www.latinobarometro.org/lat.jsp>

Pew Research Global Attitudes Project (GAP), <http://www.pewglobal.org>

World Values Survey (WVS), [http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/index\\_surveys](http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/index_surveys)

## Annex

### Data sources

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
<b>Afrobarometer</b>				
2005/2006	Mass	25397	Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe	F2F
<b>ArabBarometer</b>				
2006/2007	Mass	8122	Algeria, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Yemen	F2F
<b>Latinobarometro</b>				
2000	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2001	Mass	600/1300 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2002	Mass	600/1300 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2003	Mass	600/1300 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2004	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
2005	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2006	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2007	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2008	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
2009	Mass	1000/1200 per country	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela	CATI
<b>GAP</b>				
2002	Mass	38263	AO, AR, BD, BO, BR, BG, CA, CN, CZ, EG, FR, DE, GH, GB, GT, HN, IN, ID, IT, CI, JP, JO, KE, LB, ML, MX, NG, PK, PE, PH, PL, RU, SN, SK, ZA, KR, TZ, UG, UA, US, UZ, VE, VN	F2F, CATI
2003	Mass	15948	AU, BR, GB, CA, FR, DE, ID, IL, IT, JO, KW, LB, MA, NG, PK, PS, RU, KR, ES, TR, US	F2F, CATI
2004	Mass	7765	US, GB, FR, DE, RU, TR, PK, JO, MA	F2F, CATI
2005	Mass	11516	US, CA, GB, FR, DE, ES, NL, RU, PL, TR, PK, IN, LB, JO, MA, ID, CN	F2F, CATI
2006	Mass	16710	US, RU, NG, CN, JP, IN, TR, ID, PK, JO, EG, GB, FR, DE, ES	F2F, CATI
2007	Mass	45239	US, CA, AR, BO, BR, CL, MX, PE, VE, GB, FR, DE, IT, ES, SE, BG, CZ, PL, RU, SK, UA, TR, EG, JO, KW, LB, MA, PS, IL, PK, BD, ID, MY, CN, IN, JP, KR, ET, GH, CI, KE, ML, NG, SN, ZA, TZ, UG	F2F, CATI

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
2008	Mass	24717	US, GB, FR, DE, ES, RU, PL, TR, EG, JO, LB, AU, CN, PK, IN, ID, JP, KR, AR, BR, MX, NG, ZA, TZ	F2F, CATI
2009	Mass	26397	US, CA, GB, FR, DE, ES, PL, RU, TR, EG, JO, LB, PS, IL, CN, IN, ID, JP, PK, KR, AR, BR, MX, KE, NG	F2F, CATI
2010	Mass	24790	US, GB, FR, DE, ES, PL, RU, TR, EG, JO, LB, CN, IN, ID, JP, PK, KR, AR, BR, MX, KE, NG	F2F, CATI
<b>VoP</b>				
2000	Mass	53851	Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, Georgia, Ghana, Hong Kong, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Ukraine, Uruguay	<i>no information available</i>
2003	Mass	43384	Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Cameroon, Ecuador, Georgia, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vietnam	CAPI, CASI, CATI, F2F, self-enumerated questionnaire
2004	Mass	54746	Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Cameroon, Ecuador, Georgia, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vietnam	CAPI, CATI, F2F, self-enumerated questionnaire
2006	Mass	61249	Argentina, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Dominican Rep., Gabon, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Ukraine, Venezuela, Vietnam	CATI, CAWI, F2F, self-enumerated questionnaire

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
2007	Mass	62183	Argentina, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Ukraine, Venezuela, Vietnam	CATI, CAWI, F2F, self-enumerated questionnaire



## 1. Global economy

Table 1. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Continuing with economic themes, do you believe that private investment have a very positive, positive, negative, very negative impact, it doesn't have any impact over the job opportunities, or do you feel you don't know enough to give an opinion? (in percentages)

	Very positive impact	Positive impact	Negative impact	Very negative impact	No impact at all	Don't know enough to give an opinion	N
Argentina	6.2	40.1	20.5	6.6	7.9	18.7	1099
Bolivia	5.5	34.5	33.3	5.7	7.9	13.2	914
Brazil	4.8	36.2	16.0	2.6	11.4	28.9	916
Chile	7.8	46.5	15.9	2.4	13.4	14.1	1057
Colombia	10.8	38.5	16.6	3.1	8.0	23.0	1077
Costa Rica	9.0	52.8	14.3	2.5	6.2	15.1	866
Dominican Rep.	12.7	49.7	15.2	2.6	4.7	15.0	907
Ecuador	11.1	51.0	17.6	5.0	8.9	6.4	1096
El Salvador	5.1	50.4	21.7	3.2	4.0	15.6	840
Guatemala	3.2	47.6	26.6	3.1	4.4	15.0	800
Honduras	9.4	45.6	19.4	2.5	3.5	19.5	902
Mexico	3.0	53.3	23.8	6.8	6.2	6.9	1075
Nicaragua	10.4	43.7	18.1	3.4	4.7	19.7	874
Panama	9.6	58.0	16.6	1.9	4.5	9.3	903
Paraguay	17.8	47.2	13.2	1.9	9.6	10.3	477
Peru	8.7	44.6	15.4	2.7	10.1	18.6	1092
Uruguay	7.9	40.6	18.4	5.7	9.3	18.0	994
Venezuela	28.2	33.6	11.9	4.5	4.1	17.8	1011

Table 2. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Continuing with economic themes, do you believe that free competition have a very positive, positive, negative, very negative impact, it doesn't have any impact over the job opportunities, or do you feel you don't know enough to give an opinion? (in percentages)

	<b>Very positive impact</b>	<b>Positive impact</b>	<b>Negative impact</b>	<b>Very negative impact</b>	<b>No impact at all</b>	<b>Don't know enough to give an opinion</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	5.8	45.4	15.6	5.2	7.3	20.8	1054
Bolivia	4.0	40.0	29.7	6.8	6.0	13.6	900
Brazil	7.1	39.0	16.4	2.3	9.4	25.8	897
Chile	9.1	49.8	12.1	2.6	12.6	13.8	1041
Colombia	8.5	42.2	15.6	4.3	7.8	21.6	1064
Costa Rica	9.0	52.7	15.1	3.2	6.5	13.5	857
Dominican Rep.	8.2	48.6	20.0	2.3	5.0	16.0	881
Ecuador	8.4	44.1	23.6	7.4	7.3	9.2	1056
El Salvador	4.4	53.7	21.2	3.5	2.9	14.3	832
Guatemala	4.5	56.7	21.1	2.6	2.4	12.7	802
Honduras	8.8	49.2	19.5	2.7	3.9	15.9	897
Mexico	1.6	48.3	28.6	9.9	3.9	7.7	1074
Nicaragua	7.5	47.8	19.6	3.0	5.5	16.7	843
Panama	7.5	55.5	21.4	1.4	3.2	11.0	869
Paraguay	15.8	51.6	13.2	0.9	9.3	9.3	463
Peru	8.1	47.6	16.4	3.8	7.0	17.2	1062
Uruguay	6.0	39.8	19.5	6.0	7.9	20.7	960
Venezuela	24.5	36.1	12.7	4.7	4.2	17.9	987

Table 3. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Continuing with economic themes, do you believe that international free trade treaties have a very positive, positive, negative, very negative impact, it doesn't have any impact over the job opportunities, or do you feel you don't know enough to give an opinion? (in percentages)

	<b>Very positive impact</b>	<b>Positive impact</b>	<b>Negative impact</b>	<b>Very negative impact</b>	<b>No impact at all</b>	<b>Don't know enough to give an opinion</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	3.9	32.1	17.6	7.3	9.4	29.6	999
Bolivia	5.1	31.6	29.4	8.5	8.1	17.3	890
Brazil	5.4	37.6	16.0	3.3	9.5	28.1	885
Chile	10.1	49.1	9.6	2.2	12.4	16.5	1040
Colombia	10.2	38.1	19.1	5.1	5.6	21.8	1049
Costa Rica	8.4	51.0	17.8	3.1	6.0	13.8	838
Dominican Rep.	9.6	51.2	16.6	2.7	5.1	14.7	882
Ecuador	8.0	44.6	20.0	7.2	7.5	12.6	1049
El Salvador	5.6	50.1	22.8	4.2	4.1	13.1	824
Guatemala	2.7	51.7	26.0	2.1	3.5	14.0	772
Honduras	8.3	48.3	20.7	3.8	3.7	15.2	889
Mexico	2.6	48.8	23.6	11.4	5.7	7.9	1079
Nicaragua	8.9	47.8	19.1	4.4	5.8	13.9	839
Panama	6.3	46.0	25.5	4.1	3.7	14.3	830
Paraguay	14.5	46.6	13.6	2.7	11.1	11.5	442
Peru	8.2	44.5	13.8	3.0	7.4	23.1	1031
Uruguay	6.3	35.8	20.5	6.2	8.6	22.6	938
Venezuela	21.4	33.6	14.0	5.9	3.8	21.3	967

Table 4. *Latinobarometro (2002, 2003)*: Thinking about economic problems in (country), from the following list of institutions/organizations and issues, which, if any, do you think are responsible for the economic problems we face? (in percentages)

		Lack of entrepre- neurial initiative	The banks	Lack of individu- al initiative	Globaliz- ation	Internati- onal Monetar- y Fund	Govern- ment's economi- c policy	World Trade Organiz- ation	Lack of domesti- cally produce d goods	No-one is directly responsi- ble	Other	Don't know	N
Argentina	2003	18.5	11.8	14.3	13.4	26.2	66.0	5.2	18.8	0.8	3.0	3.6	1200
	2002	14.6	20.4	14.4	20.3	33.9	66.0	6.0	20.8	0.5	2.2	2.2	1200
Bolivia	2003	21.9	8.6	18.8	12.8	18.5	72.1	10.2	22.8	1.7	0.8	2.8	1200
	2002	14.1	5.5	7.2	8.0	9.1	31.9	5.2	15.9	2.7	1.0	2.5	1242
Brazil	2003	24.2	11.9	22.2	13.2	16.0	65.7	9.8	8.7	0.5	1.0	8.8	1200
	2002	20.9	11.2	19.5	13.6	19.1	52.5	8.5	7.3	1.1	0.9	14.5	1000
Chile	2003	45.8	10.1	19.3	11.8	5.1	48.0	7.2	14.2	3.0	0.5	5.6	1200
	2002	48.0	9.4	14.3	9.5	5.6	41.3	5.9	14.9	2.3	0.4	5.0	1195
Colombia	2003	21.6	8.3	21.1	8.7	10.7	62.3	5.9	14.1	2.3	2.5	5.7	1201
	2002	20.6	10.1	18.1	9.7	10.1	53.6	6.5	12.2	2.1	0.7	13.2	1200
Costa Rica	2003	11.7	4.0	21.5	15.1	10.0	68.2	11.6	9.3	1.8	1.2	9.1	1003
	2002	17.6	9.4	29.0	19.6	12.6	47.8	14.2	16.4	0.7	0.7	8.9	1006

Table 4. *Latinobarometro (2002, 2003)*: Thinking about economic problems in (country), from the following list of institutions/organizations and issues, which, if any, do you think are responsible for the economic problems we face? (in percentages)

		Lack of entrepre- neurial initiative	The banks	Lack of individu- al initiative	Globaliz- ation	Internati- onal Monetar- y Fund	Govern- ment's economi- c policy	World Trade Organiz- ation	Lack of domesti- cally produce- d goods	No-one is directly responsi- ble	Other	Don't know	N
Ecuador	2003	22.1	20.6	17.4	15.8	25.0	54.3	7.5	14.7	1.2	0.2	1.8	1199
	2002	27.0	38.7	22.6	18.2	20.7	43.2	6.8	10.9	1.7	0.2	2.4	1200
El Salvador	2003	17.6	9.5	14.0	18.8	8.8	61.6	6.3	12.9	0.6	2.2	17.2	1008
	2002	21.0	12.6	13.8	16.4	8.1	40.9	10.7	11.9	1.5	0.4	19.9	1014
Guatemal- a	2003	24.0	8.6	18.6	10.7	5.4	46.0	6.6	10.7	0.4	0.9	32.0	1006
	2002	19.3	9.7	23.4	14.0	11.0	69.8	10.3	16.3	1.5	0.7	8.5	1000
Honduras	2003	39.0	26.4	29.9	16.6	21.9	53.1	8.3	23.5	0.9	1.8	11.2	1005
	2002	33.6	22.6	31.9	27.2	20.4	39.7	12.5	27.5	2.6	1.9	9.2	1004
Mexico	2003	15.1	4.8	26.2	18.0	8.5	71.7	7.7	10.1	3.8	0.6	1.9	1200
	2002	17.1	7.7	21.5	20.8	9.9	48.4	2.9	9.2	8.3	1.0	2.0	1210
Nicaragua	2003	14.4	9.7	8.9	8.0	10.4	77.9	5.0	10.5	1.0	1.4	9.7	1011
	2002	23.1	29.7	18.1	20.4	19.8	54.5	9.5	22.0	1.1	2.1	8.3	1016

Table 4. *Latinobarometro (2002, 2003)*: Thinking about economic problems in (country), from the following list of institutions/organizations and issues, which, if any, do you think are responsible for the economic problems we face? (in percentages)

		Lack of entrepre- neurial initiative	The banks	Lack of individu- al initiative	Globaliz- ation	Internati- onal Monetar- y Fund	Govern- ment's economi- c policy	World Trade Organiz- ation	Lack of domesti- cally produce- d goods	No-one is directly responsi- ble	Other	Don't know	N
Panama	2003	32.8	20.4	28.2	28.0	13.6	59.3	17.2	15.9	0.4	1.1	6.2	1004
	2002	48.6	22.3	35.5	35.4	19.9	52.6	17.3	13.0	4.2	1.3	7.9	1010
Paraguay	2003	26.3	15.7	20.8	6.5	7.2	77.3	8.2	19.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	600
	2002	20.2	10.7	17.3	3.7	8.5	72.0	5.0	24.0	0.7	0.3	2.3	601
Peru	2003	15.8	4.3	15.2	9.2	10.5	69.4	5.4	18.8	1.1	0.8	4.8	1199
	2002	19.9	7.4	18.5	7.1	13.6	49.3	4.3	20.1	2.0	1.6	10.7	1224
Uruguay	2003	17.2	21.1	15.6	15.5	23.5	73.9	12.7	19.4	1.5	0.8	3.4	1201
	2002	25.7	13.7	15.3	22.1	23.5	55.6	12.0	32.4	3.4	0.3	5.1	1186
Venezuela	2003	28.1	6.2	12.9	7.5	8.1	44.0	6.2	12.8	1.7	1.1	6.2	1200
	2002	17.7	4.9	14.3	9.6	7.5	39.4	3.1	7.7	2.0	1.2	5.1	1213

Table 5. *GAP (2002, 2007)*: In your opinion, do United States' policies increase the gap between rich and poor countries, lessen the gap between rich and poor countries, or do United States policies have no effect on the gap between rich and poor countries? (in percentages)

		<b>Increase gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>Lessen gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Angola	2002	56.4	20.0	12.4	10.5	0.6	780
Argentina	2007	70.8	7.8	7.0	13.8	0.8	800
	2002	67.2	10.3	8.8	13.0	0.6	814
Bangladesh	2007	67.9	20.8	5.4	5.8	0.1	1000
	2002	40.6	9.6	0.4	49.2	0.1	758
Bolivia	2007	65.2	20.7	7.0	6.5	0.6	834
	2002	74.3	17.4	3.2	5.0	0.1	783
Brazil	2007	60.9	16.6	16.1	6.4	0.0	1000
	2002	60.2	18.2	10.7	10.9	0.0	1000
Chile	2007	48.9	17.9	18.6	13.2	1.4	800
China	2007	60.7	14.7	10.0	14.4	0.3	3141
Egypt	2007	55.9	21.4	19.6	3.0	0.1	1000
	2002	42.3	10.0	18.7	23.9	5.1	1013
Ethiopia	2007	57.8	10.0	14.1	17.7	0.4	711
Ghana	2007	23.1	32.7	26.7	17.1	0.4	707
	2002	31.2	31.3	13.1	23.1	1.3	702
Guatemala	2002	54.8	28.0	8.2	8.6	0.4	500
Honduras	2002	44.5	28.7	14.4	11.5	1.0	506
India	2007	49.5	33.0	7.3	8.5	1.7	2043
	2002	46.4	16.3	4.3	32.9	0.1	2189
Indonesia							

Table 5. *GAP (2002, 2007)*: In your opinion, do United States' policies increase the gap between rich and poor countries, lessen the gap between rich and poor countries, or do United States policies have no effect on the gap between rich and poor countries? (in percentages)

		<b>Increase gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>Lessen gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
	2007	56.7	14.5	19.4	9.3	0.0	1008
	2002	53.4	21.2	15.2	9.8	0.3	1017
Israel							
	2007	37.6	23.4	26.8	12.0	0.2	900
Ivory Coast							
	2007	37.1	41.0	21.2	0.7	0.0	708
	2002	51.3	29.2	19.1	0.4	0.0	708
Japan							
	2007	57.3	8.4	18.2	15.9	0.1	762
	2002	68.7	4.1	17.0	10.2	0.0	705
Jordan							
	2007	55.9	23.3	17.9	2.3	0.6	1000
	2002	69.9	20.7	6.3	3.1	0.0	1000
Kenya							
	2007	29.4	54.6	10.2	5.8	0.0	1000
	2002	23.7	41.2	21.0	13.7	0.3	662
Kuwait							
	2007	71.6	12.0	9.0	6.6	0.8	500
Lebanon							
	2007	53.6	25.7	17.0	3.5	0.2	1001
	2002	72.8	11.0	7.2	8.6	0.4	1000
Malaysia							
	2007	45.3	21.1	19.9	13.6	0.1	698
Mali							
	2007	42.5	32.1	20.5	3.7	1.1	701
	2002	48.9	26.0	14.1	9.5	1.6	697
Mexico							
	2007	54.8	23.0	13.4	7.3	1.6	827
	2002	54.5	24.4	9.2	11.4	0.4	996
Morocco							
	2007	57.9	5.9	5.4	30.4	0.4	1000
Nigeria							
	2007	26.8	43.1	19.1	10.8	0.1	1129
	2002	21.9	64.2	11.1	2.7	0.1	1000



Table 5. *GAP (2002, 2007)*: In your opinion, do United States' policies increase the gap between rich and poor countries, lessen the gap between rich and poor countries, or do United States policies have no effect on the gap between rich and poor countries? (in percentages)

		<b>Increase gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>Lessen gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Pakistan							
	2007	54.2	17.1	8.2	20.5	0.0	2007
	2002	38.9	12.2	9.8	36.8	2.3	2031
Palestinian Territories							
	2007	72.8	7.7	8.0	9.8	1.7	809
Peru							
	2007	55.6	17.4	9.4	17.4	0.2	800
	2002	55.4	19.4	12.1	12.8	0.3	711
Philippines							
	2002	32.6	38.9	20.9	7.6	0.1	700
Russia							
	2007	48.9	9.9	25.1	15.8	0.4	1003
	2002	53.4	8.0	25.0	13.3	0.3	1002
Senegal							
	2007	53.3	25.6	13.6	6.7	0.9	700
	2002	48.8	25.7	19.3	6.0	0.1	711
South Africa							
	2007	35.4	24.6	21.6	18.4	0.0	1000
	2002	40.8	29.2	13.4	16.3	0.3	699
South Korea							
	2007	69.6	6.8	14.3	8.6	0.6	718
	2002	67.0	12.3	13.3	7.3	0.1	701
Tanzania							
	2007	51.1	26.0	4.0	18.2	0.7	704
	2002	47.9	19.3	8.5	22.9	1.4	720
Uganda							
	2007	33.4	38.1	5.2	22.7	0.6	1122
	2002	36.4	38.4	6.9	18.2	0.1	1008
Ukraine							
	2007	49.6	11.6	23.2	15.2	0.4	500
	2002	53.7	23.4	11.0	12.0	0.0	501
Uzbekistan							

Table 5. *GAP (2002, 2007)*: In your opinion, do United States' policies increase the gap between rich and poor countries, lessen the gap between rich and poor countries, or do United States policies have no effect on the gap between rich and poor countries? (in percentages)

		<b>Increase gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>Lessen gap between rich and poor</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Venezuela	2002	40.4	17.5	28.1	14.0	0.0	701
	2007	48.1	20.4	26.0	4.9	0.6	803
Vietnam	2002	47.6	34.0	11.9	6.1	0.4	700
	2002	63.1	16.9	11.6	8.3	0.0	773

Table 6. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? Growth of the world economy (in percentages)

		Positive	Negative	Neutral	DK/DA	N
Argentina	2006	17.9	7.9	60.5	13.7	1010
	2004	16.5	59.3	11.6	12.5	1005
Bolivia	2006	38.9	18.2	36.7	6.2	1319
	2004	35.2	37.7	21.5	5.6	1248
Brazil	2004	32.1	47.3	16.8	3.8	1400
Cameroon	2006	60.2	9.3	23.5	7.0	528
	2004	40.6	27.9	20.0	11.5	520
Chile	2006	46.0	18.8	33.2	2.0	500
Colombia	2006	60.8	16.8	20.5	1.8	600
Congo	2006	50.7	12.8	21.3	15.3	517
Costa Rica	2004	51.0	26.3	18.3	4.3	300
Dominican Rep.	2006	58.8	12.1	24.2	4.8	537
Ecuador	2004	52.2	25.6	19.8	2.4	500
Egypt	2004	24.3	5.7	49.0	20.9	506
Gabon	2006	59.8	10.3	19.0	10.9	515
Georgia	2004	64.0	3.0	8.8	24.2	1000
Ghana	2006	50.1	16.6	15.6	17.7	1606
	2004	69.4	12.7	13.2	4.8	1003
Guatemala	2004	59.3	31.7	6.0	3.0	300
Hong Kong	2006	43.6	26.5	26.8	3.2	1001

Table 6. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? Growth of the world economy (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
India	2004	47.8	19.1	28.0	5.2	1007
	2006	79.7	6.1	12.9	1.2	1058
Indonesia	2004	55.3	17.1	22.5	5.0	1051
	2006	40.0	23.6	29.2	7.2	1000
Israel	2004	37.6	28.0	30.6	3.7	1234
	2006	73.2	18.2	6.4	2.2	500
Japan	2004	70.4	8.2	19.6	1.8	500
	2006	45.6	38.5	13.0	3.0	1203
Kenya	2004	42.2	21.9	32.8	3.2	1322
	2006	54.1	17.4	19.9	8.6	2001
Malaysia	2004	52.1	24.8	17.9	5.3	509
	2006	33.3	15.0	38.6	13.0	1250
Mexico	2004	20.8	27.7	32.4	19.1	1000
	2006	35.3	18.4	41.0	5.3	700
Morocco	2004	45.3	37.7	12.6	4.5	1601
	2006	36.6	13.4	43.6	6.4	516
Nigeria	2006	65.6	11.2	14.8	8.4	500
	2004	55.4	19.6	21.1	4.0	1006
Pakistan	2006	17.5	15.8	51.0	15.7	796
	2004	14.7	33.1	32.3	19.9	951
Panama	2006	64.9	17.5	15.5	2.2	498
Paraguay	2006	57.4	18.2	22.2	2.2	500
Peru	2006	54.1	11.1	18.1	16.7	1123
	2004	47.5	21.0	20.0	11.5	400
Philippines						

Table 6. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? Growth of the world economy (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
	2006	58.2	23.3	17.5	1.0	1000
	2004	57.7	24.4	14.4	3.5	1000
Russia	2006	45.0	21.0	30.5	3.5	1502
	2004	42.6	30.8	19.6	7.0	1562
Senegal	2006	48.5	4.3	34.1	13.1	511
Singapore	2006	55.9	25.6	11.5	7.0	1002
	2004	60.7	9.6	22.8	7.0	501
South Africa	2006	53.5	18.6	19.2	8.7	1001
	2004	48.4	18.4	20.2	13.0	1506
South Korea	2006	38.4	19.4	34.6	7.6	1504
	2004	32.4	38.9	21.1	7.7	1516
Taiwan	2006	34.1	38.9	22.6	4.4	1000
	2004	55.4	15.0	23.8	5.8	500
Thailand	2006	47.3	34.1	13.4	5.2	1000
Ukraine	2006	40.7	19.6	21.8	17.9	1200
	2004	37.9	22.3	18.2	21.5	1200
Uruguay	2004	15.5	61.0	13.5	10.0	200
Venezuela	2006	39.2	22.2	31.6	7.0	1000
	2004	39.2	31.2	25.2	4.4	500
Vietnam	2006	76.3	12.6	6.9	4.3	350
	2004	66.3	12.3	13.7	7.7	300

Table 7. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? The fight against poverty in the world (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	2006	7.0	7.9	72.2	12.9	1010
	2004	9.6	69.3	9.2	12.0	1005
Bolivia	2006	28.7	21.5	45.7	4.2	1319
	2004	29.7	40.1	24.8	5.4	1248
Brazil	2004	20.6	57.8	18.4	3.2	1400
Cameroon	2006	54.0	14.2	26.3	5.5	528
	2004	34.6	30.0	24.6	10.8	520
Chile	2006	16.6	24.6	55.8	3.0	500
Colombia	2006	38.3	23.8	36.3	1.5	600
Congo	2006	49.5	13.7	20.1	16.6	517
Costa Rica	2004	38.3	30.3	26.7	4.7	300
Dominican Rep.	2006	49.3	16.4	29.8	4.5	537
Ecuador	2004	40.6	36.4	21.6	1.4	500
Egypt	2004	20.0	7.1	52.2	20.8	506
Gabon	2006	50.3	14.0	24.7	11.1	515
Georgia	2004	59.1	3.9	9.6	27.4	1000
Ghana	2006	49.6	18.4	13.8	18.2	1606
	2004	66.5	12.2	15.7	5.7	1003
Guatemala	2004	54.0	29.7	12.7	3.7	300
Hong Kong	2006	18.7	27.6	47.9	5.9	1001
	2004	26.0	34.9	35.6	3.6	1007

Table 7. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? The fight against poverty in the world (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
India	2006	71.4	9.8	17.4	1.4	1058
	2004	50.7	24.3	19.5	5.5	1051
Indonesia	2006	29.5	31.9	27.6	11.0	1000
	2004	34.4	29.7	31.4	4.6	1234
Israel	2006	42.4	34.8	20.2	2.6	500
	2004	45.4	17.0	36.2	1.4	500
Japan	2006	12.5	59.2	24.9	3.4	1203
	2004	17.5	34.4	44.8	3.3	1322
Kenya	2006	51.0	18.7	20.5	9.8	2001
	2004	53.0	17.1	25.1	4.7	509
Malaysia	2006	18.4	18.5	49.0	14.2	1250
	2004	12.3	33.1	34.8	19.8	1000
Mexico	2006	21.6	19.1	53.9	5.4	700
	2004	30.3	48.0	17.4	4.3	1601
Morocco	2006	32.8	13.8	46.1	7.4	516
Nigeria	2006	62.2	17.8	11.6	8.4	500
	2004	51.1	21.2	23.3	4.5	1006
Pakistan	2006	18.8	17.6	49.1	14.4	796
	2004	12.4	30.7	34.1	22.8	951
Panama	2006	48.6	23.1	24.9	3.4	498
Paraguay	2006	34.6	26.0	35.2	4.2	500
Peru	2006	46.7	13.9	22.1	17.4	1123
	2004	40.5	27.8	22.0	9.8	400
Philippines	2006	54.9	24.5	19.9	0.7	1000

Table 7. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? The fight against poverty in the world (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
Russia	2004	55.0	24.7	17.4	2.9	1000
	2006	34.6	32.1	30.1	3.3	1502
Senegal	2004	19.0	40.8	33.7	6.5	1562
	2006	49.1	9.0	31.1	10.8	511
Singapore	2006	30.5	37.6	23.1	8.8	1002
	2004	38.3	22.2	31.9	7.6	501
South Africa	2006	45.6	23.6	22.0	8.9	1001
	2004	47.6	18.8	22.7	10.9	1506
South Korea	2006	28.7	26.9	35.1	9.3	1504
	2004	29.4	32.8	27.4	10.4	1516
Taiwan	2006	37.9	39.8	19.1	3.2	1000
	2004	34.0	27.4	32.2	6.4	500
Thailand	2006	31.0	43.4	20.8	4.8	1000
	2004	30.6	25.8	27.6	16.1	1200
Ukraine	2006	26.6	19.7	30.8	22.9	1200
	2004	7.5	69.0	14.5	9.0	200
Uruguay	2006	19.0	28.8	43.0	9.2	1000
	2004	37.2	31.2	26.0	5.6	500
Venezuela	2006	57.4	21.4	13.1	8.0	350
	2004	42.7	19.0	30.3	8.0	300
Vietnam	2006	57.4	21.4	13.1	8.0	350
	2004	42.7	19.0	30.3	8.0	300



Table 8. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Regarding the trade that exists between (country) and the USA how important do you think this trade is for the economic health of the country? (in percentages)

	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Quite important</b>	<b>Not very important</b>	<b>Not at all important</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	12.6	40.1	23.4	9.7	14.2	0.0	1200
Bolivia	22.9	33.9	20.9	7.5	14.4	0.4	1199
Brazil	21.6	46.5	17.5	4.7	7.7	1.9	1201
Chile	22.4	55.0	10.5	1.1	9.5	1.5	1199
Colombia	38.1	39.4	8.2	4.1	9.7	0.5	1202
Costa Rica	38.0	38.3	8.9	2.6	11.5	0.7	1002
Ecuador	31.6	43.6	15.0	2.8	6.3	0.7	1200
El Salvador	47.2	25.3	10.8	4.7	9.7	2.4	1009
Guatemala	30.4	32.5	5.9	2.2	26.6	2.4	1006
Honduras	49.8	30.9	9.3	3.4	6.1	0.5	1006
Mexico	36.3	37.5	19.9	4.2	1.8	0.3	1199
Nicaragua	48.3	24.0	11.8	3.7	11.5	0.8	1011
Panama	42.6	36.0	8.9	1.8	8.2	2.6	1004
Paraguay	21.8	43.5	20.7	6.7	7.2	0.2	600
Peru	35.8	38.6	16.2	2.4	6.3	0.7	1200
Uruguay	22.9	48.5	13.6	3.8	10.9	0.3	1201
Venezuela	37.7	28.7	16.0	6.0	9.0	2.6	1201

Table 9. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Now I will ask you some questions about the US. Could you tell me if you have much confidence, some confidence, little confidence or no confidence in the US...? Will help the economic development of Latin America. (in percentages)

	<b>Much</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>No confidence</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	2.7	15.2	27.4	48.0	6.8	1200
Bolivia	8.2	27.3	32.9	23.6	8.0	1201
Brazil	7.3	22.5	32.4	26.9	10.8	1199
Chile	9.3	32.4	33.8	16.8	7.6	1200
Colombia	13.3	34.1	30.6	12.1	9.8	1201
Costa Rica	26.0	31.0	23.1	10.3	9.6	1003
Ecuador	7.5	25.8	40.9	22.4	3.4	1200
El Salvador	33.6	18.6	23.8	9.4	14.6	1008
Guatemala	16.7	29.1	20.1	9.7	24.4	1006
Honduras	31.2	25.9	22.1	11.5	9.2	1006
Mexico	6.2	19.4	35.9	36.5	1.9	1200
Nicaragua	33.5	20.1	21.8	11.4	13.3	1010
Panama	25.9	39.2	20.1	7.0	7.8	1004
Paraguay	14.7	32.2	29.5	15.7	8.0	600
Peru	10.8	29.7	43.9	11.1	4.6	1199
Uruguay	8.5	26.2	23.4	34.4	7.5	1201
Venezuela	17.4	26.8	29.6	16.6	9.6	1199

Table 10. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Who is giving most economic help to the development of the country? (in percentages)

	<b>EU</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>Japan</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	24.4	19.6	9.2	41.8	5.1	1200
Bolivia	18.5	38.8	22.7	15.3	4.7	1200
Brazil	15.2	32.3	13.5	37.2	1.7	1204
Chile	32.2	28.8	19.1	18.6	1.3	1200
Colombia	11.9	70.5	5.5	11.1	1.0	1200
Costa Rica	7.3	45.9	20.9	22.2	3.7	1000
Dominican Rep.	19.1	57.4	7.9	12.2	3.4	1000
Ecuador	14.5	52.6	8.5	23.1	1.3	1200
El Salvador	7.7	75.1	6.7	8.8	1.6	1010
Guatemala	9.6	39.8	34.6	12.7	3.3	1000
Honduras	11.0	51.5	24.0	12.4	1.1	1000
Mexico	17.0	54.6	12.2	9.2	7.0	1200
Nicaragua	19.3	31.0	25.0	20.7	4.0	1000
Panama	4.1	56.7	23.9	13.5	1.8	1008
Paraguay	12.4	18.2	46.8	22.2	0.5	1200
Peru	17.0	43.7	14.6	22.7	2.1	1200
Uruguay	22.5	35.4	3.6	36.3	2.2	1200
Venezuela	29.5	15.0	16.4	33.7	5.4	1200

Table 11. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Regarding the trade that exists between (country) and the European Union how important do you think this trade is for the economic health of the country? (in percentages)

	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Quite important</b>	<b>Not very important</b>	<b>Not at all important</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	17.0	46.3	12.7	4.4	19.2	0.3	1200
Bolivia	15.1	36.2	19.0	4.8	24.0	0.9	1200
Brazil	19.3	44.0	18.9	3.8	11.8	2.3	1199
Chile	21.3	53.9	9.5	0.8	12.8	1.7	1200
Colombia	25.9	36.4	7.9	1.6	26.7	1.5	1201
Costa Rica	23.0	31.6	9.2	2.8	32.5	0.9	1002
Ecuador	18.1	47.9	16.2	3.4	12.3	2.1	1201
El Salvador	25.6	24.6	13.6	7.0	25.6	3.6	1008
Guatemala	18.9	34.1	8.2	2.0	31.9	4.9	1005
Honduras	36.3	24.6	8.2	3.3	25.7	2.0	1005
Mexico	30.5	40.2	20.2	3.0	6.1	0.1	1200
Nicaragua	33.7	26.0	12.9	4.5	22.2	0.8	1010
Panama	19.3	35.6	15.5	4.1	21.1	4.4	1004
Paraguay	21.9	50.8	10.5	3.2	13.5	0.2	599
Peru	21.1	41.8	18.8	3.4	14.2	0.7	1200
Uruguay	23.1	48.2	10.5	1.7	16.3	0.2	1200
Venezuela	30.1	33.3	13.7	8.0	13.0	1.9	1200

Table 12. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Regarding the trade that exists between (country) and Japan how important do you think this trade is for the economic health of the country? (in percentages)

	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Quite important</b>	<b>Not very important</b>	<b>Not at all important</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	14.8	33.9	13.5	4.6	32.7	0.5	1200
Bolivia	22.0	37.2	14.0	4.8	21.2	0.8	1200
Brazil	21.2	43.0	17.7	3.6	11.8	2.8	1200
Chile	14.7	50.0	15.9	1.2	16.6	1.7	1200
Colombia	23.6	28.6	13.1	2.9	30.7	1.0	1201
Costa Rica	23.3	32.8	8.4	3.4	31.3	0.8	1002
Ecuador	17.4	39.4	21.3	5.8	13.8	2.2	1200
El Salvador	25.0	20.9	12.8	6.6	30.9	3.8	1008
Guatemala	21.4	29.6	8.0	2.6	31.5	7.0	1006
Honduras	39.8	24.5	5.8	2.9	25.2	1.9	1005
Mexico	33.0	36.6	20.3	4.0	6.0	0.1	1200
Nicaragua	31.1	27.9	11.8	5.2	23.1	0.9	1010
Panama	20.4	33.6	14.7	5.2	21.7	4.4	1004
Paraguay	31.4	46.2	6.5	2.3	13.4	0.2	599
Peru	20.8	40.8	22.6	3.9	11.2	0.6	1200
Uruguay	17.6	44.4	9.2	3.7	24.8	0.2	1200
Venezuela	29.9	31.4	13.9	8.7	14.2	2.0	1201

Table 13. *GAP (2010)*: Please tell me if you approve or disapprove of the way President Barack Obama is dealing with the world economic crisis (in percentages)

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	36.7	25.8	33.6	3.9	803
Brazil	53.8	23.9	22.0	0.3	1000
China	48.8	28.6	20.8	1.8	3262
Egypt	14.7	79.8	4.8	0.7	1000
India	51.1	24.3	23.0	1.6	2254
Indonesia	74.9	19.6	5.5	0.0	1000
Japan	63.7	20.0	16.1	0.1	700
Jordan	16.3	81.2	2.1	0.4	1000
Kenya	89.1	7.9	2.6	0.4	1002
Lebanon	43.5	51.6	4.9	0.0	1000
Mexico	43.8	32.0	23.6	0.6	1300
Nigeria	80.3	7.7	11.8	0.2	1000
Pakistan	15.8	44.6	39.1	0.6	2000
Russia	35.4	26.3	37.7	0.7	1001
South Korea	71.0	14.7	14.2	0.1	706

Table 14. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Which of the following powers helps more to promote free trade? (in percentages)

	<b>Europe</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>Japan</b>	<b>China</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	49.2	31.7	11.3	7.7	652
Bolivia	20.0	52.5	15.8	11.7	691
Brazil	21.7	30.8	20.2	27.3	714
Chile	31.3	47.6	12.3	8.8	913
Colombia	18.3	72.2	5.6	3.9	981
Costa Rica	8.6	84.8	3.0	3.7	794
Dominican Rep.	15.1	75.3	4.7	4.9	855
Ecuador	13.9	63.3	10.9	12.0	909
El Salvador	4.5	89.0	4.4	2.1	771
Guatemala	12.3	72.6	10.2	5.0	620
Honduras	10.8	73.1	9.8	6.3	789
Mexico	26.0	48.4	16.8	8.8	895
Nicaragua	12.4	72.2	9.1	6.3	680
Panama	9.7	78.0	6.3	6.1	859
Paraguay	23.1	54.5	10.3	12.1	398
Peru	18.0	62.6	12.7	6.7	919
Uruguay	48.5	37.2	6.8	7.6	646
Venezuela	25.3	44.6	15.7	14.5	899

Table 15. *Latinobarometro* (2000): Which is [country's] most important trading partner at the moment? (in percentages)

	EU	Japan	USA	N
Argentina	17.3	13.5	69.2	904
Bolivia	17.3	20.8	61.9	822
Brazil	16.4	18.1	65.5	740
Chile	19.7	33.7	46.6	964
Colombia	7.4	11.0	81.5	1061
Costa Rica	10.3	15.4	74.2	764
Ecuador	17.6	11.5	70.8	901
El Salvador	9.2	9.7	81.1	937
Guatemala	22.1	18.1	59.7	854
Honduras	11.1	17.7	71.2	859
Mexico	12.7	18.2	69.1	1060
Nicaragua	25.9	29.1	45.0	698
Panama	6.8	29.5	63.7	879
Paraguay	7.7	63.8	28.6	560
Peru	9.0	65.4	25.6	888
Uruguay	36.1	18.0	45.9	787
Venezuela	13.2	22.0	64.9	1002



Table 16. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Given what you have heard, has the investment of Spanish capital in (country) been...? (in percentages)

	Very beneficial	Quite beneficial	Not very beneficial	Not at all beneficial	There has not been Spanish capital investment in (country)	Don't know	No answer	N
Argentina	7.7	37.8	21.8	13.7	2.1	15.1	1.9	1200
Bolivia	7.8	32.9	24.0	9.0	5.3	19.2	1.8	1200
Brazil	2.1	12.8	28.9	7.1	9.6	38.9	0.7	1204
Chile	10.1	36.6	25.3	14.1	2.3	10.8	0.8	1200
Colombia	11.9	35.7	19.1	5.7	8.4	18.9	0.3	1200
Costa Rica	12.2	31.2	18.6	8.0	3.4	25.7	0.9	1000
Dominican Rep.	20.0	44.1	13.6	4.4	1.5	14.7	1.7	1000
Ecuador	10.8	28.0	20.6	8.2	9.5	21.8	1.2	1200
El Salvador	21.4	33.9	17.2	4.1	7.7	14.8	1.0	1010
Guatemala	7.7	39.7	21.6	5.3	2.3	20.9	2.5	1000
Honduras	24.0	30.3	20.6	5.4	3.8	15.3	0.6	1000
Mexico	6.2	34.6	25.5	7.5	9.6	10.2	6.5	1200
Nicaragua	25.8	27.1	20.3	9.7	1.9	14.2	1.0	1000
Panama	5.1	30.3	20.9	7.0	6.2	27.6	2.9	1008
Paraguay	10.8	23.3	11.7	6.8	10.3	36.3	0.8	1200
Peru	6.3	33.2	23.5	10.2	7.8	17.8	1.2	1200
Uruguay	7.2	32.2	23.3	8.2	4.4	24.1	0.5	1200
Venezuela	22.9	30.2	11.4	2.6	3.4	26.1	3.3	1200

Table 17. *Latinobarometro (2006)*: As far as you know or have heard, the investment of Spaniard capital in (country) has been very beneficial, somewhat beneficial, a little beneficial or not at all beneficial or has there not been Spaniard capital investment in (country)? (in percentages)

	Very beneficial	Quite beneficial	Not very/Not at all beneficial	There has not been Spanish capital investment in (country)	Don't know	No answer	N
Argentina	8.1	51.2	24.4	2.2	13.3	0.8	1200
Bolivia	6.8	45.2	24.7	7.2	15.1	1.0	1200
Brazil	7.3	27.5	6.4	14.7	42.4	1.7	1204
Chile	10.1	39.5	28.8	4.3	16.2	1.2	1200
Colombia	13.4	41.4	18.4	7.1	18.9	0.8	1200
Costa Rica	12.6	33.7	11.0	9.9	31.5	1.3	1000
Dominican Rep.	29.9	51.1	9.2	2.0	6.7	1.1	1000
Ecuador	8.0	40.2	18.8	13.8	18.8	0.6	1200
El Salvador	14.8	32.1	15.4	4.9	31.9	1.0	1020
Guatemala	8.5	42.1	19.3	7.7	21.1	1.3	1000
Honduras	25.4	28.9	10.6	6.6	26.7	1.8	1000
Mexico	7.2	35.5	17.4	4.9	34.1	0.8	1200
Nicaragua	19.1	30.2	30.2	9.6	9.7	1.2	1000
Panama	11.2	37.2	13.0	8.3	28.2	2.1	1008
Paraguay	14.2	22.0	16.2	8.6	38.4	0.6	1200
Peru	9.0	37.8	27.4	5.3	19.5	0.9	1200
Uruguay	7.0	41.8	19.0	3.8	28.0	0.5	1200
Venezuela	20.4	36.5	11.4	7.8	18.8	5.0	1200

Table 18. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: In which sectors do you believe Spanish enterprises can contribute most to the development of (country)? (in percentages)

	Energy	Telecommunications	Banking	Tourism	Infrastructures and transport	Defense and army	Education	Social welfare	Justice	Human rights	Modernization of administration	N
Argentina	26.2	40.3	12.8	21.8	20.1	9.0	46.2	28.8	17.8	17.7	11.9	776
Bolivia	30.6	31.5	19.8	49.7	48.0	12.2	73.2	31.7	35.1	30.6	22.6	1022
Brazil	28.3	36.4	18.6	42.8	33.8	12.3	57.5	28.9	30.6	34.6	17.6	920
Chile	31.5	28.0	12.0	32.6	42.5	3.3	57.5	45.3	17.6	18.4	25.1	1066
Colombia	33.6	43.4	25.9	40.7	35.2	18.6	62.0	43.9	16.1	38.9	15.8	1099
Costa Rica	9.9	27.6	9.2	47.1	24.7	1.6	51.4	27.6	12.7	17.9	17.7	855
Dominican Rep.	50.2	19.0	6.3	45.3	9.2	6.0	62.4	23.0	16.6	12.0	14.1	907
Ecuador	22.2	33.7	27.0	42.0	26.8	8.9	56.2	36.0	23.6	23.4	13.6	984
El Salvador	33.1	19.0	9.9	20.3	35.9	3.5	67.9	17.4	12.5	20.2	7.2	893
Guatemala	19.8	18.9	10.8	39.7	19.7	4.1	61.7	15.2	16.5	12.4	8.3	834
Honduras	39.9	24.4	11.4	34.3	35.8	8.5	72.1	14.7	20.3	16.5	8.9	872
Mexico	16.1	23.1	26.2	44.5	31.0	8.4	42.1	25.0	18.7	30.1	24.1	1105
Nicaragua	33.7	14.3	11.1	33.1	28.3	6.6	60.4	20.1	13.9	16.2	7.6	870
Panama	17.7	25.9	16.9	53.0	27.8	3.4	61.5	25.4	16.8	22.1	21.3	812
Paraguay	21.2	21.8	14.7	32.1	46.8	3.3	61.5	27.0	22.6	20.0	7.6	1026
Peru	20.3	36.6	15.1	43.6	30.4	5.7	61.5	26.1	18.4	28.5	16.5	1086
Uruguay	26.1	41.3	16.8	37.7	32.0	4.3	44.7	44.8	11.2	25.2	25.2	940
Venezuela	21.2	29.3	19.9	33.7	24.5	8.1	39.9	31.9	13.8	17.4	12.9	1015

Table 19. *Latinobarometro (2001)*: What is the most important thing to get the successful development in a country? (in percentages)

	<b>A lot of natural resources like oil, copper, sugar, coffee</b>	<b>Industries to export products like car industries, machines industries</b>	<b>Have population with a good education</b>	<b>Have active businessmen</b>	<b>A lot of investment from the developed countries</b>	<b>Have a common market with the others Latin American countries</b>	<b>Collaborate with US</b>	<b>Develop science and technology</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	27.8	42.4	60.3	16.3	13.7	10.6	2.7	27.5	1200
Bolivia	27.5	38.0	48.4	20.0	22.5	26.6	4.9	24.9	1075
Brazil	27.8	26.9	59.7	16.7	17.3	14.4	4.8	20.5	1000
Chile	44.5	49.1	57.8	46.4	25.5	18.2	10.9	25.6	1174
Colombia	47.9	41.0	62.1	33.2	31.8	25.4	8.4	16.0	1199
Costa Rica	37.2	30.6	59.8	35.1	25.3	28.9	11.6	34.3	1000
Ecuador	33.7	24.7	49.8	16.4	18.0	17.4	6.2	19.8	1200
El Salvador	45.3	39.7	62.5	35.2	35.8	33.3	11.9	11.2	1000
Guatemala	29.5	18.6	55.7	15.5	10.3	13.4	5.9	16.1	1002
Honduras	52.7	37.7	81.3	33.3	31.1	24.4	20.8	27.4	1000
Mexico	33.6	41.2	47.7	30.5	29.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	1253
Nicaragua	47.0	21.5	51.1	23.0	37.9	29.2	24.1	28.7	1005
Panama	32.0	39.8	53.1	38.3	32.6	25.9	40.1	33.9	1000
Paraguay	24.2	51.8	49.5	29.8	20.0	9.1	0.2	0.0	604
Peru	28.8	32.7	46.7	17.9	29.6	16.4	4.7	29.9	1023
Uruguay	33.6	59.2	52.6	27.2	24.8	27.5	4.8	23.2	1200
Venezuela	28.0	24.2	46.6	16.1	15.5	9.9	6.2	15.1	1200

Table 20. *Latinobarometro (2001)*: All things considered, would you say that (nation) benefits a lot, quite a lot, a little or not at all from belonging to [regional trading block: MERCOSUR/NAFTA/Andean Pact]? (in percentages)

	<b>Benefits a lot</b>	<b>Quite a lot</b>	<b>A little</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	10.2	25.2	46.0	18.5	960
Bolivia	22.8	27.1	31.0	19.1	920
Brazil	15.3	24.1	48.2	12.4	790
Chile	23.6	36.9	32.3	7.2	948
Colombia	33.2	34.6	26.9	5.3	431
Costa Rica	37.8	33.9	22.8	5.5	820
Ecuador	29.9	25.5	37.9	6.8	1045
El Salvador	35.4	29.6	29.7	5.3	834
Guatemala	27.8	36.3	32.3	3.6	772
Honduras	51.2	23.2	21.6	3.9	921
Mexico	7.5	23.5	51.7	17.4	1175
Nicaragua	29.8	37.0	29.3	3.8	859
Panama	24.2	43.1	21.7	11.0	881
Paraguay	10.9	15.5	68.2	5.4	522
Peru	19.8	24.6	50.6	4.9	792
Uruguay	8.8	22.9	55.7	12.5	1133
Venezuela	41.8	24.3	28.8	5.0	992

## 2. International security

Table 21. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: How much interest do you have in international affairs? (in percentages)

	<b>A lot of interest</b>	<b>Some interest</b>	<b>Little interest</b>	<b>No interest</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	18.2	24.6	27.4	29.7	1177
Bolivia	19.5	24.0	33.0	23.5	1122
Brazil	16.5	18.5	39.4	25.7	1173
Chile	16.6	40.3	30.1	13.0	1189
Colombia	23.9	31.6	29.1	15.4	1168
Costa Rica	23.5	28.3	27.7	20.5	985
Dominican Rep.	37.6	33.0	17.1	12.3	986
Ecuador	14.7	31.2	38.5	15.6	1170
El Salvador	21.3	21.1	34.3	23.3	982
Guatemala	14.0	18.8	39.6	27.6	946
Honduras	19.3	20.6	32.4	27.7	975
Mexico	16.7	34.3	37.7	11.3	1182
Nicaragua	23.7	20.8	30.3	25.3	954
Panama	18.1	34.9	32.0	15.0	966
Paraguay	30.1	26.2	30.6	13.1	595
Peru	20.2	30.3	36.5	13.0	1185
Uruguay	19.2	36.6	30.3	13.9	1176
Venezuela	17.4	25.1	31.1	26.3	1147

Table 22. *Latinobarometro (2006)*: How much have you heard or read about what Venezuela's President Hugo Chávez has said or done in relation to our country and other Latin American countries: a lot, quite a lot, little, or nothing? Or have you not heard enough to have an opinion? (in percentages)

	A lot	Some	Little	Nothing	Doesn't know enough to have an opinion	Don't know	N
Argentina	6.2	16.4	35.3	15.3	23.8	2.8	1200
Bolivia	12.3	25.6	42.9	9.8	7.2	1.8	1200
Brazil	6.1	16.7	19.4	35.4	3.0	16.8	1204
Chile	4.8	22.4	31.3	8.0	27.5	4.9	1200
Colombia	21.4	19.4	32.6	10.2	15.1	1.1	1200
Costa Rica	7.0	14.0	28.8	13.1	33.8	2.6	1000
Dominican Rep.	12.1	16.5	29.3	16.9	16.6	8.0	1000
Ecuador	3.0	14.8	33.2	12.8	32.8	3.2	1200
El Salvador	10.0	11.7	23.6	15.2	33.7	5.7	1020
Guatemala	3.5	12.2	30.1	22.1	29.6	2.0	1000
Honduras	5.3	8.1	25.7	19.2	32.4	7.6	1000
Mexico	8.5	16.8	31.3	13.0	14.2	15.5	1200
Nicaragua	13.2	13.3	34.9	20.9	14.8	2.4	1000
Panama	7.2	16.8	26.5	8.5	32.8	6.5	1008
Paraguay	4.2	6.9	23.2	23.9	35.7	5.8	1200
Peru	15.8	20.8	38.0	9.2	12.8	2.8	1200
Uruguay	7.8	30.8	28.1	9.5	22.3	1.4	1200

Table 23. *Latinobarometro (2008)*: Would you say that you heard a lot, something, a little or nothing about the presidential campaign and the presidential election in USA? (in percentages)

	<b>A lot</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>Nothing</b>	<b>Don't know / No answer</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	14.2	30.1	30.7	24.2	0.8	1200
Bolivia	6.2	19.6	29.0	42.8	2.3	1200
Brazil	21.7	24.3	31.0	21.6	1.5	1204
Chile	21.6	36.4	27.4	13.5	1.1	1200
Colombia	24.3	24.6	33.9	16.3	0.8	1200
Costa Rica	17.2	36.0	29.2	16.0	1.6	1000
Dominican Rep.	17.9	48.4	25.8	7.4	0.5	1000
Ecuador	6.8	21.8	37.8	29.9	3.8	1200
El Salvador	11.1	41.0	30.7	15.0	2.2	1000
Guatemala	10.4	15.1	39.0	30.7	4.8	1000
Honduras	9.1	22.4	31.8	31.2	5.5	1000
Mexico	19.0	25.1	37.2	17.7	1.1	1200
Nicaragua	9.7	16.3	30.9	41.2	1.9	1000
Panama	7.7	22.6	31.7	33.4	4.6	1000
Paraguay	9.3	16.0	31.7	40.5	2.5	1200
Peru	6.7	24.1	28.3	37.9	3.0	1200
Uruguay	17.5	30.2	26.3	22.6	3.4	1200
Venezuela	14.8	26.5	35.9	21.3	1.4	1200



Table 24. *Latinobarometro* (2009): Could you tell me who is the president of the United States? (in percentages)

	<b>Barack Obama, Correct</b>	<b>George W. Bush, Incorrect</b>	<b>Mentions other name, Incorrect</b>	<b>Doesn't know</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	80.4	1.5	0.1	17.6	0.4	1200
Bolivia	61.0	1.2	0.0	33.9	3.8	1200
Brazil	70.5	3.9	0.0	25.0	0.6	1204
Chile	84.8	0.3	0.4	12.8	1.7	1200
Colombia	75.8	1.3	1.0	18.9	2.9	1200
Costa Rica	84.3	0.7	0.1	12.3	2.6	1000
Dominican Rep.	88.9	0.0	0.0	8.6	2.5	1000
Ecuador	67.3	1.6	0.3	27.4	3.3	1200
El Salvador	76.1	1.8	0.1	17.0	5.0	1000
Guatemala	61.7	4.2	0.0	29.3	4.8	1000
Honduras	77.8	1.2	0.0	18.5	2.5	1000
Mexico	71.1	1.2	0.6	25.6	1.6	1200
Nicaragua	65.0	0.9	0.1	25.8	8.2	1000
Panama	78.4	2.1	0.0	17.0	2.5	1000
Paraguay	56.3	2.1	1.2	39.5	0.8	1200
Peru	64.6	2.3	4.0	25.4	3.7	1200
Uruguay	85.2	0.5	0.2	14.2	0.0	1200
Venezuela	74.3	1.5	7.4	14.7	2.1	1200

Table 25. *GAP (2002-2005, 2007, 2009)*: In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like our country? (in percentages)

		<b>Great deal</b>	<b>Fair amount</b>	<b>Not too much</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Angola	2002	22.7	30.1	20.8	12.9	12.2	780
Argentina	2009	5.6	11.9	35.0	41.2	6.1	800
	2007	9.1	11.6	21.7	47.7	9.4	799
	2002	8.1	8.4	23.2	52.8	7.0	814
Bangladesh	2007	10.9	12.7	53.4	14.9	7.8	1000
	2002	6.6	9.1	12.6	26.7	43.6	760
Bolivia	2007	16.8	34.1	28.9	14.0	5.5	834
	2002	17.3	27.6	33.3	14.8	6.6	784
Brazil	2009	15.9	35.9	29.0	14.1	4.8	813
	2007	20.5	23.8	25.0	26.8	3.8	999
	2003	13.4	20.1	22.7	38.7	5.1	1000
	2002	13.2	24.4	26.5	27.5	8.4	1000
Chile	2007	7.4	22.5	36.2	25.4	7.8	800
China	2009	10.6	50.3	27.4	4.4	7.2	3160
	2007	10.2	33.7	34.7	10.7	10.3	3143
	2005	12.3	40.5	28.4	9.8	8.6	2190
Egypt	2009	7.7	11.5	30.9	45.0	2.7	1000
	2007	12.3	11.6	32.9	41.1	2.1	1000
	2002	1.4	15.8	21.1	44.8	11.6	1013
Ethiopia	2007	10.8	28.4	32.2	22.4	6.2	711
Ghana	2007	16.3	36.6	25.2	7.5	14.1	707
	2002	17.0	27.5	27.4	6.7	21.2	702
Guatemala	2002	13.0	44.2	31.0	8.4	2.8	500
Honduras	2002	19.2	42.1	22.3	10.7	5.3	506

Table 25. *GAP (2002-2005, 2007, 2009)*: In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like our country? (in percentages)

		<b>Great deal</b>	<b>Fair amount</b>	<b>Not too much</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
India	2009	28.4	52.9	10.3	2.1	6.2	2038
	2007	16.3	52.7	16.2	8.5	5.2	2043
	2005	21.2	41.5	16.4	10.4	10.4	2042
	2002	12.5	25.3	16.6	14.4	31.1	2189
Indonesia	2009	10.4	34.2	40.7	6.5	7.9	1000
	2007	8.5	35.7	32.5	9.2	14.0	1008
	2003	6.1	21.2	51.6	17.8	3.3	1011
	2002	11.7	29.0	38.6	10.2	10.1	1018
Israel	2009	26.2	43.7	19.6	9.3	0.6	1201
	2007	24.1	50.4	17.8	5.8	1.9	900
	2003	41.9	37.4	15.0	4.5	1.1	903
Ivory Coast	2007	27.2	43.4	23.9	5.2	0.3	707
	2002	18.2	36.4	25.8	19.5	0.0	708
Japan	2009	1.9	33.8	50.5	9.7	4.1	701
	2007	3.0	31.6	49.0	8.9	7.3	762
	2002	3.6	32.4	49.4	9.9	4.7	704
Jordan	2009	3.5	12.1	42.7	40.9	0.8	1000
	2007	7.8	14.7	43.3	31.8	2.2	1000
	2004	1.0	15.2	37.6	39.4	5.3	1000
	2003	2.6	16.3	43.6	36.1	1.3	1000
	2002	7.3	20.9	34.7	35.9	1.2	1000
Kenya	2009	36.4	37.7	16.7	5.1	4.1	1002
	2007	27.5	39.1	21.3	7.6	4.4	1000
	2002	18.9	34.2	28.4	10.3	8.0	661
Kuwait	2007	8.0	22.2	22.0	42.4	4.6	500
	2003	27.0	34.0	19.8	15.2	3.4	500
Lebanon	2009	2.7	17.9	34.1	44.1	1.2	1001
	2007	5.9	28.3	31.7	33.5	0.6	1000

Table 25. *GAP (2002-2005, 2007, 2009)*: In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like our country? (in percentages)

		<b>Great deal</b>	<b>Fair amount</b>	<b>Not too much</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
	2003	4.7	13.4	35.9	44.8	1.2	1000
	2002	4.1	15.8	27.5	49.9	2.5	1000
Malaysia							
	2007	3.7	16.5	40.9	27.7	11.0	701
Mali							
	2007	25.6	33.6	28.4	8.9	2.9	700
	2002	23.4	26.4	28.8	9.2	9.9	697
Mexico							
	2009	16.0	31.7	31.7	16.7	3.7	999
	2007	13.0	34.1	25.5	24.0	2.3	828
	2002	12.3	29.7	24.9	26.9	5.8	996
Morocco							
	2007	2.7	6.2	12.8	57.2	20.9	1000
	2004	9.3	25.1	16.2	41.0	8.3	1000
	2003	12.5	18.3	16.7	46.4	6.1	1001
Nigeria							
	2009	32.4	33.8	16.7	14.4	2.8	1001
	2007	30.5	34.6	20.6	8.5	5.7	1129
	2003	29.3	28.2	23.1	16.4	2.8	1000
	2002	48.6	26.7	11.2	5.7	7.8	1000
Pakistan							
	2009	3.6	17.9	14.5	37.7	26.0	1253
	2007	5.0	16.3	18.7	35.2	24.5	2007
	2004	2.9	15.0	16.3	32.2	32.9	1242
	2003	4.0	18.1	22.5	39.0	15.6	999
	2002	4.9	17.8	9.4	26.7	39.7	2030
Palestinian Territories							
	2009	2.2	13.7	29.2	54.2	0.8	1156
	2007	5.1	7.1	25.6	56.7	4.5	808
	2003	0.9	4.9	31.4	61.1	1.5	800
Peru							
	2007	15.9	36.7	20.9	18.9	7.6	799
	2002	14.3	38.1	23.8	16.6	7.2	711
Philippines							
	2002	22.0	51.6	12.3	2.9	11.0	699
Russia							

Table 25. *GAP (2002-2005, 2007, 2009)*: In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like our country? (in percentages)

		<b>Great deal</b>	<b>Fair amount</b>	<b>Not too much</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Senegal	2009	6.4	24.5	40.5	22.9	5.6	1000
	2007	4.2	15.4	40.9	31.4	7.8	1003
	2005	3.1	17.9	47.0	26.2	5.5	1002
	2004	5.1	15.0	42.6	30.3	7.0	1002
	2003	6.4	14.2	37.3	34.3	7.6	501
	2002	3.4	17.9	44.9	24.5	9.2	1002
South Africa	2007	12.3	25.3	34.1	22.9	5.4	700
	2002	8.7	25.4	32.5	26.5	6.8	710
South Korea	2007	20.8	33.2	24.4	8.3	13.2	1000
	2002	22.5	28.3	21.2	13.5	14.0	702
Tanzania	2009	5.1	29.5	57.8	5.3	2.3	701
	2007	5.3	11.0	57.5	21.0	4.7	718
	2003	4.4	16.8	57.7	18.9	2.1	525
	2002	4.7	17.9	54.1	18.7	4.4	700
Uganda	2007	16.5	32.5	12.9	19.2	18.2	704
	2002	13.2	33.8	19.9	10.4	22.1	720
Ukraine	2007	30.1	28.5	12.0	6.8	22.6	1121
	2002	19.3	33.6	21.0	7.2	18.8	1008
Uzbekistan	2007	7.0	20.8	37.6	26.6	7.4	500
	2002	4.0	25.0	43.6	24.0	3.4	500
Venezuela	2002	14.4	41.9	30.7	6.9	6.1	700
Vietnam	2007	24.4	39.5	17.1	17.1	1.7	803
	2002	33.3	45.9	15.0	4.4	1.0	700
	2002	52.1	27.8	7.4	1.2	11.5	772

Table 26. *GAP (2002)*: In terms of solving world problems, does the United States do too much, too little, or the right amount in helping solve world problems? (in percentages)

	<b>US does too much</b>	<b>US does too little</b>	<b>US does right amount</b>	<b>US does nothing (volunteered)</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Angola	25.8	34.3	23.4	9.1	6.2	779
Argentina	10.3	35.0	23.2	20.1	10.6	814
Bangladesh	43.2	6.7	9.2	2.9	37.4	759
Bolivia	18.4	46.8	19.2	9.8	5.5	782
Brazil	19.7	27.8	26.4	16.8	9.1	999
Egypt	3.9	39.6	5.4	33.8	11.8	1013
Ghana	30.1	31.2	18.2	3.8	16.2	702
Guatemala	20.2	45.8	26.6	2.6	4.2	500
Honduras	21.3	37.0	26.3	8.7	5.7	506
India	18.1	24.9	11.2	15.5	30.2	2190
Indonesia	47.7	25.9	11.0	1.9	13.3	1017
Ivory Coast	20.4	28.4	47.0	4.2	0.0	707
Japan	53.3	7.1	32.1	0.1	7.2	705
Jordan	9.4	32.7	7.4	46.5	3.6	1000
Kenya	38.1	26.3	25.4	2.4	7.9	662
Lebanon	5.0	27.6	27.0	35.1	4.8	1000
Mali	15.9	36.3	31.6	6.9	9.0	697
Mexico	14.3	48.4	18.1	11.9	6.8	995
Nigeria	43.8	27.4	18.5	5.0	5.3	1000
Pakistan	6.8	45.0	7.9	6.0	32.7	2031
Peru	6.8	41.8	33.0	11.0	7.3	710
Philippines	28.0	14.3	53.4	1.4	3.0	701
Russia	14.1	26.7	27.2	13.3	18.1	1002
Senegal	11.8	22.0	48.6	11.7	5.9	710
South Africa	23.3	33.6	20.7	8.7	13.3	699
South Korea	38.6	19.3	29.7	6.9	4.6	700
Tanzania	24.4	23.2	22.4	8.6	21.0	720
Uganda	32.5	25.8	20.8	5.7	15.2	1008
Ukraine	23.0	15.8	49.9	5.0	6.2	501
Uzbekistan	41.4	10.9	39.4	2.3	6.0	700
Venezuela	37.6	42.6	12.4	4.4	2.9	700
Vietnam	49.7	13.3	23.4	0.6	12.8	772

Table 27. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Now I will ask you some questions about the US. Could you tell me if you have much confidence, some confidence, little confidence or no confidence in the US....? As a world power (in percentages)

	<b>Much</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>No confidence</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	9.7	18.5	25.4	40.5	6.0	1201
Bolivia	16.8	26.8	26.0	23.1	7.2	1201
Brazil	18.0	23.4	27.8	22.0	8.8	1200
Chile	14.2	34.1	29.8	13.8	8.1	1200
Colombia	18.6	37.3	23.0	11.8	9.4	1202
Costa Rica	39.4	25.6	18.3	9.6	7.1	1002
Ecuador	15.6	36.3	25.9	18.8	3.5	1199
El Salvador	42.5	13.8	21.8	9.1	12.8	1009
Guatemala	32.2	22.0	13.3	8.7	23.7	1007
Honduras	47.1	18.3	20.4	7.7	6.6	1006
Mexico	19.2	25.7	28.7	25.4	1.0	1200
Nicaragua	43.3	14.9	17.6	12.4	11.8	1011
Panama	45.7	30.6	12.0	5.8	6.0	1004
Paraguay	26.2	27.3	26.0	13.8	6.7	600
Peru	24.3	31.5	30.9	9.3	4.0	1199
Uruguay	13.5	25.0	21.5	32.9	7.2	1201
Venezuela	23.6	25.2	27.1	16.3	7.8	1201

Table 28. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: When all its actions are considered, on balance would you say that the United States is having a very positive, a somewhat positive, a somewhat negative or very negative influence in the world? (in percentages)

	<b>Very positive</b>	<b>Somewhat positive</b>	<b>Somewhat negative</b>	<b>Very negative</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>DA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	3.9	18.8	33.1	35.8	7.6	0.8	1200
Bolivia	7.1	36.7	28.1	17.6	8.7	1.9	1200
Brazil	8.6	34.3	26.1	17.4	13.0	0.6	1204
Chile	4.8	34.5	32.6	18.9	8.0	1.2	1200
Colombia	17.0	42.6	20.8	12.2	7.4	0.0	1200
Costa Rica	18.4	43.1	18.6	9.3	8.9	1.7	1000
Dominican Rep.	21.3	43.3	16.6	10.4	5.9	2.5	1000
Ecuador	7.4	40.9	29.4	8.9	12.7	0.7	1200
El Salvador	23.9	44.4	13.4	9.1	7.5	1.8	1010
Guatemala	12.6	48.6	23.9	5.8	5.8	3.3	1000
Honduras	28.8	42.8	11.5	7.8	8.0	1.1	1000
Mexico	9.5	34.7	24.6	29.7	0.6	1.0	1200
Nicaragua	20.2	35.6	14.9	11.8	14.4	3.1	1000
Panama	14.0	56.4	15.6	7.2	6.2	0.6	1008
Paraguay	5.9	27.3	24.2	22.3	19.5	0.7	1200
Peru	12.9	44.4	21.7	9.9	10.2	0.8	1200
Uruguay	3.1	24.4	28.1	30.0	12.6	1.8	1200
Venezuela	10.3	25.2	29.4	20.4	12.6	2.0	1200



Table 29. *Latinobarometro (2007, 2009)*: Now thinking about the role that the USA plays in Latin America and considering everything that it does, would you say that, in general, the USA has a positive or negative influence? Do you think that it is very positive, fairly positive, fairly negative or very negative? (in percentages)

		<b>Very positive</b>	<b>Fairly positive</b>	<b>Fairly negative</b>	<b>Very negative</b>	<b>Neither negative nor positive</b>	<b>It doesn't have influence</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	2009	3.0	39.0	29.5	11.9	5.5	0.7	10.2	0.2	1200
	2007	1.4	17.8	36.6	32.5	4.8	0.3	5.8	0.8	1200
Bolivia	2009	9.2	49.1	22.0	8.1	3.6	0.6	6.9	0.5	1200
	2007	7.2	38.6	30.4	13.5	3.2	0.7	5.8	0.8	1200
Brazil	2009	15.9	45.9	15.3	5.7	5.1	1.5	9.3	1.2	1204
	2007	10.5	37.7	19.8	11.1	6.1	1.0	11.9	1.9	1204
Chile	2009	12.1	54.3	11.2	1.4	9.8	1.1	9.2	0.8	1200
	2007	6.6	39.2	24.2	8.0	11.1	1.2	8.8	1.0	1200
Colombia	2009	26.5	44.8	10.8	6.4	2.6	0.2	7.4	1.4	1200
	2007	15.5	49.9	18.8	7.4	3.3	0.3	4.4	0.3	1200
Costa Rica	2009	32.4	48.3	8.0	3.3	1.3	0.0	5.1	1.6	1000
	2007	8.6	51.4	22.6	7.0	1.4	0.4	6.8	1.8	1000
Dominican Rep.	2009	37.8	50.2	8.4	1.4	1.0	0.0	0.9	0.3	1000
	2007	24.0	59.2	10.1	3.1	0.9	0.4	1.7	0.6	1000
Ecuador	2009	7.0	43.0	27.6	7.2	6.8	1.2	6.8	0.3	1200
	2007	4.6	47.3	22.1	7.4	9.7	0.2	8.2	0.5	1200
El Salvador	2009	33.3	46.5	6.5	3.7	2.3	0.1	6.7	0.9	1000
	2007	19.8	51.5	13.4	5.5	4.8	0.3	3.3	1.4	1000
Guatemala	2009	15.6	52.6	17.2	4.6	1.6	0.2	5.5	2.7	1000
	2007	12.6	37.6	24.8	9.8	3.0	0.5	8.9	2.8	1000
Honduras	2009	31.9	40.5	11.3	5.7	1.4	0.0	7.7	1.5	1000
	2007	22.6	42.3	17.6	6.8	1.6	0.5	7.1	1.5	1000

Table 29. *Latinobarometro (2007, 2009)*: Now thinking about the role that the USA plays in Latin America and considering everything that it does, would you say that, in general, the USA has a positive or negative influence? Do you think that it is very positive, fairly positive, fairly negative or very negative? (in percentages)

		Very positive	Fairly positive	Fairly negative	Very negative	Neither negative nor positive	It doesn't have influence	Don't know	No answer	N
Mexico	2009	10.6	46.1	20.3	10.0	2.1	0.2	9.8	0.9	1200
	2007	7.6	43.8	26.7	12.5	3.2	0.3	5.3	0.6	1200
Nicaragua	2009	25.8	40.9	12.7	4.7	2.2	0.2	9.2	4.3	1000
	2007	27.3	45.5	11.4	5.2	2.0	0.2	7.8	0.6	1000
Panama	2009	32.1	44.2	7.2	2.4	2.6	0.0	9.3	2.2	1000
	2007	19.5	49.7	15.0	2.7	3.2	0.1	5.4	4.5	1008
Paraguay	2009	9.6	38.8	14.9	4.6	11.5	0.7	19.7	0.3	1200
	2007	6.1	37.8	18.7	7.0	8.9	0.3	19.9	1.3	1200
Peru	2009	9.0	50.1	17.6	6.8	4.8	0.1	10.2	1.6	1200
	2007	8.7	48.8	21.3	7.7	3.2	0.4	8.6	1.3	1200
Uruguay	2009	14.8	55.6	13.6	4.5	4.0	0.0	7.3	0.2	1200
	2007	7.9	37.3	22.1	13.8	9.1	0.4	8.4	0.9	1200
Venezuela	2009	14.2	45.2	18.2	11.0	1.9	0.8	7.2	1.5	1200
	2007	11.1	31.8	23.4	16.2	5.2	1.7	7.1	3.7	1200

Table 30. *Latinobarometro (2007, 2009)*: Historically and taking everything into consideration, how do you evaluate the influence of Spain in (country) since the discovery of America? (in percentages)

		<b>Very positive</b>	<b>Fairly positive</b>	<b>Fairly negative</b>	<b>Very negative</b>	<b>Neither negative nor positive</b>	<b>It doesn't have influence</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina										
	2009	6.9	45.6	19.3	8.1	9.1	0.8	10.0	0.2	1200
	2007	6.2	44.2	17.4	10.7	9.8	1.2	9.5	0.8	1200
Bolivia										
	2009	10.3	41.4	21.8	8.0	6.0	1.7	9.6	1.2	1200
	2007	9.4	48.9	20.9	10.4	3.1	1.1	5.6	0.6	1200
Brazil										
	2009	8.4	37.1	11.0	3.2	10.0	5.8	23.1	1.3	1204
	2007	7.0	38.5	10.5	2.8	8.4	3.2	25.9	3.7	1204
Chile										
	2009	9.2	49.7	12.4	4.1	12.5	2.8	8.3	1.0	1200
	2007	10.8	46.2	17.6	3.8	11.2	1.8	7.7	1.0	1200
Colombia										
	2009	12.9	43.0	12.2	6.2	7.8	1.9	14.1	1.8	1200
	2007	13.0	55.1	14.3	8.2	2.4	1.2	5.3	0.4	1200
Costa Rica										
	2009	25.3	42.9	10.0	5.0	4.7	1.3	8.5	2.3	1000
	2007	10.1	51.7	15.8	7.1	4.0	0.6	9.7	1.0	1000
Dominican Rep.										
	2009	22.5	50.3	17.0	2.6	3.7	0.2	3.4	0.3	1000
	2007	31.3	54.0	8.8	2.0	1.3	0.2	2.0	0.4	1000
Ecuador										
	2009	7.7	36.8	25.0	6.7	9.8	1.4	11.9	0.8	1200
	2007	7.8	48.5	16.7	8.9	9.3	0.7	7.9	0.2	1200
El Salvador										
	2009	22.7	46.9	7.6	5.4	4.4	0.6	11.6	0.8	1000
	2007	14.9	46.0	18.8	6.9	4.8	0.3	6.5	1.8	1000
Guatemala										
	2009	10.7	48.8	21.7	7.3	2.9	0.3	6.5	1.8	1000
	2007	11.0	34.0	21.2	14.2	3.0	0.5	12.7	3.4	1000
Honduras										
	2009	22.1	40.7	11.2	5.8	1.9	1.6	14.8	1.9	1000
	2007	26.1	43.4	11.4	4.8	1.9	1.5	9.4	1.5	1000
Mexico										

Table 30. *Latinobarometro (2007, 2009)*: Historically and taking everything into consideration, how do you evaluate the influence of Spain in (country) since the discovery of America? (in percentages)

		<b>Very positive</b>	<b>Fairly positive</b>	<b>Fairly negative</b>	<b>Very negative</b>	<b>Neither negative nor positive</b>	<b>It doesn't have influence</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
	2009	9.8	47.1	17.7	7.2	3.0	0.7	13.8	0.8	1200
	2007	9.8	55.7	14.6	6.2	3.8	0.8	8.7	0.5	1200
Nicaragua										
	2009	17.7	31.7	6.5	3.8	3.3	1.6	28.8	6.6	1000
	2007	23.7	47.7	9.2	5.7	2.8	0.3	10.0	0.6	1000
Panama										
	2009	19.8	47.7	6.0	4.2	4.5	1.0	14.3	2.5	1000
	2007	21.0	44.0	10.5	5.0	5.7	1.2	8.9	3.7	1008
Paraguay										
	2009	9.8	43.9	13.0	7.8	7.3	1.2	16.7	0.2	1200
	2007	14.2	46.8	12.2	6.8	6.2	1.7	11.6	0.8	1200
Peru										
	2009	4.8	38.1	26.5	14.0	4.4	0.2	10.5	1.4	1200
	2007	7.2	47.7	20.2	12.8	3.2	0.4	7.4	1.1	1200
Uruguay										
	2009	9.5	51.0	14.8	5.6	7.2	0.2	11.3	0.3	1200
	2007	13.2	50.2	15.2	4.8	8.2	0.6	7.4	0.3	1200
Venezuela										
	2009	18.5	44.9	11.0	7.4	6.6	1.9	7.6	2.1	1200
	2007	16.9	45.2	10.8	9.0	5.4	2.2	7.2	3.3	1200

Table 31. *Latinobarometro (2009)*: And Venezuela, what influence does it have? (in percentages)

	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Neither positive nor negative	No influence at all	Doesn't know	No answer	N
Argentina	3.4	22.4	29.3	17.3	7.2	2.0	18.0	0.3	1200
Bolivia	6.9	31.9	26.2	25.9	2.9	0.4	5.0	0.7	1200
Brazil	3.3	21.8	20.6	18.6	7.0	4.3	22.5	1.9	1204
Chile	1.8	22.9	21.7	20.7	9.8	5.8	15.7	1.8	1200
Colombia	5.7	12.9	20.7	48.6	2.4	0.8	7.6	1.4	1200
Costa Rica	5.8	19.6	23.2	28.1	3.7	2.4	12.5	4.7	1000
Dominican Rep.	14.5	51.1	19.3	5.6	1.9	0.9	3.0	3.7	1000
Ecuador	4.8	27.9	32.1	18.6	7.9	0.8	7.2	0.7	1200
El Salvador	10.3	33.1	21.1	18.0	2.7	0.5	8.5	5.8	1000
Guatemala	12.1	33.9	24.2	10.8	2.2	0.7	11.3	4.8	1000
Honduras	11.8	18.5	18.9	35.8	1.9	0.5	11.0	1.6	1000
Mexico	4.1	16.6	25.6	21.6	6.1	3.4	19.8	2.9	1200
Nicaragua	16.7	26.5	20.1	17.6	2.1	0.2	12.6	4.2	1000
Panama	7.1	21.0	14.2	26.5	6.7	1.2	18.0	5.3	1000
Paraguay	6.7	23.6	21.9	12.7	10.8	0.8	23.2	0.4	1200
Peru	2.8	16.6	28.7	32.3	4.4	1.0	12.2	2.1	1200
Uruguay	11.2	37.9	20.6	11.2	5.8	0.5	12.4	0.4	1200
Venezuela	17.3	39.0	19.8	12.0	2.2	1.6	6.4	1.7	1200

Table 32. *GAP (2007, 2008)*: Overall, how much influence do you think the United States is having on the way things are going in our country? Would you say it is having a great deal of influence, a fair amount, not too much, or no influence at all? (in percentages)

		<b>A great deal</b>	<b>A fair amount</b>	<b>Not too much</b>	<b>No influence at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	2008	39.1	34.8	11.4	8.6	5.9	801
	2007	30.9	35.9	13.5	4.9	14.2	800
Bolivia	2007	30.6	42.0	17.6	4.6	5.0	834
Brazil	2008	38.4	34.8	12.2	10.1	4.3	999
	2007	47.2	34.8	7.2	7.1	3.6	999
Chile	2007	22.5	38.6	21.8	5.4	10.9	801
China	2008	7.2	42.6	32.2	6.2	11.1	3212
Egypt	2008	44.6	41.4	9.3	3.3	1.0	1000
Ethiopia	2007	52.6	34.8	9.4	0.8	2.1	709
Ghana	2007	25.0	43.7	18.5	1.4	10.9	707
India	2008	26.2	46.8	12.3	5.3	8.9	2056
Indonesia	2008	26.1	44.1	17.7	4.6	7.2	999
Ivory Coast	2007	33.0	31.5	28.3	7.2	0.0	710
Japan	2008	62.9	30.5	5.4	0.6	0.7	708
Jordan	2008	43.8	44.6	7.7	2.7	0.4	1000
Kenya	2007	38.1	43.9	13.0	1.9	3.1	1000
Lebanon	2008	46.6	44.8	5.9	0.8	1.8	999
Mali	2007	37.7	28.1	26.4	4.4	2.4	700

Table 32. *GAP (2007, 2008)*: Overall, how much influence do you think the United States is having on the way things are going in our country? Would you say it is having a great deal of influence, a fair amount, not too much, or no influence at all? (in percentages)

		<b>A great deal</b>	<b>A fair amount</b>	<b>Not too much</b>	<b>No influence at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Mexico	2008	50.1	30.9	9.4	5.1	4.2	806
	2007	38.3	36.8	13.3	4.7	5.4	828
Nigeria	2008	46.0	28.8	10.2	9.4	5.7	1001
	2007	41.5	33.3	14.8	4.5	5.8	1129
Pakistan	2008	36.4	23.0	9.9	6.1	23.9	1254
Peru	2007	42.1	32.5	11.3	3.6	10.4	799
Russia	2008	26.8	31.6	24.7	10.1	6.8	1000
Senegal	2007	20.3	33.7	27.1	15.6	3.3	700
South Africa	2008	35.8	27.9	12.9	5.0	18.0	1001
	2007	28.2	38.0	18.2	4.6	11.0	1000
South Korea	2008	46.7	46.4	5.9	0.3	0.7	713
Tanzania	2008	31.9	22.6	21.9	13.4	10.2	703
	2007	21.7	25.1	17.8	19.5	15.5	704
Uganda	2007	38.6	27.8	11.1	1.8	20.6	1121
Venezuela	2007	33.1	31.0	21.0	12.2	2.4	803

Table 33. *GAP (2007)*: Overall, do you think the United States' influence in our country is growing, decreasing, or staying about the same? (in percentages)

	<b>Growing</b>	<b>Decreasing</b>	<b>Staying about the same</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	36.0	16.6	31.6	15.4	800
Bolivia	27.1	35.9	33.1	3.6	834
Brazil	59.2	6.4	30.4	3.8	1000
Chile	41.7	10.0	37.8	9.6	799
Ethiopia	72.8	6.9	17.0	3.2	710
Ghana	64.5	3.0	19.2	12.7	707
Ivory Coast	47.9	13.1	31.8	6.6	708
Kenya	65.8	13.7	14.4	5.8	1000
Mali	58.2	11.3	21.9	8.0	699
Mexico	52.6	15.1	26.7	4.6	829
Nigeria	64.3	14.0	14.3	7.1	1129
Peru	57.4	4.2	30.0	8.2	801
Senegal	51.4	11.1	16.6	19.6	700
South Africa	51.3	8.0	28.8	11.8	1001
Tanzania	68.8	12.3	11.0	4.6	455
Uganda	58.6	10.8	9.3	20.9	1121
Venezuela	28.4	32.5	36.1	2.9	803



Table 34. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Now I will ask you some questions about the US. Could you tell me if you have much confidence, some confidence, little confidence or no confidence in the US...? Its ability to solve conflicts in the world (in percentages)

	<b>Much</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>No confidence</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	3.3	12.1	26.0	52.3	6.2	1200
Bolivia	6.1	21.2	34.0	30.2	8.4	1200
Brazil	8.6	18.9	31.6	30.6	10.3	1200
Chile	6.2	24.3	34.3	27.7	7.4	1200
Colombia	13.9	30.1	31.0	14.2	10.8	1201
Costa Rica	24.6	29.5	22.6	14.5	8.8	1003
Ecuador	8.0	24.7	38.4	24.9	4.0	1200
El Salvador	30.8	15.8	25.8	12.2	15.5	1008
Guatemala	13.7	21.7	26.1	10.9	27.6	1008
Honduras	32.5	22.1	22.1	12.7	10.6	1006
Mexico	10.2	14.2	29.9	43.8	1.9	1200
Nicaragua	30.2	20.1	22.4	13.9	13.5	1010
Panama	28.6	31.1	22.8	9.9	7.7	1004
Paraguay	11.6	23.6	32.1	24.5	8.2	601
Peru	16.2	25.9	36.2	16.1	5.5	1200
Uruguay	7.2	17.2	25.7	43.1	6.8	1200
Venezuela	18.5	25.2	27.0	18.6	10.7	1202

Table 35. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Are you very much in agreement, in agreement, in disagreement, or very much in disagreement with the following: How the government of the United States is managing conflict in the world (in percentages)

	Very much in agreement	In agreement	In disagreement	Very much in disagreement	N
Argentina	0.1	5.6	36.8	57.5	1138
Bolivia	3.6	13.8	61.1	21.4	1021
Brazil	5.2	8.9	15.7	70.2	1077
Chile	1.7	16.3	54.5	27.5	1089
Colombia	4.7	30.9	49.0	15.4	1075
Costa Rica	5.4	34.4	41.6	18.6	919
Dominican Rep.	8.3	31.0	51.1	9.6	904
Ecuador	6.7	20.2	54.7	18.4	1103
El Salvador	8.4	24.9	50.4	16.3	843
Guatemala	2.7	28.7	57.6	10.9	769
Honduras	9.0	34.0	42.3	14.7	920
Mexico	0.7	8.6	33.0	57.7	1182
Nicaragua	4.2	22.9	54.7	18.2	841
Panama	8.5	36.3	46.3	8.9	933
Paraguay	1.2	15.1	56.0	27.7	575
Peru	2.1	24.5	57.5	15.8	1118
Uruguay	1.3	5.1	36.1	57.5	1094
Venezuela	12.4	23.3	36.4	27.9	1072

Table 36. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Now I will ask you some questions about the US. Could you tell me if you have much confidence, some confidence, little confidence or no confidence in the US...? Will respect international law (in percentages)

	<b>Much</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>No confidence</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	1.5	8.7	21.9	61.2	6.8	1200
Bolivia	3.2	14.1	29.5	44.8	8.4	1200
Brazil	8.4	18.2	29.5	33.5	10.3	1200
Chile	4.6	20.2	36.3	29.8	9.1	1200
Colombia	8.9	25.0	33.5	19.6	13.0	1202
Costa Rica	19.2	27.1	23.3	18.4	12.1	1002
Ecuador	5.2	21.6	36.2	32.1	4.7	1201
El Salvador	28.2	16.4	25.1	13.5	16.9	1008
Guatemala	9.9	20.4	23.7	16.5	29.5	1006
Honduras	19.6	21.4	24.3	21.4	13.4	1006
Mexico	4.5	11.6	24.7	57.1	2.2	1200
Nicaragua	26.9	19.3	21.2	18.1	14.5	1011
Panama	15.2	26.5	25.8	23.7	8.8	1004
Paraguay	6.7	20.2	26.5	38.7	8.0	600
Peru	7.2	22.1	36.9	26.9	6.8	1199
Uruguay	4.7	15.4	23.2	48.0	8.7	1200
Venezuela	18.8	23.7	24.8	21.1	11.7	1200

Table 37. *Latinobarometro (2002)*: After the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers in the United States some people say that there is a world terrorist threat, other people say there is no world terrorist threat. Which opinion is closest to your view? (in percentages)

	<b>There is a world terrorist threat</b>	<b>There is no world terrorist threat</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	51.5	40.6	7.9	1199
Bolivia	61.5	25.7	12.9	1243
Brazil	52.7	38.5	8.8	1000
Chile	48.8	40.6	10.6	1196
Colombia	69.7	21.4	8.8	1199
Costa Rica	68.5	22.7	8.8	1006
Ecuador	75.3	18.6	6.1	1200
El Salvador	59.2	21.7	19.1	1015
Guatemala	60.0	28.0	12.0	1000
Honduras	71.3	18.0	10.7	1004
Mexico	45.7	52.9	1.4	1210
Nicaragua	69.3	22.1	8.6	1016
Panama	66.6	23.0	10.4	1010
Paraguay	47.3	44.3	8.3	600
Peru	68.7	19.0	12.3	1224
Uruguay	37.4	51.5	11.0	1186
Venezuela	65.0	26.3	8.7	1213

Table 38. *GAP (2002-2007, 2009)*: Which of the following comes closer to describing your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism (in percentages)

		<b>I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Angola	2002	58.5	32.7	4.1	4.7	781
Argentina	2009	11.2	79.8	6.9	2.1	800
	2007	8.6	82.8	6.8	1.9	800
	2002	24.9	66.5	6.5	2.1	814
Bangladesh	2007	28.2	68.1	3.6	0.1	1000
	2002	27.9	45.8	25.7	0.5	759
Bolivia	2007	54.2	36.1	9.0	0.7	834
	2002	64.6	31.6	3.7	0.1	782
Brazil	2009	59.8	32.5	7.7	0.0	813
	2007	41.2	53.1	5.3	0.4	1000
	2003	42.0	52.8	4.5	0.7	1000
	2002	57.2	35.4	7.0	0.4	1000
Chile	2007	30.1	57.5	10.1	2.2	800
China	2009	50.2	36.7	12.2	0.9	3160
	2007	25.6	54.7	18.5	1.1	3142
	2006	19.0	62.6	17.3	1.1	2181
Egypt	2009	19.2	73.4	7.4	0.0	1000
	2007	25.6	67.3	4.9	2.2	1000
	2006	9.9	82.4	7.4	0.3	1000
	2002	5.0	79.0	9.5	6.5	1013
Ethiopia	2007	58.2	39.6	0.6	1.7	710
Ghana	2007	58.7	33.0	8.2	0.1	707
	2002	62.8	24.4	11.3	1.6	702
Guatemala	2002	76.8	17.0	5.0	1.2	500
Honduras						

Table 38. *GAP (2002-2007, 2009)*: Which of the following comes closer to describing your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism (in percentages)

		<b>I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
India	2002	86.0	10.1	3.2	0.8	506
	2009	82.1	14.5	3.3	0.1	2038
	2007	48.9	41.9	8.2	0.9	2043
	2006	64.9	30.3	4.4	0.4	2029
	2005	51.7	41.1	6.7	0.5	2042
	2002	65.4	10.1	24.6	0.0	2189
Indonesia	2009	58.9	33.5	7.2	0.4	1000
	2007	31.5	56.4	11.7	0.3	1008
	2006	39.4	56.6	4.0	0.0	1022
	2003	27.3	68.1	4.5	0.1	1011
	2002	30.5	64.4	4.7	0.4	1016
	2009	79.9	13.8	5.2	1.2	1201
Israel	2007	78.4	15.9	4.9	0.8	900
	2003	66.3	30.5	2.8	0.4	903
	2009	86.7	13.1	0.1	0.0	708
Ivory Coast	2002	86.9	13.1	0.0	0.0	708
	2009	41.7	49.6	8.6	0.1	700
Japan	2007	39.9	47.2	12.2	0.7	762
	2006	25.8	72.2	2.0	0.0	500
	2002	60.9	31.9	7.1	0.1	705
	2009	10.8	78.7	7.4	3.1	1000
Jordan	2007	17.8	76.6	2.6	3.0	1000
	2006	16.0	73.8	9.4	0.8	1000
	2004	11.5	78.1	8.2	2.2	1000
	2003	2.2	97.3	0.3	0.2	1000
	2002	12.9	85.0	1.0	1.1	1000
	2009	80.2	14.9	4.8	0.1	1002
Kenya	2007	73.2	24.1	2.6	0.1	1000
	2002	84.5	12.1	3.2	0.3	663

Table 38. *GAP (2002-2007, 2009)*: Which of the following comes closer to describing your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism (in percentages)

		<b>I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Kuwait	2007	37.4	53.6	7.2	1.8	500
	2003	56.4	34.8	5.0	3.8	500
Lebanon	2009	31.4	57.6	8.2	2.8	1000
	2007	33.8	62.6	2.9	0.7	1001
	2003	29.8	67.2	1.6	1.4	1000
	2002	38.4	56.0	4.1	1.5	1000
Malaysia	2007	15.6	68.3	14.7	1.4	700
Mali	2007	61.7	34.9	1.6	1.9	699
	2002	47.1	36.0	16.5	0.4	697
Mexico	2009	55.5	29.1	13.9	1.5	1001
	2007	31.2	60.7	7.2	0.8	829
	2002	51.9	36.7	10.1	1.2	996
Morocco	2007	15.5	63.6	19.2	1.7	1000
	2004	27.5	66.3	6.0	0.2	1000
	2003	8.9	84.3	6.1	0.7	1001
Nigeria	2009	65.7	28.8	5.0	0.5	1000
	2007	62.9	33.4	3.6	0.1	1129
	2006	49.3	46.6	3.9	0.2	1000
	2003	60.5	36.0	3.0	0.5	1000
	2002	74.8	20.0	5.2	0.0	1000
Pakistan	2009	23.7	55.9	19.2	1.1	1255
	2007	13.3	58.8	26.7	1.2	2007
	2006	30.3	50.2	19.0	0.4	1276
	2004	15.8	59.6	23.0	1.6	1243
	2003	16.9	72.7	9.7	0.7	999
	2002	20.3	45.1	31.8	2.9	2031
Palestinian Territories	2009	10.0	86.2	3.3	0.4	1155

Table 38. *GAP (2002-2007, 2009)*: Which of the following comes closer to describing your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism (in percentages)

		<b>I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Peru	2007	6.1	78.7	11.5	3.7	809
	2003	2.6	94.0	1.9	1.5	800
Philippines	2007	60.2	28.7	10.5	0.6	801
	2002	81.0	11.5	7.2	0.3	711
Russia	2002	82.1	16.5	1.4	0.0	699
Senegal	2009	54.1	25.2	19.5	1.2	1001
	2007	49.8	33.4	15.7	1.1	1002
	2006	52.2	35.3	11.8	0.7	1000
	2005	54.8	34.1	10.2	0.9	1002
	2004	72.8	20.1	6.9	0.3	1002
	2003	52.3	29.1	17.8	0.8	501
	2002	73.1	15.7	10.8	0.5	1002
South Africa	2007	40.7	55.3	3.6	0.4	700
	2002	31.8	64.5	3.5	0.1	710
South Korea	2007	42.8	36.2	19.5	1.5	1000
	2002	55.2	32.2	12.6	0.0	701
Tanzania	2009	22.6	70.9	6.1	0.3	702
	2007	9.9	86.1	3.5	0.6	718
	2003	24.6	70.9	3.8	0.8	525
	2002	24.3	71.7	3.1	0.9	700
Uganda	2007	40.2	52.8	6.2	0.7	704
	2002	52.8	35.1	10.0	2.1	720
Ukraine	2007	58.6	27.4	13.3	0.8	1122
	2002	67.4	23.5	8.5	0.6	1008
Uzbekistan	2007	50.8	33.8	13.0	2.4	500
	2002	85.6	12.8	1.2	0.4	501



Table 38. *GAP (2002-2007, 2009)*: Which of the following comes closer to describing your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism (in percentages)

		<b>I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Venezuela	2002	91.3	6.1	2.4	0.1	700
	2007	45.2	48.2	4.2	2.4	803
Vietnam	2002	79.1	19.6	1.0	0.3	700
	2002	62.0	28.7	9.1	0.3	771

Table 39. *VoP (2004, 2006): Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? The fight against terrorism (in percentages)*

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina						
	2006	11.3	6.6	71.6	10.5	1010
	2004	14.8	68.3	7.2	9.8	1005
Bolivia						
	2006	40.1	16.1	38.1	5.6	1319
	2004	45.4	32.5	17.5	4.6	1248
Brazil						
	2004	23.6	62.3	10.4	3.6	1400
Cameroon						
	2006	49.2	7.0	39.0	4.7	528
	2004	45.6	39.4	9.6	5.4	520
Chile						
	2006	24.6	15.8	57.6	2.0	500
Colombia						
	2006	62.0	15.7	21.2	1.2	600
Congo						
	2006	58.0	6.4	22.2	13.3	517
Costa Rica						
	2004	72.3	16.7	10.0	1.0	300
Dominican Rep.						
	2006	52.3	6.7	36.3	4.7	537
Ecuador						
	2004	59.8	22.8	16.4	1.0	500
Egypt						
	2004	26.1	3.6	52.0	18.4	506
Gabon						
	2006	64.3	5.2	24.3	6.2	515
Georgia						
	2004	69.7	4.5	5.3	20.5	1000
Ghana						
	2006	45.9	11.3	23.5	19.2	1606
	2004	68.0	21.3	6.2	4.5	1003
Guatemala						
	2004	76.3	18.3	2.7	2.7	300
Hong Kong						
	2006	36.4	13.3	47.1	3.3	1001
	2004	35.9	48.2	12.4	3.5	1007
India						
	2006	84.3	3.2	11.3	1.1	1058

Table 39. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? The fight against terrorism (in percentages)

		Positive	Negative	Neutral	DK/DA	N
Indonesia	2004	71.5	15.1	9.8	3.6	1051
	2006	29.7	13.5	51.8	5.0	1000
Israel	2004	27.9	56.4	12.5	3.2	1234
	2006	83.2	8.4	7.4	1.0	500
Japan	2004	80.2	10.0	8.6	1.2	500
	2006	31.9	32.8	32.8	2.6	1203
Kenya	2004	20.7	57.9	18.4	3.0	1322
	2006	63.3	9.3	19.2	8.2	2001
Malaysia	2004	63.7	27.1	7.1	2.2	509
	2006	14.3	11.5	62.8	11.4	1250
Mexico	2004	12.8	40.0	29.1	18.1	1000
	2006	33.9	10.3	51.6	4.3	700
Morocco	2004	42.9	43.4	9.9	3.7	1601
	2006	19.0	5.4	68.8	6.8	516
Nigeria	2006	66.0	10.2	17.0	6.8	500
	2004	67.2	19.7	8.9	4.2	1006
Pakistan	2006	14.4	13.1	60.9	11.6	796
	2004	13.8	27.4	39.1	19.7	951
Panama	2006	57.0	18.1	20.9	4.0	498
Paraguay	2006	67.6	11.8	19.6	1.0	500
Peru	2006	58.3	11.3	16.8	13.5	1123
	2004	51.5	20.5	20.2	7.8	400
Philippines	2006	64.6	23.6	11.0	0.8	1000
	2004	68.5	16.4	11.7	3.4	1000
Russia	2006	51.9	15.4	29.9	2.8	1502
	2004	43.5	22.3	29.4	4.8	1562

Table 39. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? The fight against terrorism (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
Senegal	2006	46.8	2.5	42.5	8.2	511
Singapore	2006	59.1	16.8	18.0	6.2	1002
	2004	53.1	21.2	19.8	6.0	501
South Africa	2006	48.9	15.2	27.4	8.6	1001
	2004	45.4	25.8	16.3	12.6	1506
South Korea	2006	24.9	17.5	47.1	10.5	1504
	2004	21.2	56.6	14.8	7.3	1516
Taiwan	2006	40.1	31.9	25.8	2.2	1000
	2004	58.6	23.0	14.6	3.8	500
Thailand	2006	41.4	28.5	23.9	6.2	1000
Ukraine	2006	39.9	29.0	16.8	14.2	1200
	2004	38.8	28.5	15.0	17.7	1200
Uruguay	2004	14.5	73.5	8.5	3.5	200
Venezuela	2006	26.8	25.6	39.2	8.4	1000
	2004	54.0	27.2	15.2	3.6	500
Vietnam	2006	54.3	9.4	31.4	4.9	350
	2004	59.7	27.0	9.0	4.3	300

Table 40. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? Peace in the world (in percentages)

		Positive	Negative	Neutral	DK/DA	N
Argentina	2006	5.4	6.0	78.6	9.9	1010
	2004	8.3	75.6	6.4	9.8	1005
Bolivia	2006	22.1	17.1	56.3	4.5	1319
	2004	28.2	47.0	20.7	4.1	1248
Brazil	2004	18.9	64.1	14.4	2.6	1400
Cameroon	2006	39.4	9.7	47.3	3.6	528
	2004	26.0	53.8	13.7	6.5	520
Chile	2006	8.6	12.8	77.6	1.0	500
Colombia	2006	28.8	26.8	42.7	1.7	600
Congo	2006	43.7	12.0	29.6	14.7	517
Costa Rica	2004	36.0	40.7	20.3	3.0	300
Dominican Rep.	2006	24.6	18.4	52.3	4.7	537
Ecuador	2004	32.6	50.0	16.4	1.0	500
Egypt	2004	15.8	5.3	58.5	20.4	506
Gabon	2006	57.7	8.9	26.8	6.6	515
Georgia	2004	61.9	5.3	7.4	25.4	1000
Ghana	2006	45.5	16.1	20.4	18.1	1606
	2004	60.4	23.8	11.6	4.2	1003
Guatemala	2004	48.3	38.7	8.7	4.3	300
Hong Kong	2006	20.4	21.0	55.3	3.3	1001
	2004	23.5	53.0	19.8	3.7	1007
India	2006	73.2	7.1	18.5	1.2	1058
	2004	49.8	27.7	18.2	4.4	1051

Table 40. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? Peace in the world (in percentages)

		Positive	Negative	Neutral	DK/DA	N
Indonesia	2006	23.9	19.5	49.6	7.0	1000
	2004	22.0	51.3	22.6	4.1	1234
Israel	2006	75.6	15.0	8.4	1.0	500
	2004	72.4	11.4	14.8	1.4	500
Japan	2006	24.3	44.4	28.5	2.8	1203
	2004	22.8	44.6	29.6	3.0	1322
Kenya	2006	51.8	17.2	23.3	7.6	2001
	2004	45.6	35.2	15.7	3.5	509
Malaysia	2006	15.4	12.1	61.0	11.4	1250
	2004	10.6	40.0	31.1	18.3	1000
Mexico	2006	18.4	13.7	62.9	5.0	700
	2004	22.2	61.6	12.3	3.9	1601
Morocco	2006	18.2	11.6	64.1	6.0	516
	2004	18.2	11.6	64.1	6.0	516
Nigeria	2006	60.2	15.8	16.2	7.8	500
	2004	57.0	21.3	18.3	3.5	1006
Pakistan	2006	12.6	16.1	59.7	11.7	796
	2004	15.0	26.6	38.3	20.1	951
Panama	2006	37.8	22.9	36.5	2.8	498
	2004	37.8	22.9	36.5	2.8	498
Paraguay	2006	37.2	18.6	42.6	1.6	500
	2004	37.2	18.6	42.6	1.6	500
Peru	2006	40.6	11.3	30.3	17.8	1123
	2004	35.8	36.8	18.5	9.0	400
Philippines	2006	54.4	24.7	20.5	0.4	1000
	2004	56.6	24.1	16.6	2.7	1000
Russia	2006	33.1	21.5	42.4	3.0	1502
	2004	16.1	25.8	53.1	4.9	1562
Senegal	2006	27.4	4.9	58.9	8.8	511
	2004	27.4	4.9	58.9	8.8	511

Table 40. *VoP (2004, 2006)*: Does the US tend to play a positive role, a negative role or a neutral role in the following issues? Peace in the world (in percentages)

		<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>DK/DA</b>	<i>N</i>
Singapore	2006	36.6	30.2	26.6	6.5	1002
	2004	42.1	26.9	26.9	4.0	501
South Africa	2006	36.3	20.5	34.7	8.6	1001
	2004	40.0	30.5	18.5	11.0	1506
South Korea	2006	32.2	20.2	41.3	6.2	1504
	2004	25.5	44.1	23.4	6.9	1516
Taiwan	2006	29.7	37.1	31.4	1.8	1000
	2004	45.8	21.8	28.2	4.2	500
Thailand	2006	25.9	38.7	31.3	4.1	1000
	2004	20.9	45.1	20.8	13.2	1200
Ukraine	2006	19.2	40.2	20.0	20.6	1200
	2004	8.0	80.0	8.0	4.0	200
Uruguay	2006	17.0	28.0	47.2	7.8	1000
	2004	29.2	40.4	24.0	6.4	500
Venezuela	2006	27.4	16.6	52.0	4.0	350
	2004	15.7	50.7	24.3	9.3	300
Vietnam	2006	27.4	16.6	52.0	4.0	350
	2004	15.7	50.7	24.3	9.3	300

Table 41. *GAP (2008-2010)*: Overall, do you think of the US. as more of a partner of (survey country), more of an enemy of (survey country), or neither? (in percentages)

		<b>More of a partner</b>	<b>More of an enemy</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina						
	2009	41.1	25.4	26.3	6.9	799
	2008	24.8	44.8	21.5	7.6	801
Brazil						
	2010	55.5	10.6	27.0	6.9	1000
	2009	58.6	10.1	27.0	4.3	814
	2008	34.1	21.2	40.2	4.5	1001
China						
	2008	13.1	33.6	41.4	10.9	3212
Egypt						
	2009	17.5	27.2	49.7	5.2	1000
	2008	16.7	39.3	37.7	4.9	1000
India						
	2010	47.7	23.5	16.9	11.7	2254
	2009	55.7	9.2	27.8	6.7	2038
	2008	40.0	12.9	37.7	8.8	2056
Indonesia						
	2009	47.4	7.8	38.4	6.3	999
	2008	22.9	19.5	50.9	6.5	1000
Israel						
	2009	84.1	2.2	12.1	1.5	1200
Japan						
	2009	65.9	3.4	29.4	1.3	700
	2008	65.4	4.2	29.6	0.7	709
Jordan						
	2009	12.5	31.6	54.9	1.0	1000
	2008	22.1	36.7	34.4	6.1	1000
Kenya						
	2009	89.0	3.9	5.5	1.6	1002
Lebanon						
	2009	27.3	32.9	36.6	2.6	1000
	2008	23.4	34.7	38.7	3.2	1000
Mexico						
	2009	63.7	17.5	12.9	5.8	1000
	2008	48.4	31.1	17.1	2.9	806
Nigeria						



Table 41. *GAP (2008-2010)*: Overall, do you think of the US. as more of a partner of (survey country), more of an enemy of (survey country), or neither? (in percentages)

		<b>More of a partner</b>	<b>More of an enemy</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Pakistan	2009	79.6	6.2	10.2	4.0	1000
	2008	66.7	16.7	10.5	6.1	1000
	2010	11.7	58.5	17.2	12.4	2000
	2009	8.6	64.3	12.1	14.6	1254
Palestinian Territories	2008	11.3	60.1	13.1	14.9	1254
	2009	5.0	77.3	15.9	1.7	1156
Russia	2009	27.2	21.3	45.4	6.1	1001
	2008	29.0	33.8	31.9	5.3	1000
South Africa	2008	60.0	8.4	16.9	14.7	1001
	2009	62.7	8.0	28.2	1.1	702
South Korea	2008	50.7	14.7	33.5	1.1	714
	2008	64.6	10.7	20.3	4.1	704

Table 42. *GAP (2009-2010)*: Overall, do you think of China as more of a partner of (survey country), more of an enemy of (survey country), or neither? (in percentages)

		More of a partner	More of an enemy	Neither	Don't know	N
Argentina	2010	43.3	11.7	31.6	12.0	803
	2009	44.8	13.5	32.5	8.8	800
Brazil	2010	44.8	10.7	33.7	10.6	1000
	2009	48.9	10.0	35.9	5.3	814
Egypt	2010	28.1	15.2	49.4	6.9	1000
	2009	29.9	19.0	49.0	1.9	1000
India	2010	29.7	42.8	12.8	14.5	2254
	2009	42.8	23.3	25.7	7.6	2038
Indonesia	2010	54.8	9.7	27.9	7.6	1000
	2009	52.2	8.2	33.9	5.7	1000
Israel	2009	23.6	9.3	61.7	5.2	1200
Japan	2010	31.4	20.0	47.1	1.4	700
	2009	22.7	25.4	50.7	1.1	700
Jordan	2010	47.1	13.3	35.2	4.2	1000
	2009	40.5	14.8	42.3	2.4	1000
Kenya	2010	83.6	4.1	8.3	3.9	1002
	2009	87.6	2.7	6.4	3.3	1002
Lebanon	2010	34.7	10.5	51.3	3.5	1000
	2009	33.6	12.0	51.6	2.7	1001
Mexico	2010	42.1	22.0	21.0	14.6	1300
	2009	45.5	23.7	22.6	8.0	1000
Nigeria	2010	74.5	17.3	3.6	4.6	1000
	2009	87.3	3.8	4.6	4.3	1001
Pakistan	2010	83.2	2.0	5.8	9.0	2000

Table 42. *GAP (2009-2010)*: Overall, do you think of China as more of a partner of (survey country), more of an enemy of (survey country), or neither? (in percentages)

		<b>More of a partner</b>	<b>More of an enemy</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Palestinian Territories	2009	80.3	1.9	4.9	12.8	1254
Russia	2009	39.3	8.1	47.0	5.6	1154
South Korea	2010	48.7	13.2	33.2	4.9	1001
	2009	50.7	10.1	34.3	4.8	1001
	2010	23.5	35.0	37.4	4.0	706
	2009	24.6	37.3	36.8	1.1	703

Table 43. *GAP (2003, 2009)*: How worried are you, if at all, that the US. could become a military threat to your country someday? Are you very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not at all worried? (in percentages)

		<b>Very worried</b>	<b>Somewhat worried</b>	<b>Not too worried</b>	<b>Not at all worried</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Egypt							
	2009	25.5	24.7	20.3	28.0	1.4	1000
Indonesia							
	2009	42.4	35.1	16.5	3.5	2.4	1000
	2003	33.1	41.9	17.8	5.8	1.2	1011
Jordan							
	2009	21.0	27.1	26.6	23.9	1.4	1000
	2003	20.8	35.1	33.0	11.1	0.0	1000
Kuwait							
	2003	35.4	18.4	5.2	38.8	1.8	500
Lebanon							
	2009	33.0	23.8	21.4	15.6	6.2	1001
	2003	25.7	32.1	24.7	16.2	1.1	1000
Morocco							
	2003	24.1	21.8	12.5	39.3	1.9	1001
Nigeria							
	2003	53.8	17.7	13.8	13.1	1.5	1000
Pakistan							
	2009	49.4	29.9	6.6	4.5	8.1	1253
	2003	48.2	24.5	8.5	13.1	5.1	999
Palestinian Territories							
	2009	36.0	39.0	12.4	11.9	0.8	1155
Russia							
	2003	43.5	27.5	16.0	10.0	3.0	501

Table 44. *Latinobarometro (2007)*: Independently of your own opinion of the USA, please tell me which of the following reasons are most important in the bad opinion that some people have of the USA (in percentages)

	The negative influence of North American society and culture		Envy for the power and the wealthness of the USA		The omnipotence of the USA in imposing its will on the others		The military intervention of the USA in other countries		The commercial and economic practices of the USA towards other countries		The North American people have a contemptuous attitude towards the people of other countries		Historical reasons related to military governments		Don't know/No answer		N
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
Argentina	5.8	3.5	12.7	4.5	33.2	19.3	26.3	25.9	7.9	17.2	5.0	9.6	1.5	4.4	7.5	15.5	1200
Bolivia	15.2	6.3	13.9	7.9	26.7	15.0	14.5	19.8	4.7	10.5	14.3	21.3	1.7	4.7	9.0	14.4	1200
Brazil	4.7	4.9	12.3	7.6	31.3	16.7	17.4	17.6	4.7	8.2	12.4	16.8	4.5	4.6	12.7	23.6	1204
Chile	18.0	7.2	12.6	5.9	25.5	17.0	18.2	22.3	4.4	9.1	4.0	11.2	1.4	6.1	15.8	21.2	1200
Colombia	12.8	7.9	11.2	5.9	31.6	16.0	16.2	18.8	4.7	11.0	16.5	19.8	1.0	2.9	5.9	17.6	1200
Costa Rica	14.8	3.4	13.7	5.3	26.2	13.0	22.0	22.2	2.5	7.8	7.6	11.1	3.0	3.8	10.2	33.4	1000
Dominican Rep.	27.7	3.9	27.5	4.5	24.3	16.9	10.6	22.6	2.2	16.4	4.7	24.1	0.2	3.4	2.8	8.2	1000
Ecuador	17.7	4.9	21.2	6.4	26.3	12.4	12.4	28.9	2.9	13.2	5.2	15.5	0.7	2.5	13.6	16.1	1200
El Salvador	27.3	6.8	21.0	7.2	18.0	13.1	8.2	15.7	3.7	11.0	14.2	23.6	1.0	3.6	6.6	19.0	1000
Guatemala	27.3	4.7	16.8	6.0	15.5	10.9	6.9	12.9	3.3	15.8	10.2	14.1	0.9	2.0	19.1	33.6	1000
Honduras	23.4	2.0	17.1	8.2	24.1	10.9	8.7	12.9	2.2	9.4	15.8	29.8	0.2	2.4	8.5	24.4	1000
Mexico	16.2	4.2	11.8	5.8	27.2	16.8	10.9	15.2	2.2	6.5	26.4	28.5	1.5	2.5	3.8	20.5	1200
Nicaragua	13.1	4.7	15.8	9.2	18.6	13.1	19.6	20.6	2.4	11.5	17.5	17.0	1.9	4.4	11.1	19.5	1000

Table 44. *Latinobarometro (2007)*: Independently of your own opinion of the USA, please tell me which of the following reasons are most important in the bad opinion that some people have of the USA (in percentages)

	The negative influence of North American society and culture		Envy for the power and the wealthness of the USA		The omnipotence of the USA in imposing its will on the others		The military intervention of the USA in other countries		The commercial and economic practices of the USA towards other countries		The North American people have a contemptuous attitude towards the people of other countries		Historical reasons related to military governments		Don't know/No answer		N
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
Panama	22.4	1.6	19.0	6.8	24.0	10.5	14.3	17.8	3.9	15.7	1.4	10.4	4.6	16.3	10.4	20.9	1008
Paraguay	11.0	2.2	14.5	6.2	22.6	15.3	16.7	22.9	3.8	8.6	5.8	10.2	0.4	1.3	25.2	33.1	1200
Peru	9.8	5.8	13.1	6.2	30.3	15.2	15.2	20.0	4.3	11.5	14.8	15.9	0.9	3.9	11.6	21.4	1200
Uruguay	9.8	2.9	15.2	5.2	32.8	17.0	23.8	30.2	4.1	10.2	3.2	4.8	1.4	4.4	9.7	25.2	1200
Venezuela	19.5	4.5	19.7	6.8	24.1	15.0	13.2	18.1	1.8	9.3	3.8	8.8	2.2	4.6	15.8	32.8	1200

Table 45. *GAP (2009-2010)*: Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the international policies of President Barack Obama? (in percentages)

		<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	2010	36.5	27.1	32.1	4.2	803
	2009	57.1	10.1	30.4	2.4	800
Brazil	2010	56.7	20.1	22.9	0.3	1000
	2009	80.2	6.0	13.8	0.0	813
China	2010	43.1	28.0	28.1	0.8	3262
	2009	56.8	13.4	28.6	1.2	3160
Egypt	2010	17.1	72.2	10.0	0.7	1000
	2009	38.0	50.2	10.1	1.7	1000
India	2010	50.3	24.8	24.5	0.4	2254
	2009	67.5	11.5	19.9	1.2	2038
Indonesia	2010	63.6	25.0	10.5	0.9	1000
	2009	65.0	15.6	19.3	0.1	999
Israel	2009	52.7	34.1	12.0	1.2	1200
Japan	2010	73.6	13.3	12.9	0.3	700
	2009	76.9	4.9	18.1	0.1	701
Jordan	2010	14.8	80.9	3.8	0.5	1000
	2009	27.2	59.5	12.9	0.4	1000
Kenya	2010	89.0	8.4	2.4	0.2	1002
	2009	88.2	4.6	7.2	0.0	1002
Lebanon	2010	45.6	47.3	6.4	0.7	1000
	2009	45.9	43.6	8.8	1.7	1000
Mexico	2010	38.6	34.0	26.1	1.3	1300
	2009	56.2	16.9	24.5	2.4	999
Nigeria	2010	73.9	11.0	14.6	0.5	1000
	2009	84.9	7.9	6.4	0.8	1000

Table 45. *GAP (2009-2010)*: Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the international policies of President Barack Obama? (in percentages)

		<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Pakistan						
	2010	10.8	49.4	34.4	5.4	2000
	2009	12.3	42.1	42.4	3.2	1253
Palestinian Territories						
	2009	35.2	54.3	10.1	0.3	1156
Russia						
	2010	38.9	20.4	39.8	1.0	1001
	2009	40.3	15.6	43.9	0.3	1001
South Korea						
	2010	69.5	8.8	21.0	0.7	706
	2009	70.8	7.0	20.8	1.4	702



Table 46. *VoP (2003-2004)*: Generally, do you think American foreign policy has a positive effect on this country, a negative effect or does American foreign policy have no effect on this country? (in percentages)

		<b>A positive effect</b>	<b>A negative effect</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know/No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Afghanistan						
	2004	66.3	10.0	8.0	15.6	2153
	2003	73.7	10.4	3.3	12.6	2195
Argentina						
	2004	14.7	50.7	16.2	18.3	1005
	2003	10.7	63.6	9.6	16.2	1003
Bolivia						
	2004	26.0	51.4	16.4	6.1	1248
	2003	23.2	52.7	18.0	6.0	499
Brazil						
	2004	13.3	64.4	16.1	6.2	1400
Cameroon						
	2004	21.5	28.5	29.4	20.6	520
	2003	23.5	32.9	27.3	16.3	520
Costa Rica						
	2004	38.3	28.3	27.7	5.7	300
Ecuador						
	2004	32.4	41.6	22.0	4.0	500
	2003	25.4	50.0	16.8	7.8	500
Georgia						
	2004	56.7	9.0	4.2	30.1	1000
	2003	63.1	7.9	6.0	23.0	1500
Ghana						
	2004	48.9	27.6	14.1	9.5	1003
Guatemala						
	2004	55.3	26.3	7.7	10.7	300
Hong Kong						
	2004	29.9	36.7	26.5	6.9	1007
	2003	34.7	42.8	12.5	10.0	502
India						
	2004	38.2	30.5	13.5	17.8	1051
	2003	33.7	47.3	14.9	4.1	1032
Indonesia						
	2004	21.1	55.4	18.4	5.1	1234
	2003	16.5	56.8	15.6	11.0	1017

Table 46. *VoP (2003-2004)*: Generally, do you think American foreign policy has a positive effect on this country, a negative effect or does American foreign policy have no effect on this country? (in percentages)

		<b>A positive effect</b>	<b>A negative effect</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know/No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Israel	2004	74.0	17.0	6.2	2.8	500
	2003	67.0	19.8	6.4	6.8	500
Japan	2004	20.4	56.1	17.6	5.8	1322
	2003	13.5	67.7	15.1	3.7	1302
Kenya	2004	38.9	39.9	12.2	9.0	509
	2003	32.1	44.7	12.4	10.8	501
Malaysia	2004	13.4	31.5	32.8	22.3	1000
	2003	26.1	27.9	26.2	19.8	1000
Mexico	2004	20.5	60.8	8.4	10.2	1601
	2003	32.2	50.4	13.2	4.2	673
Nigeria	2004	50.6	22.4	16.9	10.1	1006
	2003	33.3	31.1	20.7	14.8	594
Pakistan	2004	16.3	41.2	20.3	22.2	951
	2003	24.8	41.3	15.0	19.0	1183
Peru	2004	32.2	36.2	17.2	14.2	400
	2003	29.8	39.2	22.2	8.9	406
Philippines	2004	61.2	22.7	10.9	5.2	1000
	2003	55.8	22.1	19.7	2.4	1000
Russia	2004	12.0	59.8	21.3	6.9	1562
	2003	16.4	70.0	6.2	7.4	500
Singapore	2004	51.9	14.6	13.4	20.2	501
South Africa	2004	37.2	27.0	16.7	19.1	1506
	2003	33.5	28.0	18.7	19.8	1068
South Korea						

Table 46. *VoP (2003-2004)*: Generally, do you think American foreign policy has a positive effect on this country, a negative effect or does American foreign policy have no effect on this country? (in percentages)

		<b>A positive effect</b>	<b>A negative effect</b>	<b>No effect</b>	<b>Don't know/No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Taiwan	2004	34.9	43.3	7.5	14.3	1516
	2003	40.2	47.6	6.5	5.7	523
Uganda	2004	52.2	33.2	4.6	10.0	500
	2003	39.4	27.4	19.4	13.8	500
Ukraine	2003	45.5	37.8	0.0	16.7	497
Uruguay	2004	14.8	40.3	21.9	23.0	1200
	2003	14.3	52.0	14.2	19.4	1200
Venezuela	2004	11.0	69.0	10.5	9.5	200
	2003	10.0	59.3	12.7	18.0	300
Vietnam	2004	38.4	37.2	18.8	5.6	500
	2004	35.0	32.7	22.0	10.3	300
	2003	36.5	23.4	28.3	11.8	304

Table 47. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: United States (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	6.8	65.2	7.8	20.1	1010
Bolivia	8.5	66.1	20.2	5.2	1364
Cameroon	17.1	64.4	13.5	5.0	519
Colombia	19.8	48.5	25.7	6.0	600
Dominican Rep.	32.1	30.1	26.3	11.5	471
Ecuador	20.7	43.0	23.3	13.0	600
Ghana	39.5	26.4	18.5	15.6	2003
Guatemala	45.6	14.0	22.4	18.0	500
Hong Kong	39.0	40.0	17.0	4.1	1006
India	13.1	62.0	17.7	7.2	1069
Indonesia	34.0	41.0	15.5	9.5	1010
Japan	12.5	35.2	21.6	30.8	1200
Malaysia	12.5	52.2	16.2	19.1	1250
Nigeria	38.3	18.7	16.2	26.8	5017
Pakistan	20.6	48.2	11.5	19.7	1013
Panama	45.0	26.0	21.0	8.0	685
Peru	21.9	41.3	19.7	17.1	1133
Philippines	41.0	27.2	31.4	0.4	1000
Russia	25.1	34.5	34.4	6.0	1573
Senegal	21.1	60.7	13.0	5.1	507
Singapore	35.6	28.9	24.6	10.9	1020
South Africa	28.5	27.9	23.5	20.1	1496
South Korea	14.7	49.0	31.2	5.2	1001
Ukraine	17.2	43.4	21.3	18.0	1200
Venezuela	14.0	47.3	27.0	11.7	1058
Vietnam	35.3	38.0	18.8	7.8	600

Table 48. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: Russia (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	5.8	35.1	18.5	40.5	1010
Bolivia	14.0	45.2	29.0	11.8	1364
Cameroon	16.2	43.5	23.9	16.4	519
Colombia	21.8	40.0	27.2	11.0	600
Dominican Rep.	22.3	23.6	33.8	20.4	471
Ecuador	19.8	38.8	22.0	19.3	600
Ghana	23.8	26.2	27.9	22.2	2003
Guatemala	36.0	14.4	21.2	28.4	500
Hong Kong	35.7	20.0	31.4	12.9	1006
India	35.6	29.2	28.2	7.0	1069
Indonesia	16.7	38.2	24.0	21.1	1010
Japan	5.6	25.9	18.5	50.0	1200
Malaysia	13.5	35.0	27.0	24.5	1250
Nigeria	25.8	20.9	21.7	31.5	5017
Pakistan	16.4	42.2	17.2	24.3	1013
Panama	24.2	30.9	28.3	16.5	685
Peru	17.5	34.2	17.7	30.5	1133
Philippines	18.0	45.8	31.2	5.0	1000
Russia	53.7	7.3	33.8	5.2	1573
Senegal	23.5	32.7	29.0	14.8	507
Singapore	33.5	19.0	29.0	18.4	1020
South Africa	22.1	21.7	26.2	30.0	1496
South Korea	14.5	27.3	37.3	21.0	1001
Ukraine	45.2	18.7	19.6	16.5	1200
Venezuela	24.2	30.8	29.7	15.3	1058
Vietnam	40.0	15.7	34.0	10.3	600

Table 49. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: Iran (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	6.3	36.5	15.0	42.1	1010
Bolivia	21.6	41.2	22.7	14.5	1364
Cameroon	14.6	46.2	19.3	19.8	519
Colombia	17.5	49.0	21.5	12.0	600
Dominican Rep.	19.5	39.1	23.1	18.3	471
Ecuador	18.5	40.7	17.2	23.7	600
Ghana	19.4	28.4	26.3	26.0	2003
Guatemala	37.6	13.6	12.0	36.8	500
Hong Kong	27.9	27.4	24.5	20.2	1006
India	12.3	43.6	36.3	7.8	1069
Indonesia	18.8	27.5	28.9	24.8	1010
Japan	3.8	30.4	10.4	55.4	1200
Malaysia	17.9	26.7	29.9	25.4	1250
Nigeria	23.6	24.1	19.2	33.1	5017
Pakistan	44.3	16.6	18.5	20.6	1013
Panama	21.8	34.9	25.0	18.4	685
Peru	13.5	30.3	16.3	39.9	1133
Philippines	15.6	51.9	29.4	3.1	1000
Russia	12.8	20.5	59.6	7.1	1573
Senegal	31.2	26.6	24.1	18.1	507
Singapore	26.5	33.3	20.9	19.3	1020
South Africa	20.9	34.4	17.6	27.1	1496
South Korea	9.9	32.1	36.5	21.6	1001
Ukraine	9.8	26.8	30.2	33.2	1200
Venezuela	40.5	15.7	26.5	17.4	1058
Vietnam	21.5	28.0	34.5	16.0	600

Table 50. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: European Union (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	14.4	37.1	19.1	29.4	1010
Bolivia	19.0	47.1	27.1	6.9	1364
Cameroon	32.9	39.5	20.0	7.5	519
Colombia	33.5	34.0	23.5	9.0	600
Dominican Rep.	33.8	23.4	29.3	13.6	471
Ecuador	25.7	37.2	22.8	14.3	600
Ghana	44.6	17.5	20.0	17.9	2003
Guatemala	47.6	9.2	22.4	20.8	500
Hong Kong	52.5	16.8	24.0	6.8	1006
India	12.9	45.2	33.1	8.8	1069
Indonesia	29.0	33.5	21.9	15.6	1010
Japan	19.1	10.2	29.2	41.5	1200
Malaysia	15.3	39.3	23.1	22.3	1250
Nigeria	36.0	17.1	18.7	28.2	5017
Pakistan	21.4	40.8	13.4	24.4	1013
Panama	35.5	24.1	27.4	13.0	685
Peru	25.6	32.7	18.5	23.1	1133
Philippines	31.7	31.6	31.4	5.3	1000
Russia	39.0	15.7	39.4	5.8	1573
Senegal	40.0	36.9	17.4	5.7	507
Singapore	41.2	15.3	28.4	15.1	1020
South Africa	36.4	16.6	23.1	23.9	1496
South Korea	26.7	20.9	41.7	10.8	1001
Ukraine	40.8	17.8	22.7	18.8	1200
Venezuela	18.0	34.6	33.8	13.6	1058
Vietnam	44.2	14.3	31.8	9.7	600

Table 51. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: India (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	12.1	22.3	19.8	45.8	1010
Bolivia	33.8	23.5	28.5	14.1	1364
Cameroon	28.5	25.4	24.7	21.4	519
Colombia	35.5	27.7	24.0	12.8	600
Dominican Rep.	30.6	16.6	31.4	21.4	471
Ecuador	24.2	34.8	20.7	20.3	600
Ghana	23.8	21.1	31.4	23.8	2003
Guatemala	39.6	11.6	16.0	32.8	500
Hong Kong	47.3	11.7	25.0	16.0	1006
India	97.1	1.1	1.3	0.5	1069
Indonesia	24.6	25.0	31.0	19.4	1010
Japan	13.1	13.2	20.4	53.3	1200
Malaysia	23.3	26.3	28.6	21.8	1250
Nigeria	27.1	17.9	22.2	32.8	5017
Pakistan	16.6	43.3	19.6	20.4	1013
Panama	25.8	29.1	28.0	17.1	685
Peru	19.7	24.1	17.4	38.8	1133
Philippines	21.9	40.4	33.3	4.4	1000
Russia	19.5	15.5	57.7	7.4	1573
Senegal	40.4	17.0	27.2	15.4	507
Singapore	51.8	13.2	21.4	13.6	1020
South Africa	32.0	18.7	22.9	26.3	1496
South Korea	25.8	15.3	40.1	18.9	1001
Ukraine	10.9	19.8	36.9	32.4	1200
Venezuela	38.4	12.7	30.4	18.5	1058
Vietnam	34.3	15.7	36.3	13.7	600



Table 52. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: China (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	10.0	34.9	15.9	39.2	1010
Bolivia	20.6	40.5	28.7	10.2	1364
Cameroon	33.7	34.1	20.2	11.9	519
Colombia	28.5	36.2	25.2	10.2	600
Dominican Rep.	26.5	21.7	35.5	16.3	471
Ecuador	20.2	44.7	17.0	18.2	600
Ghana	36.1	16.0	26.4	21.4	2003
Guatemala	47.6	12.0	14.0	26.4	500
Hong Kong	75.4	9.7	11.5	3.3	1006
India	29.8	42.5	23.4	4.3	1069
Indonesia	40.7	27.7	20.0	11.6	1010
Japan	8.5	39.0	11.7	40.8	1200
Malaysia	27.3	24.3	27.9	20.5	1250
Nigeria	32.9	14.8	20.8	31.5	5017
Pakistan	49.8	16.6	13.8	19.8	1013
Panama	29.9	26.1	27.9	16.1	685
Peru	22.9	28.9	16.4	31.9	1133
Philippines	24.8	42.3	30.9	2.0	1000
Russia	38.1	13.9	41.4	6.6	1573
Senegal	41.8	20.3	26.4	11.4	507
Singapore	53.2	16.7	18.7	11.4	1020
South Africa	30.0	27.4	19.7	22.9	1496
South Korea	21.3	33.9	35.4	9.5	1001
Ukraine	23.3	21.0	29.1	26.6	1200
Venezuela	41.0	13.8	31.4	13.8	1058
Vietnam	30.5	32.2	29.2	8.2	600

Table 53. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: South Africa (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	12.0	21.8	20.3	45.9	1010
Bolivia	47.5	17.4	20.4	14.7	1364
Cameroon	65.3	7.5	15.0	12.1	519
Colombia	38.0	24.8	24.2	13.0	600
Dominican Rep.	33.3	18.5	25.3	22.9	471
Ecuador	24.2	30.7	21.2	24.0	600
Ghana	43.5	11.0	24.2	21.3	2003
Guatemala	43.2	8.8	9.2	38.8	500
Hong Kong	27.9	13.2	37.1	21.8	1006
India	36.2	30.0	27.1	6.6	1069
Indonesia	14.1	23.0	33.5	29.5	1010
Japan	9.8	10.1	16.4	63.7	1200
Malaysia	15.7	26.2	31.0	27.0	1250
Nigeria	40.1	10.2	17.6	32.1	5017
Pakistan	17.6	27.9	23.9	30.6	1013
Panama	27.2	26.7	27.2	19.0	685
Peru	21.1	21.1	16.6	41.2	1133
Philippines	24.3	36.7	33.6	5.4	1000
Russia	9.2	17.2	66.9	6.7	1573
Senegal	70.2	5.1	13.0	11.6	507
Singapore	41.5	12.7	25.5	20.3	1020
South Africa	59.7	10.6	17.5	12.2	1496
South Korea	24.7	14.9	39.0	21.5	1001
Ukraine	6.3	21.4	33.2	39.1	1200
Venezuela	49.0	8.3	26.3	16.4	1058
Vietnam	31.3	14.0	34.0	20.7	600

Table 54. *VoP (2007)*: For the world becomes a better place, do you believe that the global influence of the following major powers should: Brazil (in percentages)

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Decrease</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	15.8	23.5	25.7	35.0	1010
Bolivia	37.0	26.8	29.0	7.2	1364
Cameroon	54.7	9.2	20.8	15.2	519
Colombia	40.0	22.5	25.7	11.8	600
Dominican Rep.	37.2	16.1	29.3	17.4	471
Ecuador	29.8	28.2	23.2	18.8	600
Ghana	28.6	14.7	30.8	26.0	2003
Guatemala	41.2	6.0	15.6	37.2	500
Hong Kong	29.5	12.1	36.5	21.9	1006
India	21.9	28.1	39.1	10.9	1069
Indonesia	18.1	19.8	32.8	29.3	1010
Japan	10.0	7.5	21.8	60.8	1200
Malaysia	13.9	26.6	31.0	28.4	1250
Nigeria	30.6	13.9	21.3	34.2	5017
Pakistan	14.5	27.8	25.5	32.2	1013
Panama	35.6	19.9	27.9	16.6	685
Peru	32.2	17.3	20.0	30.5	1133
Philippines	20.9	37.2	36.4	5.5	1000
Russia	9.5	13.2	70.4	6.9	1573
Senegal	51.5	11.2	20.3	17.0	507
Singapore	35.8	11.5	28.4	24.3	1020
South Africa	29.8	12.6	23.1	34.5	1496
South Korea	17.9	14.0	44.6	23.6	1001
Ukraine	6.9	17.9	35.8	39.4	1200
Venezuela	53.3	6.0	26.5	14.2	1058
Vietnam	30.3	12.0	37.8	19.8	600

Table 55. *GAP (2002)*: Do you think the world would be a safer place or a more dangerous place if there was another country that was equal in military power to the United States? (in percentages)

	<b>Safer place</b>	<b>More dangerous place</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Angola	26.2	62.9	10.0	0.9	780
Argentina	27.5	52.1	17.9	2.5	814
Bangladesh	34.9	35.3	29.4	0.4	759
Bolivia	21.5	70.6	7.3	0.6	782
Brazil	36.7	55.8	7.4	0.1	1000
Egypt	25.3	55.2	15.2	4.3	1013
Ghana	24.6	58.4	16.2	0.7	702
Guatemala	18.4	75.6	5.6	0.4	500
Honduras	29.2	57.9	12.3	0.6	506
India	45.0	28.5	26.4	0.0	2190
Indonesia	23.3	67.6	8.8	0.3	1017
Ivory Coast	34.0	66.0	0.0	0.0	708
Japan	5.8	88.1	6.1	0.0	704
Jordan	32.9	63.2	2.0	1.9	1000
Kenya	27.0	68.7	4.1	0.2	662
Lebanon	36.3	54.2	9.5	0.0	1000
Mali	37.2	55.8	6.5	0.6	697
Mexico	19.9	69.9	9.9	0.3	996
Nigeria	46.8	43.6	8.8	0.8	1000
Pakistan	19.0	50.5	28.4	2.0	2032
Peru	32.4	57.9	9.7	0.0	710
Philippines	33.9	61.3	4.4	0.4	700
Russia	25.2	53.4	20.9	0.5	1002
Senegal	48.2	49.0	2.8	0.0	710
South Africa	36.1	49.7	13.4	0.7	700
South Korea	35.9	56.3	7.9	0.0	700
Tanzania	18.1	63.2	18.2	0.6	720
Uganda	33.0	56.5	10.2	0.2	1008
Ukraine	35.3	55.3	8.8	0.6	501
Uzbekistan	37.6	48.8	13.4	0.1	699
Venezuela	47.0	48.1	4.3	0.6	700
Vietnam	35.7	58.1	6.2	0.0	773

Table 56. *GAP (2010)*: Please tell me if you approve or disapprove of the way President Barack Obama is dealing with the situation in Afghanistan (in percentages)

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	11.0	46.3	38.6	4.1	803
Brazil	31.5	41.2	26.8	0.5	1000
China	24.9	44.9	27.9	2.3	3262
Egypt	15.3	81.1	3.0	0.6	1000
India	29.1	31.9	37.0	2.0	2254
Indonesia	35.6	52.3	12.0	0.1	1000
Japan	41.3	38.4	20.1	0.1	700
Jordan	13.4	83.5	2.5	0.6	1000
Kenya	66.5	22.0	10.9	0.7	1002
Lebanon	23.7	70.2	6.1	0.0	1000
Mexico	22.8	46.0	30.7	0.5	1300
Nigeria	58.3	25.3	16.1	0.3	1000
Pakistan	7.3	55.4	36.6	0.8	2000
Russia	19.2	44.9	35.2	0.8	1001
South Korea	48.0	29.9	21.8	0.3	706

Table 57. *GAP (2010)*: Please tell me if you approve or disapprove of the way President Barack Obama is dealing with Iran (in percentages)

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	11.3	43.6	41.0	4.1	803
Brazil	30.9	41.3	27.4	0.4	1000
China	19.7	45.2	32.8	2.3	3262
Egypt	22.4	75.8	1.1	0.7	1000
India	18.2	36.4	42.1	3.2	2254
Indonesia	36.1	51.7	12.2	0.0	1000
Japan	41.6	36.1	22.1	0.1	700
Jordan	14.4	83.5	1.7	0.4	1000
Kenya	58.3	26.3	14.8	0.6	1002
Lebanon	45.2	52.5	2.3	0.0	1000
Mexico	18.3	46.3	34.5	0.8	1300
Nigeria	53.5	28.0	18.0	0.5	1000
Pakistan	8.1	52.8	37.9	1.3	2000
Russia	19.4	43.0	36.8	0.9	1001
South Korea	42.9	29.9	26.9	0.3	706

Table 58. *GAP (2010)*: Please tell me if you approve or disapprove of the way President Barack Obama is dealing with the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians (in percentages)

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	10.2	41.5	44.0	4.4	803
Brazil	24.8	47.6	27.3	0.3	1000
China	19.6	43.4	34.0	3.1	3262
Egypt	11.0	88.1	0.6	0.3	1000
India	17.7	34.4	44.5	3.4	2254
Indonesia	35.2	55.0	9.8	0.0	1000
Japan	33.0	46.0	20.9	0.1	700
Jordan	14.7	83.6	1.4	0.3	1000
Kenya	57.4	25.0	17.2	0.5	1002
Lebanon	9.2	89.0	1.7	0.1	1000
Mexico	16.1	47.6	35.4	0.9	1300
Nigeria	56.3	25.1	18.2	0.4	1000
Pakistan	5.1	50.7	42.7	1.6	2000
Russia	14.8	39.2	44.8	1.3	1001
South Korea	36.4	35.4	28.0	0.1	706

Table 59. *GAP (2010)*: Please tell me if you approve or disapprove of the way President Barack Obama is dealing with the situation in Iraq (in percentages)

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	10.1	46.6	39.1	4.2	803
Brazil	27.9	46.6	25.2	0.3	1000
China	22.6	44.1	30.7	2.6	3262
Egypt	20.1	79.2	0.5	0.2	1000
India	18.1	34.5	44.2	3.2	2254
Indonesia	38.7	50.3	10.7	0.3	1000
Japan	42.3	39.1	18.4	0.1	700
Jordan	19.9	74.0	5.5	0.6	1000
Kenya	58.8	23.7	16.8	0.8	1002
Lebanon	21.1	75.8	3.0	0.1	1000
Mexico	18.2	47.1	33.7	1.0	1300
Nigeria	55.5	27.1	17.1	0.3	1000
Pakistan	6.8	53.1	38.6	1.6	2000
Russia	18.9	41.3	38.6	1.3	1001
South Korea	41.9	34.1	23.7	0.3	706



Table 60. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Do you agree with the following statement: “US involvement in the region justifies armed operations against the US everywhere”? (in percentages)

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	28.0	25.2	13.6	12.2	15.6	5.3	1300
Jordan	18.7	32.3	23.4	9.1	15.3	1.1	1143
Kuwait	23.8	27.8	22.5	14.2	10.6	1.1	747
Lebanon	13.1	22.3	32.1	28.1	3.8	0.6	1200
Palestine	34.6	29.3	23.2	9.7	2.9	0.3	1263

Table 61 *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Do you agree that armed groups are justified in attacking civilians in Iraq in order to resist the American occupation? (in percentages)

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	5.2	7.2	34.4	37.3	11.3	4.6	1300
Jordan	5.4	12.3	46.2	24.1	10.9	1.0	1143
Kuwait	2.8	7.3	38.9	44.1	5.9	0.9	750
Lebanon	2.6	6.8	35.2	54.0	1.2	0.2	1200
Morocco	3.2	11.8	22.0	54.4	7.6	0.9	1277
Palestine	3.2	9.9	45.9	38.0	2.8	0.3	1264

Table 62. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Do you agree with the following statement: “US democracy promotion in the region has been successful”? (in percentages)

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	4.9	15.8	31.0	25.1	19.0	4.2	1300
Jordan	5.1	23.9	35.3	17.3	17.0	1.3	1143
Kuwait	9.9	44.2	23.0	10.0	11.8	1.1	747
Lebanon	4.8	21.1	37.1	28.9	7.8	0.4	1200
Palestine	6.1	26.7	39.4	22.6	5.1	0.1	1264

Table 63. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Do you agree with the following statement: “Despite negative US foreign policies, most ordinary Americans are good people”? (in percentages)

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	35.6	32.9	26.2	5.1	1300
Jordan	34.2	46.8	17.5	1.1	1143
Kuwait	69.7	14.0	14.6	1.8	742
Lebanon	76.4	14.6	8.6	0.4	1200
Palestine	36.6	57.3	5.9	0.2	1251

Table 64. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Do you agree with the following statement: “The culture of US and other Western countries has many positive attributes”? (in percentages)

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	51.5	23.6	19.1	5.3	1300
Kuwait	80.6	7.7	10.5	1.2	741
Jordan	41.5	39.8	17.2	1.4	1143
Lebanon	80.1	13.0	6.1	0.8	1200
Palestine	57.0	37.9	5.0	0.2	1257
Morocco	60.1	28.6	10.8	0.5	1277
Yemen	35.7	23.9	36.5	3.9	1182

Table 65. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: In your opinion which of the following is the most important problem facing [respondent's country] today? (in percentages)

	Economic situation (poverty, unemployment, inflation)		Corruption		Authoritarianism		Ending the US occupation of Iraq		The Arab-Israeli conflict		Other		Can't choose/Don't know		Decline to answer		N	
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Algeria	51.1	33.3	30.5	43.2	7.6	12.9	1.2	1.6	1.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	5.5	2.2	2.5	3.5	1300	1212
Jordan	67.3	18.7	17.6	45.7	2.2	8.2	2.4	7.5	7.1	17.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.6	0.1	0.3	1143	1103
Kuwait	33.9	36.4	45.0	35.5	8.8	19.0	3.7	4.3	0.1	1.6	0.0	0.0	8.2	3.2	0.3	0.0	747	690
Lebanon	55.7	26.5	25.9	49.4	9.6	11.0	0.6	1.5	6.4	10.3	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.8	0.3	0.4	1200	1183
Morocco	56.4	31.8	26.7	52.4	3.6	7.1	0.9	1.1	2.0	4.3	6.7	0.0	3.5	3.2	0.1	0.1	1277	1231
Yemen	53.6	35.1	32.7	54.9	1.6	3.7	0.5	0.8	1.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	8.0	3.2	2.4	0.8	1182	1060

Table 66. *Latinobarometro (2000)*: Are you in favour of continuing the US embargo against Cuba or do you support the ending of the US embargo against Cuba? (in percentages)

	In favour	Against	N
Argentina	5.0	95.0	883
Bolivia	15.1	84.9	748
Brazil	15.0	85.0	655
Chile	27.9	72.1	850
Colombia	25.5	74.5	897
Costa Rica	50.5	49.5	740
Ecuador	22.1	77.9	897
El Salvador	29.5	70.5	747
Guatemala	31.9	68.1	746
Honduras	34.4	65.6	674
Mexico	21.2	78.8	981
Nicaragua	23.7	76.3	738
Panama	39.3	60.7	758
Paraguay	16.1	83.9	554
Peru	17.7	82.3	696
Uruguay	14.7	85.3	871
Venezuela	27.8	72.2	886

Table 67. *Latinobarometro (2002)*: Do you support or oppose the military actions undertaken by the United States against Afghanistan in retaliation to the terrorists attacks of September 11th, 2001 on the Twin Towers in New York? (in percentages)

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	9.3	79.8	10.8	1200
Bolivia	29.5	55.6	14.9	1242
Brazil	19.7	68.2	12.1	1000
Chile	23.3	64.1	12.5	1196
Colombia	29.2	52.0	18.8	1200
Costa Rica	41.5	44.5	14.0	1006
Ecuador	30.8	59.4	9.8	1200
El Salvador	21.7	47.9	30.4	1014
Guatemala	34.8	46.1	19.1	1000
Honduras	37.8	46.3	15.8	1004
Mexico	23.0	74.2	2.8	1210
Nicaragua	38.0	49.1	12.9	1016
Panama	53.6	36.3	10.1	1010
Paraguay	25.1	67.6	7.3	601
Peru	30.6	50.9	18.5	1224
Uruguay	18.1	59.9	22.0	1187
Venezuela	30.8	57.2	12.0	1213



Table 68. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Are you very much in agreement, in agreement, in disagreement, or very much in disagreement with the following: The actions of the United States in Iraq (in percentages)

	Very much in agreement	In agreement	In disagreement	Very much in disagreement	N
Argentina	0.2	2.8	36.8	60.2	1141
Bolivia	2.3	7.7	61.1	29.0	1018
Brazil	4.3	6.4	13.1	76.1	1073
Chile	1.2	8.9	53.8	36.1	1096
Colombia	1.8	16.5	60.9	20.8	1049
Costa Rica	4.2	23.6	48.3	23.8	906
Dominican Rep.	3.9	20.0	56.6	19.5	897
Ecuador	3.0	20.1	51.4	25.5	1103
El Salvador	3.1	21.5	55.5	19.8	827
Guatemala	1.3	19.5	63.4	15.8	748
Honduras	5.9	21.6	51.7	20.7	911
Mexico	0.3	3.1	34.9	61.6	1182
Nicaragua	2.3	14.2	60.1	23.5	839
Panama	5.4	26.2	55.7	12.8	929
Paraguay	0.9	9.1	58.9	31.2	581
Peru	1.1	12.6	62.8	23.5	1109
Uruguay	0.8	3.7	34.1	61.4	1104
Venezuela	8.3	17.9	38.2	35.7	1063

Table 69. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Policies that should be the top two priorities for the US in Latin America (in percentages)

	Promoting good, clean governance		Combating international terrorism		Reducing poverty and social inequality		Promoting free trade		Helping to create jobs		Combating illegal drug production and trafficking		Supporting human rights		DK/DA	N
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		
Argentina	16.3	0.0	17.4	3.6	38.8	14.5	2.5	7.5	4.6	40.2	1.9	18.4	1.1	15.7	17.5	1200
Bolivia	22.5	9.0	18.8	45.8	35.3	17.4	4.3	10.2	6.2	6.8	1.3	9.5	0.2	1.2	11.5	1200
Brazil	8.0	0.0	23.6	1.6	32.4	10.2	4.4	7.3	14.7	31.3	3.4	33.6	0.2	16.0	13.4	1204
Chile	16.0	0.0	19.8	2.8	42.0	14.2	3.5	7.5	6.0	33.6	2.1	23.7	0.4	18.2	10.2	1200
Colombia	16.3	0.0	33.3	3.7	32.8	16.1	5.3	8.5	7.7	32.5	2.1	18.8	0.0	20.5	2.6	1200
Costa Rica	12.8	0.1	24.0	2.9	31.2	12.6	8.1	10.0	9.1	32.5	3.4	23.1	0.7	18.8	10.7	1000
Dominican Rep.	20.2	0.0	25.6	5.6	25.4	13.8	5.1	11.9	8.9	26.9	2.5	25.7	0.6	16.2	11.7	1000
Ecuador	18.0	0.1	29.2	2.9	32.2	14.4	3.4	10.8	4.3	32.5	1.8	26.2	0.1	12.9	11.0	1200
El Salvador	11.4	0.0	15.2	2.7	46.6	10.8	4.7	5.1	9.3	52.1	0.8	14.0	0.4	15.2	11.6	1010
Guatemala	21.3	0.1	16.0	2.4	34.6	11.4	6.2	7.3	6.6	38.5	1.7	22.4	0.2	18.0	13.4	1000
Honduras	18.5	0.0	15.8	4.5	39.0	10.6	6.5	11.0	9.3	39.2	2.3	19.3	0.1	15.4	8.5	1000
Mexico	19.5	0.0	29.2	2.9	30.3	11.5	6.0	10.8	4.8	24.0	4.7	27.3	0.3	23.5	5.3	1200
Nicaragua	15.0	0.1	15.5	3.3	35.0	10.9	5.7	11.6	8.4	40.5	1.9	16.3	0.4	17.2	18.1	1000
Panama	24.4	0.2	23.9	3.6	31.4	13.3	6.2	8.0	7.2	36.0	1.9	19.9	0.2	18.9	4.8	1008
Paraguay	16.2	0.0	15.5	2.8	33.7	8.8	3.1	5.3	12.8	42.4	2.4	21.9	0.4	18.7	15.9	1200
Peru	13.2	0.0	27.0	2.8	33.5	14.8	5.8	8.4	7.4	37.6	2.5	20.1	0.3	16.2	10.3	1200
Uruguay	17.7	0.2	15.4	5.2	30.8	12.6	4.6	10.8	5.8	29.8	1.8	21.3	0.7	20.1	23.4	1200
Venezuela	24.5	0.0	28.3	5.2	21.8	14.1	2.8	10.6	4.8	20.3	3.3	30.4	1.4	19.4	13.1	1200

Table 70. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Policies you think are currently the top two priorities for the US in Latin America (in percentages)

	Promoting good, clean governance		Combating international terrorism		Reducing poverty and social inequality		Promoting free trade		Helping to create jobs		Combating illegal drug production and trafficking		Supporting human rights		DK/DA	N
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		
Argentina	9.8	0.0	42.6	8.6	6.3	5.3	4.2	19.1	2.0	10.9	2.8	42.0	1.0	14.2	31.5	1200
Bolivia	0.2	0.1	1.4	2.1	10.7	2.6	9.3	6.3	32.0	7.9	17.3	55.7	12.4	25.2	16.8	1200
Brazil	8.4	0.0	31.6	3.7	10.5	7.1	5.0	12.1	5.4	16.5	3.8	38.0	1.0	22.6	34.4	1204
Chile	11.1	0.0	47.7	7.9	9.8	3.7	8.1	31.8	3.1	8.1	2.2	36.2	0.3	12.4	17.8	1200
Colombia	11.3	0.0	43.3	3.0	11.7	5.9	11.4	11.2	7.7	13.3	7.7	44.1	0.0	22.5	7.0	1200
Costa Rica	8.6	0.6	31.2	2.6	15.5	6.5	15.7	20.8	6.3	20.4	5.9	32.4	0.7	16.8	16.1	1000
Dominican Rep.	12.9	0.1	38.4	3.9	13.9	5.8	9.6	20.9	6.1	17.1	4.7	32.8	0.7	19.4	13.7	1000
Ecuador	14.5	0.0	39.2	4.6	14.6	6.7	10.0	16.8	4.0	17.0	3.3	39.5	0.2	15.3	14.3	1200
El Salvador	6.2	0.1	36.3	2.0	10.3	2.8	16.5	31.1	4.1	16.9	5.0	32.5	0.4	14.6	21.2	1010
Guatemala	14.5	0.3	41.8	5.3	8.8	6.3	9.5	19.2	3.5	11.8	3.3	32.6	0.1	24.6	18.5	1000
Honduras	12.9	0.4	25.6	2.9	18.7	8.5	9.5	13.5	6.8	19.1	3.8	34.9	0.7	20.7	22.0	1000
Mexico	8.8	0.0	51.8	3.2	9.8	5.1	8.3	13.1	6.2	10.9	4.3	52.8	0.7	14.9	10.3	1200
Nicaragua	9.1	0.0	38.3	3.9	8.9	7.6	7.5	22.6	5.0	14.5	2.7	31.2	0.5	20.1	28.0	1000
Panama	11.8	0.0	46.7	3.1	18.8	5.7	8.0	12.3	4.2	18.5	3.4	41.7	0.5	18.6	6.5	1008
Paraguay	10.3	0.0	26.8	6.4	6.3	4.9	2.5	6.2	3.1	8.0	8.3	51.5	1.8	23.1	40.9	1200
Peru	9.5	0.0	29.8	2.9	11.5	5.0	11.3	13.1	6.3	16.4	5.3	41.8	0.5	20.7	25.8	1200
Uruguay	11.7	0.2	35.5	7.1	8.5	7.4	5.8	18.4	4.1	12.2	2.4	33.2	0.8	21.5	31.3	1200
Venezuela	16.0	0.0	29.0	10.5	16.8	9.7	7.3	12.4	6.3	12.9	6.0	34.2	2.3	20.3	16.2	1200

Table 71. *VoP (2000)*: What would you say should be the most to important aims for the United Nations in the future? (in percentages)

	To improve the health of human beings	To give humanitarian aid in times of natural disasters	To give humanitarian aid in times of war/conflict	To prevent war by intervention	To maintain peace by armed forces	To develop into a World Government	To protect human rights	Don't know	<i>N</i>
Argentina	27.0	24.5	15.9	32.0	9.8	4.6	42.3	16.3	1513
Armenia	19.0	15.9	13.5	27.6	20.1	6.3	43.6	19.0	800
Belarus	37.6	28.8	18.4	50.0	7.3	4.2	25.0	6.3	1009
Bolivia	23.7	17.0	10.5	10.6	5.1	2.9	27.5	2.8	1326
Cameroon	47.5	72.9	52.3	60.2	41.0	25.6	65.1	2.1	1001
Chile	40.2	50.4	39.8	47.1	16.5	13.1	67.8	2.6	605
China	25.3	15.2	10.2	33.6	4.7	10.4	0.0	0.7	578
Colombia	25.9	32.1	23.2	39.0	9.6	6.5	60.1	1.6	1000
Dominican Rep.	25.0	20.8	5.2	7.0	6.8	3.2	28.0	4.0	500
Ecuador	30.6	31.8	23.5	20.9	15.9	9.2	42.9	7.3	660
Georgia	29.5	18.8	12.1	24.4	12.7	1.9	45.1	12.2	1013
Ghana	51.8	45.7	39.8	46.4	25.0	17.4	56.4	3.0	1002
Hong Kong	14.9	31.6	20.2	55.0	18.1	10.0	28.7	6.3	509
Japan	14.9	44.3	28.2	31.6	9.2	13.2	26.6	13.6	1321
Kazakhstan	22.8	17.0	12.2	33.4	8.8	8.2	45.0	12.6	500
Malaysia	12.7	22.1	20.4	27.1	31.6	7.5	47.6	8.7	1014
Mexico	22.7	36.9	29.3	32.6	14.2	6.0	39.0	1.4	515
Nigeria	57.8	50.6	52.9	49.0	33.4	19.7	65.1	9.4	1030
Pakistan	41.3	35.9	37.2	26.8	9.3	6.1	25.3	58.7	462

Table 71. *VoP (2000)*: What would you say should be the most to important aims for the United Nations in the future? (in percentages)

	<b>To improve the health of human beings</b>	<b>To give humanitarian aid in times of natural disasters</b>	<b>To give humanitarian aid in times of war/conflict</b>	<b>To prevent war by intervention</b>	<b>To maintain peace by armed forces</b>	<b>To develop into a World Government</b>	<b>To protect human rights</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Paraguay	13.8	9.0	6.2	14.8	3.2	6.8	41.4	5.2	500
Peru	23.9	34.5	19.2	24.3	9.2	5.2	54.1	3.9	1001
Philippines	26.9	44.3	27.6	30.7	18.5	9.3	52.2	2.4	1000
Russia	24.0	24.7	20.0	41.8	4.0	4.3	39.6	14.2	2000
Singapore	21.5	28.1	19.8	31.4	17.4	9.9	28.1	12.3	506
South Korea	16.8	13.9	33.1	27.5	37.0	10.3	43.5	7.6	1509
Taiwan	18.8	42.4	34.2	43.2	20.7	21.5	43.0	3.4	526
Thailand	21.6	40.2	52.5	27.6	13.1	10.6	44.7	0.0	510
Ukraine	20.5	25.1	14.1	23.6	8.3	4.2	37.5	21.3	1200
Uruguay	27.7	28.1	15.2	43.1	4.6	4.0	44.0	12.5	527

### 3. Human rights and democracy

Table 72. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented. Democracy is a Western form of government that is not compatible with Islam (in percentages)

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	9.7	14.6	36.9	18.0	15.7	5.1	1300
Jordan	7.2	18.6	44.0	17.3	11.8	1.0	1143
Kuwait	5.9	12.7	51.9	23.1	5.9	0.7	750
Lebanon	11.2	14.2	32.9	23.6	16.7	1.4	1200
Morocco	5.3	11.4	40.6	19.7	22.1	0.9	1277
Palestine	9.3	22.4	47.2	16.3	4.7	0.2	1264
Yemen	9.6	10.8	45.1	12.2	18.3	4.0	1182

Table 73. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Using a 10-point scale, please give your opinion about the degree to which each of the following countries is a democracy: 1 means complete dictatorship and 10 means complete democracy. How democratic is United States? (in percentages)

	<b>Complete Dictatorship</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Complete Democracy</b>	<b>There is no democracy</b>	<b>Not important</b>	<b>Can't choose/Don't know</b>	<b>Decline to answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Algeria	4.8	2.7	2.3	2.9	3.6	5.2	4.0	11.2	9.4	12.7	12.8	7.5	15.8	5.1	1300
Jordan	3.4	1.8	1.6	2.7	5.2	3.6	5.2	10.9	11.7	21.4	3.5	3.7	24.9	0.2	1143
Kuwait	1.2	0.1	0.9	1.3	1.5	3.3	5.7	12.7	15.9	32.1	3.7	6.7	11.9	2.8	748
Lebanon	2.2	2.0	2.5	2.7	6.5	7.0	10.2	12.2	11.2	20.6	10.5	3.8	8.3	0.3	1200
Morocco	5.6	4.5	3.9	4.1	5.9	4.9	4.5	8.1	9.8	21.1	11.9	2.1	12.8	0.8	1277
Palestine	23.3	3.3	2.4	1.8	6.1	3.7	4.8	6.9	8.3	25.7	0.0	3.2	10.4	0.1	1269
Yemen	3.0	1.0	0.3	0.9	3.6	1.8	1.9	5.9	5.4	16.8	10.6	6.3	37.5	4.8	1182

Table 74. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Using a 10-point scale, please give your opinion about the degree to which each of the following countries is a democracy: 1 means complete dictatorship and 10 means complete democracy. How democratic is Turkey? (in percentages)

	Complete Dictatorship	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Complete Democracy	There is no democracy	Not important	Can't choose/Don't know	Decline to answer	N
Algeria	3.6	3.2	3.6	7.4	7.8	8.4	5.0	3.5	1.2	1.6	8.7	11.2	29.8	5.0	1300
Jordan	1.9	1.6	3.0	4.8	11.0	9.4	8.6	4.0	2.9	2.6	2.9	6.1	40.9	0.1	1143
Kuwait	5.0	3.1	7.2	5.4	7.6	5.9	4.0	4.8	1.6	2.9	11.5	13.7	26.3	0.9	746
Lebanon	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.8	13.2	6.9	7.8	4.1	1.3	2.1	12.3	5.0	29.7	0.5	1200
Morocco	2.8	4.6	4.9	6.9	10.1	9.1	5.2	4.2	2.0	1.9	3.1	4.2	40.0	0.9	1277
Palestine	12.3	3.6	5.6	5.3	13.7	7.9	7.3	6.5	3.2	5.8	0.0	6.2	22.5	0.1	1267
Yemen	2.7	1.4	1.3	1.9	4.7	3.2	4.0	2.8	1.5	5.9	5.9	10.6	50.8	3.3	1182



Table 75. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Using a 10-point scale, please give your opinion about the degree to which each of the following countries is a democracy: 1 means complete dictatorship and 10 means complete democracy. How democratic is Japan? (in percentages)

	Complete Dictatorship	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Complete Democracy	There is no democracy	Not important	Can't choose/Don't know	Decline to answer	N
Algeria	1.6	1.5	1.2	2.2	3.0	4.8	6.9	9.0	8.5	16.2	3.0	11.4	26.3	4.5	1300
Jordan	0.6	1.0	0.8	1.8	4.9	5.9	9.4	8.7	10.3	9.4	0.7	5.9	40.0	0.2	1143
Kuwait	0.3	0.5	1.2	0.9	2.9	5.2	5.1	7.5	12.2	14.9	3.4	14.6	29.6	1.6	746
Lebanon	1.3	2.0	1.1	2.0	7.6	5.2	8.2	9.0	6.0	10.7	2.5	5.3	38.8	0.2	1200
Morocco	1.1	1.0	2.1	1.7	4.5	6.5	5.6	12.5	12.8	20.6	0.9	3.0	27.2	0.5	1277
Palestine	6.3	1.3	1.8	2.1	6.0	5.0	9.3	11.3	11.2	17.0	0.0	5.7	22.9	0.1	1268
Yemen	1.7	0.0	0.8	0.7	3.3	2.4	2.8	3.2	3.6	9.4	5.0	11.3	51.6	4.2	1182

Table 76. *ArabBarometer (2006/2007)*: Using a 10-point scale, please give your opinion about the degree to which each of the following countries is a democracy: 1 means complete dictatorship and 10 means complete democracy. How democratic is China? (in percentages)

	Complete Dictatorship	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Complete Democracy	There is no democracy	Not important	Can't choose/Don't know	Decline to answer	N
Algeria	3.1	3.0	3.7	4.8	6.0	6.8	4.7	7.5	2.1	3.6	9.8	11.5	28.2	5.1	1300
Jordan	1.0	1.0	3.0	4.3	7.5	6.4	8.2	8.5	6.6	6.0	2.0	5.2	40.0	0.1	1143
Kuwait	1.9	3.2	2.9	4.7	8.0	5.7	6.1	4.1	5.7	5.1	9.4	13.8	28.1	1.2	748
Lebanon	4.1	3.5	2.3	3.1	8.3	4.5	7.0	5.9	2.2	3.8	13.5	5.1	36.4	0.2	1200
Morocco	1.1	2.3	2.7	4.6	7.2	8.1	7.6	10.5	8.7	13.7	2.0	3.4	27.6	0.5	1277
Palestine	8.8	1.8	3.9	3.8	9.3	6.2	9.9	12.2	6.3	10.2	0.0	5.3	22.1	0.1	1269
Yemen	2.4	1.4	0.9	1.0	2.6	2.2	3.6	3.6	2.7	6.9	9.2	10.1	50.6	2.7	1182

Table 77. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Are you very much in agreement, in agreement, in disagreement, or very much in disagreement with the following: Violence will impede the installation of democracy in Iraq (in percentages)

	Very much in agreement	In agreement	In disagreement	Very much in disagreement	N
Argentina	14.7	29.4	25.6	30.3	1054
Bolivia	3.1	23.8	54.0	19.1	955
Brazil	56.0	18.1	6.7	19.2	1038
Chile	12.7	31.0	36.6	19.7	1025
Colombia	8.0	39.4	44.9	7.8	1005
Costa Rica	8.9	31.8	41.7	17.7	869
Dominican Rep.	11.3	31.4	42.9	14.4	850
Ecuador	10.6	29.4	42.8	17.2	1085
El Salvador	4.7	32.2	45.0	18.1	769
Guatemala	3.2	32.7	57.3	6.8	691
Honduras	8.9	33.8	42.9	14.4	885
Mexico	8.6	25.0	37.9	28.5	1168
Nicaragua	4.9	33.5	45.9	15.6	790
Panama	8.7	37.5	42.7	11.2	912
Paraguay	9.2	46.0	37.9	6.8	543
Peru	4.0	33.8	48.8	13.5	1062
Uruguay	10.9	25.6	26.7	36.8	1027
Venezuela	22.1	25.4	30.2	22.3	996

Table 78. *GAP (2002, 2003, 2007): And which of these comes closer to your view? I like American ideas about democracy, OR I dislike American ideas about democracy (in percentages)*

		<b>I like American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>I dislike American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Angola	2002	50.6	30.9	14.7	781
Argentina	2007	14.0	67.4	16.9	801
	2002	28.6	50.0	19.7	814
Bangladesh	2007	37.2	55.8	6.9	1000
	2002	30.7	31.1	38.2	760
Bolivia	2007	30.8	58.6	9.1	834
	2002	26.9	60.0	11.5	783
Brazil	2007	26.2	67.2	6.3	999
	2003	27.2	65.1	7.4	1000
	2002	34.8	50.5	14.6	1001
Chile	2007	30.3	49.4	17.6	801
China	2007	47.8	36.3	15.3	3142
Egypt	2007	40.3	55.6	3.4	1000
Ethiopia	2007	65.5	31.0	2.8	710
Ghana	2007	73.4	14.4	12.0	707
	2002	80.3	6.6	12.4	702
Guatemala	2002	58.8	30.8	10.0	500
Honduras	2002	58.3	28.9	12.3	506
India	2007	40.8	48.6	9.0	2043
	2002	35.6	27.1	36.9	2188
Indonesia	2007	27.7	56.6	15.5	1007

Table 78. *GAP (2002, 2003, 2007): And which of these comes closer to your view? I like American ideas about democracy, OR I dislike American ideas about democracy (in percentages)*

		<b>I like American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>I dislike American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Israel	2003	28.8	64.6	6.5	1011
	2002	51.5	40.1	8.1	1017
	2007	61.2	28.6	9.0	900
Ivory Coast	2003	57.9	36.0	5.9	903
	2007	81.4	18.4	0.0	708
	2002	78.5	21.4	0.1	707
Japan	2007	56.7	25.5	17.7	762
	2002	62.4	26.5	10.8	703
Jordan	2007	41.6	54.9	2.0	1000
	2003	37.7	60.0	2.2	1000
	2002	29.1	68.6	2.3	1000
Kenya	2007	71.5	23.2	5.0	1000
	2002	86.7	6.3	6.6	662
Kuwait	2007	37.2	55.6	5.6	500
	2003	53.4	39.2	6.4	500
Lebanon	2007	38.9	55.7	3.1	999
	2003	46.1	50.0	3.8	1000
	2002	48.6	44.9	5.7	1000
Malaysia	2007	28.6	55.3	15.6	700
Mali	2007	62.7	34.9	1.7	699
	2002	55.2	35.4	7.7	697
Mexico	2007	29.2	59.9	9.7	828
	2002	41.0	40.9	17.4	997
Morocco	2007	29.5	51.3	18.4	1000

Table 78. *GAP (2002, 2003, 2007): And which of these comes closer to your view? I like American ideas about democracy, OR I dislike American ideas about democracy (in percentages)*

		<b>I like American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>I dislike American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Nigeria	2003	43.3	47.8	8.7	1001
	2007	75.4	20.9	3.6	1130
	2003	76.0	20.2	3.6	1000
Pakistan	2002	86.0	8.4	5.4	1000
	2007	6.4	72.1	21.0	2008
	2003	15.0	74.3	9.9	999
Palestinian Territories	2002	8.9	60.3	28.9	2031
	2007	16.5	71.4	10.6	808
	2003	13.8	83.6	2.4	800
Peru	2007	32.6	50.6	16.4	801
	2002	46.6	36.1	16.9	711
Philippines	2002	68.9	24.9	6.0	700
	2007	20.6	62.1	16.1	1001
	2003	29.3	41.7	28.5	501
Russia	2002	28.3	45.6	25.2	1002
	2007	53.7	39.7	6.0	700
	2002	65.0	28.3	6.5	709
Senegal	2007	52.6	31.0	15.9	1000
	2002	53.4	32.2	13.9	699
	2007	58.9	32.6	7.9	718
South Africa	2003	58.9	31.6	9.1	525
	2002	58.1	37.1	4.4	700
	2007	32.0	55.8	11.4	704
South Korea	2002	43.3	31.4	24.2	720
	2007	32.0	55.8	11.4	704
	2002	43.3	31.4	24.2	720
Tanzania	2007	32.0	55.8	11.4	704
	2002	43.3	31.4	24.2	720
	2007	32.0	55.8	11.4	704

Table 78. *GAP (2002, 2003, 2007): And which of these comes closer to your view? I like American ideas about democracy, OR I dislike American ideas about democracy (in percentages)*

		<b>I like American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>I dislike American ideas about democracy</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Uganda					
	2007	59.6	18.5	21.8	1121
	2002	67.3	16.9	15.5	1008
Ukraine					
	2007	38.7	46.7	14.2	499
	2002	53.0	35.0	11.6	500
Uzbekistan					
	2002	64.6	22.6	12.9	700
Venezuela					
	2007	40.5	54.3	3.9	803
	2002	67.4	29.6	2.9	700

Table 79. *GAP (2007)*: And which comes closer to describing your view? The United States promotes democracy wherever it can, OR the United States promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests? (in percentages)

	<b>The US promotes democracy wherever it can</b>	<b>The US promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	4.9	80.1	13.5	801
Bangladesh	13.7	78.5	7.6	1000
Bolivia	11.4	79.5	8.4	834
Brazil	9.5	82.6	7.5	1001
Chile	18.4	69.3	10.9	799
China	16.5	63.7	19.1	3142
Egypt	24.4	69.0	6.2	1000
Ethiopia	27.3	68.4	4.2	711
Ghana	37.9	46.4	15.6	707
India	31.6	51.4	14.5	2043
Indonesia	27.0	57.7	15.1	1007
Israel	36.3	55.7	7.2	900
Ivory Coast	29.9	69.8	0.1	708
Japan	17.8	56.3	25.6	762
Jordan	37.5	55.1	4.8	1000
Kenya	36.6	57.8	5.5	1000
Kuwait	11.2	82.0	5.4	500
Lebanon	21.3	74.4	3.9	1001
Malaysia	16.3	63.9	19.3	700
Mali	28.4	66.3	4.9	700
Mexico	21.0	70.3	6.0	828
Morocco	16.1	45.8	37.6	1000
Nigeria	47.6	45.6	6.6	1129
Pakistan	10.0	57.0	31.5	2009
Palestinian Territories	7.1	78.6	9.5	808
Peru	10.2	77.1	12.6	800
Russia	10.7	72.8	15.8	1002
Senegal	18.3	75.6	5.7	700
South Africa	36.2	47.0	16.6	1000
South Korea	17.4	69.5	12.5	718
Tanzania	14.5	67.0	18.0	704



Table 79. *GAP (2007)*: And which comes closer to describing your view? The United States promotes democracy wherever it can, OR the United States promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests? (in percentages)

	<b>The US promotes democracy wherever it can</b>	<b>The US promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<i>N</i>
Uganda	27.3	53.2	19.3	1122
Ukraine	16.4	73.9	9.2	499
Venezuela	26.0	67.9	4.7	803

Table 80. *Latinobarometro (2006)*: Do you think USA promotes democracy? (in percentages)

	<b>A lot</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Little</b>	<b>Nothing</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	2.1	10.1	22.1	55.5	9.5	0.8	1200
Bolivia	4.8	19.3	35.9	28.8	9.1	2.0	1200
Brazil	6.6	28.1	21.7	27.7	15.3	0.7	1204
Chile	4.0	23.8	35.7	18.0	16.8	1.8	1200
Colombia	16.1	26.4	33.8	14.7	8.2	0.8	1200
Costa Rica	8.1	31.1	30.7	16.9	11.5	1.7	1000
Dominican Rep.	24.9	40.2	22.4	4.2	6.5	1.8	1000
Ecuador	2.9	16.2	39.0	28.7	12.5	0.8	1200
El Salvador	16.1	24.5	31.0	16.6	9.5	2.4	1020
Guatemala	5.2	24.1	37.6	20.0	11.4	1.7	1000
Honduras	14.7	19.1	31.3	20.0	12.3	2.6	1000
Mexico	3.8	17.7	32.1	35.0	10.8	0.8	1200
Nicaragua	18.3	25.2	27.4	18.5	8.5	2.1	1000
Panama	18.0	42.7	17.5	6.6	12.9	2.4	1008
Paraguay	5.6	15.8	29.3	22.9	24.8	1.7	1200
Peru	4.8	20.8	40.8	20.4	11.2	2.0	1200
Uruguay	4.4	18.9	35.1	28.2	12.2	1.2	1200
Venezuela	11.8	19.2	23.5	33.9	8.5	3.0	1200

Table 81. *Latinobarometro (2004)*: Which of the following powers helps more to promote democracy? (in percentages)

	<b>Europe</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>Japan</b>	<b>China</b>	<i>N</i>
Argentina	69.4	23.1	5.9	1.5	792
Bolivia	43.8	40.2	13.1	2.9	796
Brazil	34.4	39.7	15.0	10.9	755
Chile	70.8	24.2	3.1	1.9	876
Colombia	36.8	57.8	3.9	1.4	977
Costa Rica	23.2	70.6	6.2	0.0	725
Dominican Rep.	23.5	70.6	3.8	2.1	867
Ecuador	38.0	53.5	4.8	3.7	920
El Salvador	18.0	74.8	5.0	2.2	757
Guatemala	24.0	65.0	9.1	1.9	645
Honduras	18.7	66.8	10.8	3.6	795
Mexico	64.3	23.5	10.5	1.7	952
Nicaragua	26.1	61.5	10.1	2.3	685
Panama	15.4	80.3	2.0	2.3	856
Paraguay	34.6	45.9	12.4	7.2	460
Peru	31.9	58.5	7.6	2.0	956
Uruguay	73.0	20.0	3.4	3.7	711
Venezuela	39.7	39.8	9.1	11.3	954

#### 4. EU, US and their leaders

Table 82. *GAP (2002)*: Asked in Europe only: For each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in our country. Is the influence of the European Union very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad in our country? (in percentages)

	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Somewhat good</b>	<b>Somewhat bad</b>	<b>Very bad</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<i>N</i>
Canada	9.4	48.6	9.0	4.6	28.0	0.4	500
Russia	3.5	40.7	13.1	6.5	35.0	1.2	1002
Turkey	23.8	27.7	12.1	20.2	15.8	0.4	1006
Ukraine	16.6	45.9	12.4	6.6	18.0	0.4	499

Table 83. *GAP (2002)*: For each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in our country. Is the influence of the United Nations very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad in our country? (in percentages)

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Don't know	Refused	N
Angola	26.5	48.2	8.5	5.9	4.0	6.9	780
Argentina	3.9	20.6	23.8	26.0	21.7	3.8	814
Bangladesh	13.5	31.1	13.9	4.7	36.8	0.0	758
Bolivia	15.9	45.8	20.6	6.0	11.1	0.6	782
Brazil	3.5	41.4	30.0	4.3	20.7	0.1	1000
Canada	28.4	52.8	10.4	2.6	5.0	0.8	500
China	17.4	47.5	8.0	1.6	24.7	0.8	3000
Ivory Coast	33.3	55.6	7.6	3.0	.1	0.3	708
Ghana	38.6	44.3	4.8	1.3	11.0	0.0	702
Guatemala	28.8	48.8	11.0	4.4	6.4	0.6	500
Honduras	18.8	54.7	10.7	1.6	12.8	1.4	506
India	28.8	20.7	5.2	5.6	39.6	0.0	2188
Indonesia	12.2	50.0	18.2	4.4	15.1	0.1	1016
Japan	13.8	52.3	16.2	1.3	16.5	0.0	705
Kenya	51.1	42.3	3.8	.8	2.1	0.0	662
South Korea	7.7	55.5	17.8	2.7	16.1	0.1	701
Mali	23.8	47.6	5.9	2.3	18.1	2.3	697
Mexico	21.8	41.0	10.5	3.5	22.7	0.5	996
Nigeria	37.7	45.0	6.2	2.9	8.1	0.1	1000
Pakistan	10.1	16.2	9.8	10.7	52.1	0.9	2031
Peru	16.7	49.0	8.4	3.9	21.6	0.3	712
Philippines	35.8	52.5	5.0	2.3	4.4	0.0	699
Russia	5.4	40.1	14.5	6.5	32.8	0.8	1003
Senegal	38.9	45.9	6.3	3.9	4.8	0.1	710
South Africa	36.1	33.5	8.3	7.8	14.1	0.1	701
Tanzania	24.3	38.8	10.3	3.9	22.1	0.7	720
Turkey	15.3	28.2	16.3	18.4	20.7	1.0	1004
Uganda	45.3	33.9	3.3	1.2	15.9	0.4	1008
Ukraine	19.2	49.9	10.4	6.0	14.4	0.0	499
Uzbekistan	40.9	43.4	2.9	.9	11.7	0.3	701
Venezuela	29.1	46.9	13.9	5.9	1.4	2.9	700
Vietnam	53.4	35.5	1.9	.5	8.7	0.0	772
Lebanon	15.7	33.0	21.6	18.8	10.6	0.3	1000
Jordan	18.9	23.9	31.3	23.9	1.8	0.2	1000

Table 84. *GAP (2002-2010)*: Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of the United States (in percentages)

		<b>Very favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat unfavorable</b>	<b>Very unfavorable</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Australia	2003	15.6	43.7	26.3	11.6	1.8	1.0	501
Angola	2002	26.8	27.3	16.3	6.5	12.2	10.9	780
Argentina	2002	8.7	25.4	25.7	23.5	13.9	2.8	814
	2007	3.2	13.4	31.0	41.4	9.5	1.5	801
	2008	2.9	18.8	28.5	33.1	13.5	3.2	800
	2010	8.5	33.5	26.7	13.7	13.7	4.0	803
Australia	2008	6.4	39.8	34.1	14.0	5.4	.3	701
Bangladesh	2002	17.9	26.7	23.1	23.6	8.6	0.1	758
	2007	17.3	36.2	15.0	26.2	4.9	.4	1000
Bolivia	2002	10.6	46.0	24.1	11.4	7.3	0.6	782
	2007	7.8	33.6	32.7	18.6	6.1	1.2	834
Brazil	2002	6.5	45.0	26.0	6.4	15.9	0.3	1000
	2003	4.7	29.5	47.3	13.5	4.6	.4	1000
	2007	3.8	39.6	38.4	12.8	5.0	.3	999
	2008	4.3	43.3	33.2	10.6	8.3	.3	1000
	2010	6.7	53.8	24.2	5.1	9.9	.3	1000
Canada	2002	23.6	47.5	18.6	7.8	1.8	0.8	500
	2003	20.0	42.4	21.6	13.4	2.4	.2	500
	2007	11.6	43.4	27.7	14.1	2.8	.4	1004
Chile	2007	13.7	40.8	24.5	11.0	8.2	1.7	801
Egypt	2002	3.1	2.8	10.3	58.8	19.2	5.8	1003
	2006	5.3	25.2	33.0	36.0	.3	.2	1000
	2007	6.8	14.1	31.9	45.7	1.3	.2	1000
	2008	9.5	12.2	34.8	39.7	2.0	1.8	1000
	2010	4.3	13.1	34.0	47.9	.7	.0	1000
Ethiopia	2007	41.3	35.5	14.1	8.0	.8	.3	710
Ivory Coast	2002	39.9	44.6	10.9	4.7	.0	0.0	708
	2007	51.3	37.4	8.3	3.0	.0	.0	708
China	2005	5.2	36.7	40.3	12.6	5.0	.2	2091
	2006	8.5	38.4	36.9	6.0	9.3	.8	2180
	2007	2.5	32.2	47.0	10.1	7.8	.4	3142
	2008	4.6	36.0	37.3	10.9	10.9	.3	3212
	2010	9.4	45.4	31.9	8.0	5.1	.2	3262
Ghana	2002	41.9	41.3	5.6	3.1	7.3	0.9	702
	2007	45.0	34.5	7.4	6.8	6.2	.1	707

Guatemala	2002	30.6	51.2	9.8	3.0	5.2	0.2	500
Honduras	2002	42.7	37.5	3.0	2.2	11.7	3.0	506
India	2002	22.1	32.2	10.9	15.5	19.4	0.0	2188
	2005	29.5	41.7	7.7	9.4	11.3	.4	2042
	2006	17.6	38.0	14.5	14.3	14.8	.8	2030
	2007	20.0	39.4	18.3	10.3	10.2	1.8	2043
	2008	22.8	43.4	9.9	15.0	8.7	.3	2056
	2010	23.0	36.0	8.4	16.0	15.2	1.4	2254
	2010	23.0	36.0	8.4	16.0	15.2	1.4	2254
Indonesia	2002	5.0	56.1	26.8	9.4	2.5	0.1	1016
	2003	3.5	16.3	36.9	42.0	1.3	.0	1011
	2006	6.6	22.8	41.8	25.1	3.7	.0	1021
	2007	3.6	25.4	41.5	24.8	4.7	.1	1008
	2008	7.2	30.3	36.7	16.2	9.3	.3	1000
	2010	8.1	51.9	27.1	6.1	6.7	.1	1000
	2010	8.1	51.9	27.1	6.1	6.7	.1	1000
Israel	2003	25.6	38.0	13.7	19.9	2.5	.2	903
	2007	29.2	49.0	15.4	5.0	1.1	.2	900
Jordan	2003	.1	1.1	15.9	82.9	.0	.0	1000
	2004	2.2	3.3	26.3	67.4	.5	.3	1000
	2006	6.3	8.8	29.6	54.9	.4	.0	1000
	2007	8.3	12.2	25.5	52.1	1.1	.8	1000
	2008	4.8	14.3	30.7	47.8	.4	2.0	1000
	2010	6.7	14.4	33.5	44.9	.3	.2	1000
	2010	6.7	14.4	33.5	44.9	.3	.2	1000
Kuwait	2003	29.8	33.0	15.6	16.2	4.0	1.4	500
	2007	13.6	31.6	19.4	26.6	7.2	1.6	500
Japan	2002	13.2	58.7	23.3	3.1	1.7	0.0	705
	2006	7.6	54.6	29.2	6.0	2.6	.0	500
	2007	7.7	53.0	33.3	2.8	3.0	.1	762
	2008	4.1	45.6	41.0	7.3	2.0	.0	708
	2010	6.7	60.1	27.9	3.9	1.4	.0	700
	2010	6.7	60.1	27.9	3.9	1.4	.0	700
	2010	6.7	60.1	27.9	3.9	1.4	.0	700
Kenya	2002	44.7	35.3	9.5	5.3	5.1	0.0	662
	2007	43.0	43.5	7.7	3.3	2.5	.0	1000
	2010	71.2	22.8	2.1	1.3	2.6	.1	1002
South Korea	2002	4.3	48.4	37.4	7.0	2.9	0.0	701
	2003	3.4	43.0	39.0	10.9	3.6	.0	525
	2007	2.9	55.3	32.6	4.6	4.5	.1	718
	2008	4.5	65.9	24.8	2.8	1.7	.3	713
Malaysia	2007	3.7	23.0	30.1	39.0	4.0	.1	700
Mali	2002	29.8	45.0	15.6	4.4	4.6	0.6	697
	2007	44.4	35.4	8.8	9.4	1.1	.9	701

Mexico	2002	15.2	49.3	14.9	10.4	9.6	0.6	996
	2007	9.9	46.0	26.2	15.1	2.1	.8	829
	2008	12.7	34.0	25.1	19.3	8.7	.2	805
	2010	13.2	42.0	20.3	14.5	9.6	.4	1300
Morocco	2003	13.5	14.0	12.9	53.0	4.9	1.7	1001
	2004	7.8	19.1	21.8	46.1	5.1	.1	1000
	2007	4.3	10.6	16.3	39.6	26.6	2.6	1000
Nigeria	2002	41.4	35.8	6.4	4.7	11.5	0.2	1000
	2003	30.8	30.0	15.2	21.4	2.4	.2	1000
	2006	33.6	28.0	19.7	16.2	2.5	.0	1000
	2007	44.3	25.7	9.2	17.5	3.3	.0	1129
	2008	40.3	24.1	13.0	19.7	2.9	.0	1000
	2010	50.3	30.6	8.4	4.9	5.8	.0	
Pakistan	2002	2.3	8.4	11.2	58.4	18.5	1.2	2031
	2003	3.2	9.3	9.5	71.4	5.9	.7	999
	2004	3.9	16.8	10.5	50.4	17.3	1.0	1241
	2006	6.8	20.1	13.7	41.8	16.5	1.0	1276
	2007	4.1	11.3	14.2	54.4	15.8	.2	2009
	2008	6.5	13.1	11.3	51.9	16.4	.8	1254
	2010	3.4	14.0	14.2	54.1	14.0	.3	2000
	2003	.5	.4	11.4	86.6	.6	.5	800
Palestinian Authority	2009	3.7	8.9	16.0	69.9	1.5	.0	808
Peru	2002	21.7	44.9	13.9	4.6	14.2	0.7	712
	2007	12.4	48.8	20.3	11.5	6.9	.1	799
Philippines	2002	36.8	53.1	5.6	1.4	3.0	0.1	699
Russia	2002	8.5	52.7	26.6	5.6	6.2	0.4	1003
	2003	10.0	25.5	32.1	24.0	7.6	.8	501
	2004	8.5	37.5	28.7	14.7	10.5	.2	1001
	2005	8.6	43.1	30.5	9.5	7.7	.6	1002
	2006	9.0	33.7	27.6	19.4	9.5	.8	1000
	2007	7.9	32.7	32.0	16.0	10.5	1.0	1003
	2008	11.8	33.7	27.6	20.4	6.5	.1	1001
	2010	9.5	48.1	25.8	6.7	9.8	.2	1001
Senegal	2002	21.0	40.5	27.5	8.7	2.3	0.0	710
	2007	25.9	42.7	18.7	10.1	1.9	.7	700
South Africa	2002	30.7	33.6	9.3	18.6	7.9	0.0	701
	2007	21.5	40.4	14.8	15.2	7.9	.2	1000
	2008	28.2	31.5	7.9	16.5	15.8	.1	1002



Tanzania	2002	17.4	36.0	15.7	9.6	20.1	1.2	720
	2007	20.3	26.4	15.3	24.4	12.4	1.1	704
	2008	34.8	30.4	10.9	10.2	13.5	.1	704
Turkey	2002	6.4	24.2	12.5	41.5	15.1	0.4	1004
	2003	1.4	12.3	15.3	67.6	3.2	.2	1000
	2004	6.0	23.5	18.2	45.3	6.5	.5	1017
	2006	1.9	10.3	9.1	67.0	11.5	.3	1013
	2007	1.8	7.0	8.4	75.1	7.6	.1	971
	2008	3.6	8.5	7.3	69.6	10.6	.5	1002
	2010	2.4	14.7	14.6	59.2	8.6	.6	1003
Uganda	2002	41.2	33.2	7.1	6.4	11.5	0.5	1008
	2007	29.1	34.8	8.4	10.8	16.7	.2	1122
Ukraine	2002	29.8	50.0	14.0	4.6	1.6	0.0	499
	2007	9.6	44.4	19.4	19.6	6.2	.8	500
Uzbekistan	2002	34.6	50.1	9.3	1.4	4.4	0.1	701
Venezuela	2002	48.6	33.1	10.6	3.3	3.7	0.7	700
	2007	12.1	44.3	18.3	22.2	2.5	.6	803
Vietnam	2002	16.7	53.8	22.9	3.6	2.8	0.1	772
Lebanon	2002	8.5	26.8	21.0	37.6	5.6	0.5	1000
	2003	8.3	19.2	23.1	47.9	.9	.6	1000
	2007	16.2	31.3	23.9	27.8	.7	.2	1001
	2008	17.7	33.0	19.2	29.5	.6	.0	1000
	2010	15.5	39.3	13.1	31.7	.3	.1	1000

Table 85. *GAP (2004-2010)*: Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of the European Union (in percentages)

		Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	Never heard of	Don't know	Refused	N
Argentina	2007	5.4	31.6	14.4	11.5		33.0	4.1	800
	2010	10.7	39.5	13.3	7.8		23.7	5.0	803
Bangladesh	2007	18.5	32.4	13.3	5.6		29.6	.6	1000
Bolivia	2007	7.0	35.7	22.5	9.6		23.7	1.4	834
Brazil	2007	2.7	48.3	28.4	7.1		13.2	.2	999
	2010	3.1	49.2	23.2	5.2		19.1	.2	1000
Canada	2007	18.5	53.9	7.5	2.5		15.9	1.7	1004
Chile	2007	16.3	47.3	11.9	2.5		17.1	4.9	799
China	2007	4.2	36.1	33.4	6.5		19.1	.7	3142
	2010	5.8	39.1	29.2	10.0		15.3	.6	3262
Egypt	2007	19.0	33.2	30.2	14.1		3.4	.1	1000
	2010	10.4	32.2	30.0	25.3		1.3	.8	1000
Ethiopia	2007	29.6	49.0	10.6	3.8		6.6	.4	710
Ghana	2007	33.1	40.7	9.1	4.0		12.9	.3	707
India	2007	8.2	34.0	23.3	14.0		18.6	1.8	2043
	2010	7.4	23.4	14.2	23.1		29.5	2.4	2254
Indonesia	2007	7.4	48.4	19.0	3.3		21.6	.2	1008
	2010	6.7	49.9	21.6	5.8		16.0	.0	1000
Israel	2007	9.4	40.1	27.0	17.4		5.3	.7	900
Ivory Coast	2007	20.2	51.8	18.5	9.3		.1	.0	708
Japan	2007	6.0	55.0	21.5	5.0		12.5	.0	762
	2010	10.7	64.3	13.4	2.4		9.0	.1	700
Jordan	2004	2.5	13.5	43.6	30.7	.0	6.4	3.3	1000
	2010	11.3	17.6	29.9	36.6		3.9	.7	1000
Kenya	2007	36.9	45.2	9.1	3.2		5.6	.0	1000
	2010	49.4	31.4	9.5	3.3		6.3	.1	1002
Kuwait	2007	15.8	34.0	12.4	8.6		27.8	1.4	500
Lebanon	2007	21.5	38.1	18.0	14.7		7.7	.0	1000
	2010	18.7	43.1	18.6	18.2		1.4	.0	1000
Malaysia	2007	4.7	47.9	14.6	6.2		26.5	.1	699
Mali	2007	44.2	39.1	7.9	3.6		4.7	.6	699
Mexico	2007	9.9	40.1	18.1	8.6		20.5	2.8	828
	2010	12.9	29.3	13.2	6.1		36.7	1.8	1300
Morocco	2004	13.9	27.0	27.4	23.2	.0	8.5	.0	1000
	2007	11.1	23.9	14.2	8.3		40.0	2.5	1000

Nigeria	2007	29.6	40.4	14.4	5.0		10.5	.0	1138
	2010	29.2	36.6	12.9	5.0		16.3	.0	1000
Pakistan	2004	2.7	15.7	11.4	22.2	.0	47.0	1.0	1242
	2007	3.2	11.0	18.4	21.7		45.4	.3	2009
	2010	1.6	7.6	12.8	33.4		44.2	.6	2000
Palestinian Territories	2007	6.6	25.2	27.8	31.9		8.2	.2	808
Peru	2007	10.1	39.9	11.6	4.9		32.9	.6	800
Russia	2004	10.8	50.9	12.7	4.6	.0	20.2	.9	1002
	2007	15.1	47.5	14.5	3.1		19.3	.6	1003
	2010	18.8	50.0	12.0	3.2		15.3	.7	1001
Senegal	2007	26.9	52.9	7.6	3.1		8.1	1.4	700
South Africa	2007	14.7	38.5	17.7	10.7		17.1	1.3	1000
South Korea	2007	3.9	67.3	13.4	1.8		13.5	.1	718
	2010	10.6	64.4	11.8	2.1		10.5	.6	706
Tanzania	2007	28.3	31.5	9.9	3.0		26.4	.9	704
Turkey	2004	21.5	36.3	14.9	20.0	.0	6.8	.5	1017
	2007	5.1	21.7	14.3	44.2		14.2	.4	971
	2010	5.2	23.7	12.1	44.9		13.2	1.0	1003
Uganda	2007	26.9	25.5	7.1	5.7		34.4	.4	1121
Ukraine	2007	20.8	55.7	8.2	2.8		11.2	1.4	501
Venezuela	2007	14.9	52.3	17.3	8.0		6.6	.9	803

Table 86. *GAP (2003, 2005)*: Why do you have an unfavorable view of the United States? Is it mostly because of President George W. Bush or is it more a general problem with America? (in percentages)

		<b>Mostly Bush</b>	<b>America in general</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Australia	2003	51.6	41.1	5.8	1.1	.5	190
Brazil	2003	55.6	36.2	6.1	2.1	.0	608
Canada	2003	57.1	36.0	5.1	1.7	.0	157
	2005	53.7	37.2	9.0	.0	.0	188
China	2005	15.6	34.3	42.1	7.5	.4	1158
India	2005	35.0	35.5	13.8	15.2	.6	349
Indonesia	2003	66.8	22.3	7.9	2.9	.1	798
Israel	2003	48.0	33.2	15.8	2.0	1.0	304
Jordan	2003	41.7	27.5	30.4	.3	.1	988
Kuwait	2003	44.0	42.1	7.5	3.8	2.5	159
Lebanon	2003	51.3	32.0	15.5	1.0	.3	710
Morocco	2003	65.9	14.2	17.9	.5	1.5	660
Nigeria	2003	59.8	21.6	18.0	.5	.0	366
Pakistan	2003	62.7	30.3	2.1	4.2	.6	808
Palestinian Authority	2003	33.7	34.4	31.4	.3	.3	784
Russia	2003	43.1	32.0	15.7	9.3	.0	281
	2005	29.7	58.4	9.0	2.7	.2	401
South Korea	2003	20.6	72.1	6.5	.8	.0	262
Turkey	2003	51.6	32.9	11.6	3.6	.2	829

Table 87. *GAP (2002)*: When there are differences between our country and the United States, do you think these differences occur because we have different values than the United States or because we have different policies than the United States? (in percentages)

	<b>Different Values</b>	<b>Different Policies</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Angola	29.5	62.5	6.5	1.4	779
Argentina	28.5	56.6	12.9	2.0	814
Bangladesh	15.5	30.3	53.3	.9	760
Bolivia	45.4	47.4	6.6	.5	782
Brazil	35.9	53.1	10.9	.1	1000
Canada	37.1	56.5	5.6	.8	501
Ivory Coast	51.8	47.9	.3	.0	708
Egypt	37.5	45.1	12.5	4.8	1013
Ghana	44.0	40.6	14.5	.9	702
Guatemala	33.4	56.6	9.6	.4	500
Honduras	30.0	63.8	5.7	.4	506
India	15.3	46.0	38.5	.2	2189
Indonesia	66.4	30.5	2.9	.3	1017
Japan	61.1	34.4	4.5	.0	704
Kenya	32.8	62.8	3.8	.6	662
South Korea	40.9	52.7	6.3	.1	700
Mali	66.6	25.5	6.6	1.3	697
Mexico	34.3	56.5	8.8	.4	997
Pakistan	13.9	37.6	46.1	2.3	2032
Peru	31.8	61.2	6.8	.3	711
Philippines	25.9	71.6	2.6	.0	700
Russia	36.7	48.8	14.5	.1	1003
Senegal	59.6	37.0	3.4	.0	710
South Africa	35.5	52.1	11.8	.6	701
Tanzania	27.4	48.8	23.3	.6	720
Turkey	35.1	47.0	17.2	.7	1006
Uganda	27.2	59.4	12.9	.5	1008
Ukraine	31.4	64.2	4.2	.2	500
Uzbekistan	53.7	39.3	6.6	.4	700
Venezuela	30.3	68.0	1.3	.4	700
Vietnam	24.1	67.7	7.9	.3	772
Lebanon	35.4	55.9	8.3	.4	1000
Jordan	35.1	61.2	2.2	1.5	1000

Table 88. *GAP (2002-2007)*: Which of the following phrases comes closer to your view? It's good that American ideas and customs are spreading here OR it's bad that American ideas and customs are spreading here (in percentages)

		<b>It's good that American ideas and customs are spreading here</b>	<b>It's bad that American ideas and customs are spreading here</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Angola	2002	33.5	54.4	9.6	2.6	780
Argentina	2002	16.0	73.5	9.0	1.6	814
	2007	9.9	76.8	12.1	1.2	800
Australia	2003	25.7	66.1	6.4	1.8	501
Bangladesh	2002	13.4	76.3	10.0	.3	759
	2007	24.5	71.8	3.5	.2	1000
Bolivia	2002	21.9	73.3	4.2	.6	782
	2007	19.4	72.3	7.7	.6	834
Brazil	2002	30.5	61.8	7.7	.0	1000
	2003	24.2	71.5	4.1	.2	1000
Canada	2002	37.4	54.2	6.2	2.2	500
	2003	39.6	50.8	7.6	2.0	500
	2007	22.2	66.9	9.4	1.6	501
Chile	2007	24.0	65.5	9.4	1.1	801
China	2007	38.4	39.1	21.7	.7	3141
Ivory Coast	2002	68.5	31.5	.0	.0	708
	2007	79.5	20.3	.1	.0	708
Egypt	2002	6.1	84.2	5.6	4.0	1013
	2007	12.8	78.8	7.7	.7	1000
Ethiopia	2007	54.1	41.0	4.6	.3	710
Ghana	2002	46.9	39.9	12.3	1.0	702
	2007	42.9	49.6	7.2	.3	707
India	2002	24.0	53.9	22.1	.0	2189
	2007	28.9	62.0	8.1	1.0	2043
Guatemala	2002	40.4	53.2	5.6	.8	500
Honduras	2002	43.7	53.2	2.6	.6	506
Indonesia	2002	19.7	73.4	6.7	.3	1017
	2003	11.9	82.4	5.4	.3	1011
	2007	11.2	76.2	12.3	.3	1008

Israel	2003	40.3	51.5	7.8	.4	903
	2007	55.9	31.7	11.7	.8	900
Kuwait	2003	13.2	78.6	6.8	1.4	500
	2007	9.8	85.0	4.0	1.2	500
Morocco	2003	16.0	79.8	4.1	.1	1001
Japan	2002	49.4	35.2	15.0	.4	705
	2007	41.9	34.5	23.2	.4	762
Kenya	2002	40.0	55.5	4.5	.0	663
	2007	44.9	52.8	2.2	.1	1000
South Korea	2002	30.1	61.6	7.1	1.1	700
	2003	41.7	45.0	12.0	1.3	525
	2007	38.4	48.2	11.7	1.7	718
Mali	2002	34.9	60.8	4.0	.3	697
	2007	44.8	52.1	1.4	1.7	699
Mexico	2002	22.0	65.6	11.8	.6	996
	2007	23.4	67.5	7.2	1.8	828
Nigeria	2002	63.8	30.9	4.7	.6	1000
	2003	60.9	35.4	3.1	.6	1000
	2007	50.7	44.2	4.7	.4	1130
Pakistan	2002	2.2	81.0	15.7	1.1	2032
	2003	3.3	93.4	3.0	.3	999
	2007	4.3	84.2	11.5	.0	2008
Palestinian authority	2003	3.1	94.9	1.0	1.0	800
	2007	3.3	89.6	6.1	1.0	809
Peru	2002	36.5	50.1	12.9	.4	712
	2007	29.3	59.6	10.3	.9	799
Philippines	2002	58.1	35.6	6.1	.1	700
Russia	2002	16.5	68.0	15.3	.3	1003
	2003	19.2	66.9	13.4	.6	501
	2007	13.6	75.6	10.4	.4	1002
Senegal	2002	34.3	62.0	3.4	.3	711
	2007	31.6	65.3	2.6	.6	700
South Africa	2002	42.7	44.7	12.4	.3	701
	2007	41.3	44.8	14.0	.0	1001
Tanzania	2002	17.8	66.9	14.3	1.0	720
	2007	11.6	81.7	5.8	.9	704
Turkey	2002	11.4	77.6	10.3	.6	1005
	2003	9.7	84.5	5.2	.6	1000

	2007	4.3	85.6	9.1	1.0	971
Uganda	2002	49.6	42.0	8.2	.2	1008
	2007	44.6	37.9	17.4	.2	1122
Ukraine	2002	35.2	58.0	6.8	.0	500
	2007	20.0	68.4	10.6	1.0	500
Uzbekistan	2002	32.6	56.4	11.0	.0	700
Venezuela	2002	43.6	52.3	3.1	1.0	700
	2007	36.9	56.8	4.9	1.5	803
Vietnam	2002	33.2	59.6	7.1	.0	773
Lebanon	2002	26.3	67.4	5.7	.6	1000
	2003	30.8	64.8	3.0	1.4	1000
	2007	38.4	58.3	2.5	.8	1000
Jordan	2002	12.8	81.7	2.2	3.3	1000
	2003	4.9	92.7	2.3	.1	1000
	2007	12.0	81.1	4.6	2.3	1000



Table 89. *GAP (2002-2007)*: Which comes closer to describing your view? I like American ways of doing business OR I dislike American ways of doing business (in percentages)

		I like American ways of doing business	I dislike American ways of doing business	Don't know	Refused	N
Angola	2002	41.4	36.3	19.6	2.7	780
Argentina	2002	29.1	53.7	16.6	.6	814
	2007	15.8	67.0	15.4	1.9	800
Australia	2003	26.7	61.5	10.6	1.2	501
Bangladesh	2002	20.9	31.9	47.0	.1	759
	2007	45.6	46.8	7.5	.1	1000
Bolivia	2002	31.6	56.0	11.3	1.2	782
	2007	34.1	50.7	14.3	1.0	834
Brazil	2002	33.5	51.2	15.2	.1	1000
	2003	33.8	58.5	7.5	.2	1000
	2007	30.7	61.3	7.6	.4	999
Canada	2002	33.7	55.9	8.8	1.6	501
	2003	36.2	53.6	8.8	1.4	500
	2007	28.9	59.1	9.0	3.0	501
Chile	2007	41.3	40.1	15.8	2.9	799
China	2002	35.7	24.4	39.3	.6	3001
	2007	49.4	25.0	24.6	.9	3141
Egypt	2002	33.5	46.1	16.4	4.0	1013
	2007	48.4	49.6	1.6	.4	1000
Ethiopia	2007	52.4	26.5	21.0	.1	710
Ghana	2002	69.8	10.7	18.4	1.1	702
	2007	74.1	12.4	13.0	.4	707
Guatemala	2002	63.0	24.8	11.8	.4	500
Honduras	2002	67.0	22.9	9.7	.4	506
India	2002	50.0	16.7	33.3	.0	2189
	2007	50.6	38.2	9.5	1.7	2043
Indonesia	2002	54.5	38.3	7.0	.2	1017
	2003	55.1	37.1	7.6	.2	1011
	2007	41.9	45.5	12.4	.2	1008
Israel	2003	57.0	29.1	13.5	.3	903
	2007	69.8	18.8	11.0	.4	900
Ivory Coast	2002	76.3	23.4	.3	.0	708

	2007	77.5	22.2	.1	.1	708
Japan	2002	39.6	40.0	20.1	.3	705
	2007	39.5	36.4	23.9	.3	762
Jordan	2002	43.9	52.5	3.6	.0	1000
	2003	56.3	43.1	.6	.0	1000
	2007	51.1	46.5	1.8	.6	1000
Kenya	2002	78.2	8.0	13.7	.0	662
	2007	78.8	15.9	5.1	.2	1000
Kuwait	2003	74.6	18.8	6.4	.2	500
	2007	71.0	22.6	5.6	.8	500
Lebanon	2002	65.0	28.1	6.3	.6	1000
	2003	68.6	28.5	2.9	.0	1000
	2007	62.5	33.1	4.2	.2	1000
Malaysia	2007	53.2	33.2	13.4	.1	701
Mali	2002	47.6	43.6	7.2	1.7	698
	2007	57.4	37.1	3.6	1.9	700
Mexico	2002	43.9	38.3	17.0	.9	996
	2007	37.7	53.3	7.0	2.1	828
Morocco	2003	63.9	30.0	5.8	.3	1001
	2007	44.0	39.4	16.2	.4	1000
Nigeria	2002	84.8	7.2	7.6	.4	1000
	2003	76.6	18.1	5.1	.2	1000
	2007	77.9	18.8	3.3	.1	1129
Pakistan	2002	14.0	52.9	30.9	2.1	2031
	2007	15.7	56.0	27.5	.8	2009
	2003	28.7	53.1	16.4	1.8	999
Palestinian Authority	2003	33.8	60.5	5.0	.8	800
	2007	40.0	45.5	12.1	2.4	808
Peru	2002	46.9	29.9	22.9	.3	712
	2007	43.8	40.0	16.1	.1	800
Philippines	2002	73.3	20.9	5.7	.1	700
Russia	2002	40.6	30.3	28.5	.6	1003
	2003	34.7	35.5	29.3	.4	501
	2007	32.0	40.6	25.4	1.9	1002
Senegal	2002	49.5	44.6	5.9	.0	709
	2007	46.0	49.6	3.6	.9	700
South Africa	2002	60.0	21.4	18.3	.3	700
	2007	59.6	21.9	17.6	.9	1000
South	2002	58.7	32.0	8.7	.6	700

## Korea

	2003	56.6	31.2	11.6	.6	525
	2007	60.9	28.0	11.0	.1	718
Tanzania	2002	46.8	25.7	26.8	.7	720
	2007	44.6	36.4	18.0	1.0	704
Turkey	2002	27.4	58.6	13.5	.5	1005
	2003	20.1	72.9	6.6	.4	1000
	2007	6.3	82.7	10.3	.7	971
Uganda	2002	65.5	13.0	21.3	.2	1008
	2007	57.7	16.1	25.5	.7	1121
Ukraine	2002	58.2	23.4	18.0	.4	500
	2007	44.2	30.6	24.4	.8	500
Uzbekistan	2002	76.3	11.4	12.0	.3	701
Venezuela	2002	64.4	31.1	4.0	.4	700
	2007	40.2	51.3	7.2	1.2	803
Vietnam	2002	68.3	24.0	7.8	.0	772

Table 90. *GAP (2003-2010)*: Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of-Americans (in percentages)

		<b>Very favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat unfavorable</b>	<b>Very unfavorable</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	2010	6.1	34.0	24.3	13.7	17.6	4.4	803
Australia	2003	19.8	54.9	17.0	2.4	5.0	1.0	501
Brazil	2003	4.2	39.5	39.8	10.0	5.9	.6	1000
	2010	5.2	54.0	24.8	4.6	11.1	.3	1000
Canada	2003	28.0	45.8	18.2	4.8	2.4	.8	500
	2005	23.4	43.0	20.6	9.0	1.2	2.8	500
China	2005	5.3	38.2	38.1	10.8	7.2	.5	2191
	2006	5.7	43.5	33.8	4.9	11.2	.8	2180
	2010	9.9	47.1	29.0	8.3	5.6	.2	3262
Egypt	2006	8.2	28.4	30.3	32.6	.3	.2	1000
	2010	6.8	32.1	31.8	26.5	2.8	.0	1000
India	2005	28.4	42.5	9.2	8.7	10.9	.3	2042
	2006	22.8	44.2	13.8	12.2	6.5	.5	2030
	2010	23.2	41.8	11.0	9.1	13.4	1.5	2254
Indonesia	2003	7.4	51.6	28.2	10.6	2.2	.0	1011
	2006	5.7	29.7	42.1	17.7	4.8	.0	1022
	2010	5.3	51.0	30.0	5.7	7.8	.2	1000
Israel	2003	28.0	42.4	12.5	11.8	5.1	.1	903
Japan	2006	15.6	66.1	13.0	2.8	2.4	.0	499
	2010	8.0	68.1	17.0	2.9	3.9	.1	700
Jordan	2003	2.8	15.1	35.7	46.2	.2	.0	1000
	2006	2.5	36.2	30.6	29.8	.9	.0	1000
	2004	3.9	16.8	40.4	33.3	4.0	1.6	1000
	2010	12.2	32.0	27.5	26.2	1.1	1.0	1000
Kuwait	2003	39.2	32.4	9.4	9.4	7.2	2.4	500
Lebanon	2003	20.9	40.8	20.8	16.5	.7	.3	1000
	2010	22.2	45.9	11.2	20.4	.2	.1	1000
Mexico	2010	9.5	38.8	25.7	13.2	12.3	.5	1300
Morocco	2003	29.3	25.1	9.6	27.8	6.6	1.7	1001
	2004	8.7	28.3	25.0	31.1	6.7	.2	1000
Nigeria	2003	32.0	35.3	12.2	17.2	3.0	.3	1000
	2006	28.0	27.9	20.8	18.8	4.4	.1	1000
	2010	44.5	35.7	9.1	5.3	5.3	.1	1000
Pakistan	2003	7.4	28.0	11.2	41.6	10.7	1.0	999
	2004	5.4	20.3	13.0	34.2	26.4	.6	1241

	2006	5.4	22.3	18.3	33.9	19.7	.4	1276
	2010	4.0	16.4	20.8	40.1	18.2	.4	2000
Palestinian Authority	2003	.6	7.9	24.0	65.9	1.0	.6	800
Russia	2003	15.8	49.3	16.6	8.0	9.6	.8	501
	2005	9.9	51.2	22.6	5.8	9.9	.7	1002
	2006	10.9	46.0	23.1	10.5	9.1	.4	1000
	2004	12.5	51.1	17.5	7.6	10.9	.5	1002
	2010	11.0	52.4	21.2	5.2	9.9	.3	1000
South Korea	2003	4.0	69.5	17.3	3.0	5.3	.8	525
	2010	6.9	75.2	12.9	1.6	3.3	.1	706
Turkey	2003	4.5	25.6	18.5	43.2	8.0	.2	1000
	2006	2.1	14.8	14.4	54.8	13.6	.3	1013
	2004	5.5	26.2	21.2	32.5	13.8	.8	1017
	2004	5.4	20.3	13.0	34.2	26.4	.6	1241
	2006	5.4	22.3	18.3	33.9	19.7	.4	1276
	2010	1.6	14.0	17.5	51.8	13.8	1.3	1300

Table 91. *GAP (2005-2008)*: Now I'm going to read a list of political leaders. For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs – US President George W. Bush (in percentages)

		<b>A lot of confidence</b>	<b>Some confidence</b>	<b>Not too much confidence</b>	<b>No confidence at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	2007	1.4	4.2	16.5	71.3	5.4	1.2	801
	2008	1.0	5.9	15.1	71.0	6.2	.8	800
Australia	2008	3.9	19.0	25.0	50.6	1.4	.1	700
Bangladesh	2007	4.7	13.7	14.5	63.1	3.8	.2	1000
Bolivia	2007	4.9	17.5	30.2	43.4	3.4	.6	834
Brazil	2007	2.4	14.6	19.1	60.9	2.8	.2	999
	2008	2.5	14.1	17.1	63.3	2.9	.1	1001
Canada	2005	8.8	30.6	26.6	33.0	.6	.4	500
	2007	5.6	21.9	23.3	47.1	1.6	.6	503
Chile	2007	5.4	24.2	28.5	33.8	7.8	.4	800
China	2007	3.3	28.1	35.5	15.7	16.7	.7	3143
	2008	3.7	25.8	30.8	14.0	23.9	1.8	3213
Egypt	2007	.3	7.6	19.7	67.0	4.8	.6	1000
	2008	3.2	7.5	17.8	68.0	2.2	1.3	1000
Ethiopia	2007	19.7	28.5	29.1	21.6	1.0	.1	709
Ghana	2007	36.2	33.2	12.7	11.5	6.4	.0	707
India	2005	20.2	33.8	19.2	12.1	14.3	.2	2042
	2007	18.3	31.6	21.6	20.7	7.3	.5	2043
	2008	21.5	33.9	11.3	22.2	10.9	.1	2056
Indonesia	2007	1.2	12.6	44.2	34.9	7.0	.1	1009
	2008	2.1	21.1	41.9	23.9	11.0	.1	1001
Israel	2007	21.4	36.2	23.1	15.4	2.6	1.2	900
Ivory Coast	2007	33.2	49.4	10.7	6.6	.0	.0	708
Japan	2007	1.6	32.5	45.4	13.1	7.3	.0	762
	2008	2.0	23.4	43.2	26.3	5.1	.0	708
Jordan	2007	.8	7.3	33.0	54.6	2.5	1.8	1000
	2008	3.0	4.3	30.4	58.6	3.1	.6	1000
Kenya	2007	32.8	39.2	15.6	9.5	2.6	.3	1000
Kuwait	2007	8.4	17.0	16.2	50.6	6.2	1.6	500
Lebanon	2007	9.0	25.4	22.3	42.9	.3	.1	1000
	2008	8.4	25.2	22.5	43.3	.7	.0	1001
Malaysia	2007	2.1	12.1	24.3	51.6	9.6	.3	700
Mali	2007	28.3	37.6	14.2	17.7	1.6	.6	699

Mexico	2007	2.9	24.6	26.1	40.8	4.5	1.1	828
	2008	4.5	11.5	23.3	54.3	6.1	.2	806
Morocco	2007	.8	1.6	7.5	56.4	30.6	3.1	1000
Nigeria	2007	35.5	25.9	12.4	21.2	4.6	.4	1129
	2008	29.4	26.3	13.1	25.8	5.3	.1	1000
Pakistan	2007	1.7	5.3	9.0	56.8	26.8	.4	2009
	2008	2.4	4.9	5.3	55.9	31.2	.3	1255
Palestinian Territories	2007	2.1	5.6	6.9	83.6	1.6	.2	809
Peru	2007	4.0	24.7	31.6	27.8	11.4	.5	801
Russia	2005	4.2	23.7	39.6	16.7	15.5	.4	1002
	2007	3.4	15.2	33.8	36.5	10.7	.5	1001
	2008	7.2	14.9	27.9	40.9	9.0	.1	1000
Senegal	2007	11.0	27.1	21.7	35.3	2.4	2.4	700
South Africa	2007	11.3	25.7	21.1	32.5	9.4	.1	1001
	2008	11.0	20.6	16.3	35.9	16.3	.0	1001
South Korea	2007	.6	20.6	50.6	22.0	6.1	.1	718
	2008	1.3	29.1	52.9	10.8	5.9	.0	714
Tanzania	2007	15.9	24.3	15.5	33.7	9.7	1.0	704
	2008	27.6	32.0	14.3	19.2	7.0	.0	704
Turkey	2007	.4	2.2	8.1	81.1	7.8	.4	971
	2008	.5	1.8	3.6	85.0	8.5	.7	1004
Uganda	2007	22.3	29.6	14.2	15.2	18.4	.4	1122
Ukraine	2007	5.2	14.4	29.1	35.3	12.6	3.4	501
Venezuela	2007	2.7	19.9	27.1	47.7	2.0	.5	803

Table 92. *GAP (2007, 2008)*: Now I'm going to read a list of political leaders. For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs – German Chancellor Angela Merkel (in percentages)

		<b>A lot of confidence</b>	<b>Some confidence</b>	<b>Not too much confidence</b>	<b>No confidence at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	2007	1.5	8.8	7.2	21.2	55.5	5.8	800
	2008	1.5	7.4	7.7	22.8	56.8	3.7	801
Australia	2008	7.1	41.0	9.6	4.1	38.1	.0	700
Bangladesh	2007	3.8	25.5	16.6	14.2	39.9	.0	1000
Bolivia	2007	2.0	11.9	20.3	24.9	37.5	3.4	834
Brazil	2007	2.7	21.4	17.3	36.2	22.4	.1	1001
	2008	1.8	22.1	15.2	32.9	28.0	.1	1001
Canada	2007	8.2	40.0	8.9	7.4	33.4	2.2	503
Chile	2007	3.8	20.4	16.8	14.1	42.9	2.1	800
China	2007	3.3	27.6	30.1	7.9	29.8	1.3	3142
	2008	2.4	23.8	23.3	10.1	37.9	2.5	3212
Egypt	2007	.8	24.4	22.9	25.4	26.4	.1	1000
	2008	2.9	20.9	25.5	28.7	20.0	2.0	1000
Ethiopia	2007	6.3	27.5	34.6	13.4	17.9	.3	710
Ghana	2007	21.9	38.9	14.3	4.8	20.1	.0	707
India	2007	6.9	21.5	17.9	16.3	35.5	1.9	2043
	2008	3.2	15.4	11.6	15.7	53.6	.6	2056
Indonesia	2007	.6	28.8	24.1	6.7	39.7	.2	1006
	2008	1.1	17.9	20.2	8.4	52.2	.2	1000
Israel	2007	5.4	19.3	28.0	33.2	13.0	1.0	900
Ivory Coast	2007	19.8	55.6	20.8	3.2	.6	.0	708
Japan	2007	1.2	26.4	20.6	4.2	47.6	.0	762
	2008	4.8	42.5	23.8	2.1	26.8	.0	709
Jordan	2007	3.2	23.0	28.8	22.7	22.1	.2	1000
	2008	2.0	17.5	32.3	26.8	19.9	1.5	1000
Kenya	2007	15.0	38.8	22.9	7.8	15.2	.3	1000
Kuwait	2007	5.4	16.2	9.2	22.4	44.0	2.8	500
Lebanon	2007	11.0	29.1	21.3	30.3	8.2	.1	1000
	2008	12.4	21.6	31.9	28.4	5.7	.0	998
Malaysia	2007	1.9	20.7	16.4	7.1	53.7	.1	700
Mali	2007	25.1	45.7	11.7	4.9	10.4	2.1	700
Mexico	2007	5.1	16.7	20.8	21.9	31.5	4.1	828
	2008	2.9	9.1	18.1	24.0	43.4	2.6	805



Morocco	2007	1.6	3.7	6.8	14.7	69.8	3.4	1000
Nigeria	2007	11.2	36.3	19.4	11.6	21.2	.4	1130
	2008	11.0	28.0	21.6	15.4	23.1	.9	1000
Pakistan	2007	1.5	4.8	12.4	35.5	45.0	.8	2008
	2008	.6	4.2	5.7	30.8	57.5	1.2	1253
Palestinian Territories	2007	2.2	9.3	21.3	50.1	16.7	.4	807
Peru	2007	2.2	15.2	17.4	18.9	45.5	.8	800
Russia	2007	11.9	32.4	18.8	6.0	30.3	.6	1000
	2008	13.5	35.0	20.2	7.8	23.4	.1	1000
Senegal	2007	11.4	33.1	13.1	10.7	26.3	5.3	700
South Africa	2007	5.0	19.6	11.0	14.1	49.1	1.2	1000
	2008	5.2	14.4	8.8	11.7	59.6	.3	1000
South Korea	2007	1.0	26.5	33.8	6.5	31.8	.4	718
	2008	2.0	32.4	28.2	3.9	32.5	1.0	713
Tanzania	2007	22.4	29.3	8.0	7.1	32.0	1.3	704
	2008	19.3	27.7	11.9	6.7	34.2	.1	704
Turkey	2007	.5	9.3	12.5	51.1	26.2	.5	971
	2008	.4	6.3	7.5	60.3	23.8	1.7	1003
Uganda	2007	7.3	16.6	11.2	10.2	54.1	.5	1122
Ukraine	2007	8.4	33.2	21.6	5.0	28.4	3.4	500
Venezuela	2007	1.2	11.6	23.7	36.4	25.5	1.6	803

Table 93. *Afrobarometer (2005/2006)*: Effectiveness of international organizations (in percentages)

		Missing	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	DK	N
Botswana	EU	.0	1.8	.3	1.8	2.3	4.5	11.6	6.2	4.6	2.8	1.6	5.6	56.8	1200
Ghana	EU	.0	.6	1.0	1.2	2.4	4.1	6.0	4.6	4.2	4.7	2.8	4.4	64.1	1200
Lesotho	EU	.0	1.0	.3	.3	.8	.2	.9	1.5	1.1	.7	1.0	4.2	87.8	1200
Malawi	EU	.0	.9	.6	1.0	.8	1.2	3.8	4.2	4.2	5.1	3.5	20.9	53.7	1200
Mali	EU	.0	3.3	.9	1.2	2.2	2.8	9.5	6.7	3.5	5.3	2.7	12.0	50.0	1283
Namibia	EU	.1	2.3	2.6	5.4	7.9	9.7	13.0	10.1	6.8	5.2	3.4	5.3	28.3	1199
Nigeria	EU	.0	.8	.7	1.1	2.4	4.9	10.9	11.5	11.0	8.5	4.8	4.4	39.1	2428
South Africa	EU	.0	2.1	2.1	3.2	4.3	5.3	10.4	6.1	3.8	3.7	1.1	1.8	56.0	2400
Tanzania	EU	.0	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.4	2.9	7.5	5.2	6.4	6.1	4.9	7.5	54.4	1223
Uganda	EU	.0	1.2	1.2	3.5	3.5	4.0	7.0	6.0	5.2	7.2	3.6	6.0	51.5	2400
Zambia	EU	.0	.8	.3	2.4	2.6	4.3	7.3	6.9	6.8	6.8	2.9	8.4	50.6	1198
Cape Verde	EU	.1	.2	.2	1.0	1.7	3.1	10.7	5.8	6.6	8.1	2.6	8.9	50.9	1268
Kenya	EU	.1	1.1	1.3	2.9	5.5	6.2	10.3	8.3	6.2	4.3	1.8	4.0	47.9	2398
Mozambique	EU	.3	.9	.5	.8	1.7	2.1	3.4	3.3	2.9	2.4	2.0	11.1	68.5	1400
Senegal	EU	.5	1.7	.6	1.5	2.2	3.1	8.1	3.9	4.8	4.9	3.1	6.1	59.7	1200
Botswana	UN	.0	2.6	1.0	1.9	2.2	3.6	10.2	4.9	6.7	4.6	3.6	7.8	50.9	1200
Ghana	UN	.0	.5	.7	.8	1.8	2.1	5.8	5.7	6.4	8.5	5.0	11.0	51.8	1200
Lesotho	UN	.0	1.0	.3	.6	.2	1.2	2.2	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.1	6.8	80.3	1200
Malawi	UN	.1	2.0	1.1	1.7	1.7	2.6	4.4	2.6	3.6	4.7	2.2	18.0	55.5	1200
Mali	UN	.0	2.9	.7	2.3	2.4	3.7	9.0	6.3	4.5	5.1	4.3	16.8	42.0	1283
Namibia	UN	.3	1.1	1.7	3.6	5.6	5.9	11.9	9.3	11.7	11.9	12.3	13.2	11.5	1199
Nigeria	UN	.0	.6	.8	1.1	2.3	3.7	9.5	11.4	12.6	11.4	6.9	6.5	33.1	2428
South Africa	UN	.0	1.8	1.6	2.5	4.0	7.2	11.0	7.1	6.0	5.5	3.5	3.8	46.0	2400
Tanzania	UN	.0	2.1	1.5	2.6	2.9	4.1	8.7	6.1	7.0	7.5	4.7	9.6	43.3	1223
Uganda	UN	.0	.8	.6	2.0	2.2	3.1	6.3	7.0	9.0	11.8	9.5	15.4	32.3	2400
Zambia	UN	.0	1.3	.5	2.5	2.7	3.8	7.7	6.4	5.3	8.2	6.6	14.1	40.8	1198
Cape Verde	UN	.0	.2	.2	.6	1.4	3.6	7.9	5.7	6.4	8.2	4.6	13.8	47.5	1268
Kenya	UN	.3	.5	.8	1.8	4.5	6.0	10.5	9.8	10.4	8.5	5.2	7.5	34.2	2398
Mozambique	UN	.5	1.4	.4	.8	1.7	1.3	3.7	3.0	2.6	3.8	2.8	16.3	61.9	1400
Senegal	UN	.5	3.1	1.2	1.3	2.4	3.9	8.3	3.4	5.1	4.2	3.6	7.1	55.8	1200
Botswana	World Bank	.0	1.0	.2	1.5	1.1	3.0	9.2	6.2	5.3	4.9	2.9	7.3	57.2	1200
Ghana	World Bank	.0	.5	1.2	1.0	1.8	3.8	7.4	5.9	6.2	6.4	5.3	8.0	52.3	1200
Lesotho	World Bank	.0	.0	.1	.3	.4	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.9	2.4	1.8	5.8	83.4	1200

	Bank														
Malawi	World Bank	.0	1.2	.7	1.2	2.3	2.8	3.9	2.6	3.2	4.2	3.1	19.2	55.6	1200
Mali	World Bank	.0	2.9	.5	.9	2.2	2.2	9.7	6.2	7.6	6.2	3.9	21.3	36.7	1283
Namibia	World Bank	.1	1.8	2.2	3.6	6.2	7.5	12.5	7.8	7.1	7.1	4.3	8.2	31.6	1199
Nigeria	World Bank	.0	.8	.9	1.4	2.4	4.0	9.3	10.4	12.0	9.3	6.3	6.3	36.8	2428
South Africa	World Bank	.0	2.1	1.8	2.5	3.9	5.8	10.5	6.7	5.0	3.6	2.4	2.7	53.0	2400
Tanzania	World Bank	.0	1.2	1.6	2.1	1.9	2.5	7.5	6.1	7.5	8.2	17.7	10.5	33.2	1223
Uganda	World Bank	.0	.9	1.2	1.8	2.9	4.4	7.2	6.8	7.0	9.2	7.3	13.3	38.1	2400
Zambia	World Bank	.0	.8	.8	1.5	3.2	4.9	7.2	6.4	7.3	6.4	4.4	12.3	44.8	1198
Cape Verde	World Bank	.2	.1	.3	.2	1.2	1.8	7.7	6.5	5.1	7.9	4.5	13.7	50.8	1268
Kenya	World Bank	.3	1.4	1.0	2.0	3.8	6.0	11.7	10.9	9.4	8.5	5.0	7.4	32.5	2398
Mozambique	World Bank	.5	2.1	.6	.4	1.4	1.6	2.6	2.6	3.0	3.2	2.3	13.6	66.2	1400
Senegal	World Bank	.6	1.8	.7	1.8	2.7	3.1	8.2	4.8	4.7	5.1	4.7	10.0	52.0	1200
Botswana	IMF	.0	1.0	.5	1.3	1.8	3.0	7.2	5.6	5.6	4.2	2.2	6.8	60.8	1200
Ghana	IMF	.0	.6	.9	1.3	2.4	3.5	6.5	5.6	5.8	5.4	4.0	5.5	58.4	1200
Lesotho	IMF	.0	.2	.2	.6	.2	.8	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.8	4.1	87.1	1200
Malawi	IMF	.2	1.4	.8	1.0	1.9	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.2	4.0	2.5	17.5	55.6	1200
Mali	IMF	.0	2.6	.5	1.2	2.0	3.6	8.4	6.5	6.3	5.5	2.7	17.2	43.5	1283
Namibia	IMF	.2	.6	1.2	4.3	5.1	8.1	12.4	8.5	7.8	6.8	4.6	6.6	33.9	1199
Nigeria	IMF	.0	1.1	1.1	1.6	2.3	4.0	8.3	9.5	13.1	10.3	5.7	4.0	39.2	2428
South Africa	IMF	.0	2.6	1.5	2.7	3.3	5.3	7.1	5.1	6.5	3.1	1.7	2.2	58.8	2400
Tanzania	IMF	.0	1.7	1.8	2.6	1.8	4.2	6.4	5.7	6.7	7.2	3.8	9.1	49.1	1223
Uganda	IMF	.0	1.2	1.5	2.5	2.7	3.9	5.8	6.5	7.0	6.7	5.3	6.7	50.2	2400
Zambia	IMF	.0	1.1	1.1	2.8	3.8	5.8	7.8	5.8	6.1	6.2	3.5	7.1	49.0	1198
Cape Verde	IMF	.1	.2	.5	.6	1.7	3.2	7.4	4.2	5.2	6.1	4.8	8.8	57.3	1268
Kenya	IMF	.2	1.2	1.3	2.1	4.2	5.8	11.8	10.7	9.5	7.9	4.0	6.6	34.8	2398
Mozambique	IMF	.4	2.3	.6	.6	.9	1.8	2.4	1.6	2.6	1.9	1.6	10.2	73.1	1400
Senegal	IMF	.5	1.8	.9	1.6	2.6	3.5	5.9	4.2	5.2	6.0	2.8	6.7	58.3	1200
Botswana	WTO	.0	.8	.4	2.1	2.1	3.0	7.4	6.4	4.5	3.5	2.7	7.0	60.1	1200
Ghana	WTO	.0	.8	.8	1.2	1.7	5.0	6.0	4.2	3.3	3.9	3.0	4.4	65.7	1200
Lesotho	WTO	.0	.3	.2	.5	.3	.4	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.5	3.7	88.8	1200
Malawi	WTO	.1	2.5	.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.8	2.1	2.2	2.4	1.8	15.0	64.3	1200

Mali	WTO	.0	2.0	.5	1.6	2.2	4.1	8.0	5.9	3.7	5.5	2.9	13.9	49.7	1283
Namibia	WTO	.3	.8	1.6	3.2	5.3	7.1	12.1	10.4	8.8	7.3	4.5	6.8	32.0	1199
Nigeria	WTO	.0	.7	.7	1.1	2.0	3.4	7.9	9.4	11.8	8.9	7.6	5.5	40.9	2428
South Africa	WTO	.0	2.1	1.8	2.4	2.7	5.0	8.9	5.5	6.4	3.9	1.9	2.8	56.7	2400
Tanzania	WTO	.0	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.6	2.5	6.7	4.3	5.9	5.3	2.9	6.6	57.2	1223
Uganda	WTO	.0	1.7	1.9	3.0	3.5	4.7	6.4	5.0	6.0	5.6	2.8	4.7	54.7	2400
Zambia	WTO	.0	1.2	1.6	2.5	2.8	3.9	6.6	4.8	5.4	4.0	2.3	5.5	59.3	1198
Cape Verde	WTO	.0	.2	.4	.5	1.8	2.9	8.2	4.3	5.2	5.8	3.4	8.0	59.2	1268
Kenya	WTO	.3	1.7	1.3	2.7	4.3	6.9	9.7	8.6	6.3	5.0	2.2	4.8	46.1	2398
Mozambique	WTO	.1	1.5	.9	1.1	.6	.9	3.3	1.7	1.9	2.2	1.8	9.1	74.9	1400
Senegal	WTO	.7	1.7	.5	1.2	2.7	2.2	7.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	2.6	5.6	64.7	1200

Table 94. *Latinobarometro (2000-2005)*: Opinion about the USA (in percentages)

		No opinion	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad	DK	N
Argentina	2000		10.7	53.6	30.8	4.9		1162
	2001		9.3	50.2	32.0	8.5		1047
	2002		5.4	32.9	36.8	18.4		1199
	2003	.0	2.6	27.7	40.1	21.8	7.9	1200
	2005	1.4	5.5	26.2	31.7	27.7	7.6	1200
Bolivia	2000		16.1	64.6	16.3	3.0		1022
	2001		15.4	64.3	17.5	2.8		936
	2002		11.4	43.9	27.2	7.9		1243
	2003	.5	9.5	35.6	30.1	12.7	11.7	1201
	2005	2.5	6.8	43.2	29.3	9.9	8.2	1200
Brazil	2000		11.1	66.9	17.8	4.2		977
	2001		16.9	65.0	14.0	4.1		824
	2002		5.1	48.7	30.0	6.9		1000
	2003	1.7	8.3	42.0	30.7	10.8	6.4	1201
	2005	1.3	8.1	45.0	26.5	9.6	9.4	1204
Chile	2000		12.0	63.5	22.1	2.4		1147
	2001		17.7	61.6	17.6	3.2		1075
	2002		10.7	59.1	19.8	3.4		1197
	2003	2.1	3.9	54.1	26.7	9.8	3.5	1200
	2005	2.6	8.6	48.8	25.3	10.1	4.6	1200
Colombia	2000		19.2	63.1	15.5	2.2		1132
	2001		27.4	60.3	10.3	2.1		1012
	2002		22.2	53.7	11.2	2.7		1200
	2003	.2	10.5	58.0	17.5	7.1	6.8	1199
	2005	.3	14.7	55.1	17.6	5.8	6.6	1200
Costa Rica	2000		40.6	51.5	6.4	1.4		910
	2001		30.6	63.8	3.7	1.9		860
	2002		24.4	59.6	6.7	1.8		1006
	2003	1.3	14.7	60.4	12.7	5.5	5.5	1003
	2005	1.6	20.3	54.7	10.8	6.0	6.6	1000
Dominican republic	2005	3.8	31.2	42.4	10.8	4.5	7.3	1000
Ecuador	2000		25.3	61.5	11.5	1.7		1098
	2001		31.7	56.1	10.0	2.2		1068
	2002		31.2	53.8	9.4	1.1		1200
	2003	.0	16.5	51.6	20.7	6.1	5.2	1200
	2005	.6	16.4	49.7	16.2	6.2	10.8	1200
El Salvador	2000		54.7	41.4	2.8	1.1		950

	2001	28.7	64.6	5.6	1.1		876
	2002	29.7	53.9	5.1	2.0		1014
	2003 1.4	24.2	56.0	8.1	2.6	7.6	1007
	2005 1.3	25.7	54.9	10.9	2.7	4.6	1010
Guatemala	2000	22.3	65.3	10.8	1.6		920
	2001	14.5	74.1	9.8	1.6		889
	2002	22.3	57.5	10.8	2.0		1001
	2003 1.8	13.6	53.9	8.3	2.4	20.0	1006
	2005 1.7	18.0	58.8	13.1	3.6	4.8	1000
Honduras	2000	40.2	55.3	3.6	.9		931
	2001	32.6	59.2	5.0	3.2		939
	2002	41.7	47.0	4.1	1.7		1003
	2003 1.2	26.4	53.7	10.3	2.1	6.3	1006
	2005 .9	34.7	52.5	6.8	2.3	2.8	1000
Mexico	2000	24.4	50.9	17.5	7.2		1125
	2001	17.5	57.2	17.6	7.6		1220
	2002	16.8	46.5	25.8	8.6		1211
	2003 1.3	4.8	36.0	34.4	23.1	.3	1199
	2005 1.1	10.7	42.2	30.1	14.3	1.7	1200
Nicaragua	2000	24.6	68.6	6.2	.6		990
	2001	36.5	56.3	6.0	1.1		961
	2002	32.6	51.8	6.8	2.9		1016
	2003 2.3	20.0	49.5	12.5	5.9	9.9	1011
	2005 3.3	17.1	50.8	13.0	5.1	10.7	1000
Panama	2000	24.5	66.2	8.5	.8		900
	2001	29.3	51.8	14.4	4.5		921
	2002	53.4	35.7	3.0	1.0		1010
	2003 3.3	27.3	52.6	7.7	2.9	6.3	1004
	2005 1.4	25.8	57.6	8.3	1.8	5.1	1008
Paraguay	2000	14.4	65.8	.0	19.8		602
	2001	23.8	61.1	11.3	3.8		558
	2002	10.1	60.2	22.1	4.2		601
	2003 .0	5.7	44.1	30.1	12.9	7.3	599
	2005 .5	6.9	41.5	27.0	9.2	14.8	1200
Peru	2000	13.8	72.5	12.3	1.5		989
	2001	17.6	68.4	10.9	3.2		854
	2002	20.2	54.6	13.9	2.0		1223
	2003 1.1	14.7	54.0	19.9	5.1	5.2	1200
	2005 1.3	14.6	56.2	14.9	5.4	7.6	1200
Uruguay	2000	7.8	61.4	25.2	5.5		1161

Venezuela	2001	9.3	59.1	25.4	6.3		1021
	2002	4.6	46.3	27.2	6.7		1186
	2003	.6	5.3	40.5	27.5	16.6	9.5 1201
	2005	2.8	4.1	33.9	27.2	19.0	12.9 1200
	2000	27.1	59.9	10.7	2.3		1050
	2001	22.8	54.7	16.5	5.9		1034
	2002	24.2	43.8	13.7	7.2		1213
	2003	2.5	18.9	40.0	21.2	10.7	6.7 1199
	2005	4.1	11.2	29.4	27.5	18.8	9.0 1200

Table 95. *Latinobarometro (2000-2005)*: Opinion about the EU (in percentages)

		No opinion	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad	DK	N
Argentina	2000		17.9	70.2	10.6	1.3		1162
	2001		15.8	68.3	14.3	1.5		859
	2003	.0	6.2	44.0	15.1	3.8	31.0	1200
	2005	1.8	7.2	46.1	17.2	8.3	19.3	1200
Bolivia	2000		19.1	72.4	6.8	1.8		1022
	2001		19.4	70.4	8.1	2.1		712
	2003	.8	5.6	38.3	15.3	3.0	37.0	1201
	2005	2.4	7.3	51.8	14.8	3.2	20.4	1200
Brazil	2000		11.8	74.8	11.4	2.0		977
	2001		11.8	69.7	14.9	3.6		663
	2003	3.8	4.6	47.2	16.4	3.7	24.4	1199
	2005	2.5	6.1	48.0	17.6	4.1	21.7	1204
Chile	2000		14.1	71.6	12.5	1.7		1147
	2001		17.9	70.2	10.4	1.4		910
	2003	2.3	7.8	58.3	13.1	1.1	17.4	1200
	2005	2.2	15.1	61.4	8.0	1.3	11.9	1200
Colombia	2000		27.9	64.3	6.8	1.1		1132
	2001		20.8	64.7	10.9	3.6		742
	2003	1.1	9.1	46.8	8.7	2.1	32.2	1201
	2005	.8	12.2	54.2	12.2	1.3	19.2	1200
Costa Rica	2000		32.2	61.5	6.0	.3		910
	2001		22.8	65.5	8.1	3.6		615
	2003	1.7	6.6	39.0	6.2	1.0	45.5	1002
	2005	5.5	12.0	43.9	10.9	1.9	25.8	1000
Dominican Republic	2005	6.2	22.3	44.4	6.1	2.5	18.5	1000
Ecuador	2000		21.2	68.0	9.7	1.2		1098
	2001		27.8	62.2	8.7	1.3		904
	2003	.3	10.3	48.0	15.4	3.6	22.4	1199
	2005	1.0	13.6	48.2	11.2	2.5	23.6	1200
El Salvador	2000		46.7	46.7	5.4	1.2		950
	2001		27.6	63.0	6.7	2.7		733
	2003	1.6	9.7	40.1	5.8	1.9	40.9	1007
	2005	3.5	17.1	43.5	7.3	2.4	26.2	1010
Guatemala	2000		28.8	63.4	5.8	1.9		920
	2001		15.2	78.4	5.2	1.2		770
	2003	4.0	9.4	40.2	5.1	1.3	40.1	1006
	2005	3.6	12.3	53.8	9.4	1.3	19.6	1000



Honduras	2000		41.5	54.2	3.5	.8		931
	2001		29.5	65.6	3.7	1.3		767
	2003	3.5	12.2	28.7	3.1	.7	51.8	1006
	2005	1.4	21.7	41.1	4.7	2.0	29.1	1000
Mexico	2000		14.8	57.3	19.3	8.6		1125
	2001		25.0	61.9	11.0	2.1		1145
	2003	1.3	9.1	51.3	17.0	3.6	17.7	1200
	2005	6.1	11.8	58.0	11.8	2.9	9.3	1200
Nicaragua	2000		39.8	58.8	1.3	.2		990
	2001		36.7	59.5	3.1	.7		921
	2003	2.6	13.4	43.4	7.7	2.0	31.0	1011
	2005	4.3	15.6	45.0	8.3	2.5	24.3	1000
Panama	2000		24.6	66.2	8.3	.9		900
	2001		22.2	57.5	14.2	6.1		781
	2003	6.1	9.3	40.5	9.2	3.3	31.7	1004
	2005	2.3	6.7	45.4	7.3	2.7	35.5	1008
Paraguay	2000		20.1	72.8	5.9	1.2		602
	2001		18.7	74.0	5.9	1.4		427
	2003	.0	8.7	51.0	10.5	3.3	26.5	600
	2005	.5	7.2	45.9	8.8	2.4	35.2	1200
Peru	2000		21.6	71.1	6.0	1.3		989
	2001		19.1	70.8	7.4	2.6		658
	2003	2.1	6.8	50.8	11.1	1.8	27.5	1200
	2005	1.9	12.2	50.5	9.5	2.3	23.5	1200
Uruguay	2000		11.8	77.4	9.6	1.2		1161
	2001		13.1	74.7	10.2	2.0		871
	2003	.8	5.6	47.0	13.7	4.3	28.7	1200
	2005	2.8	5.5	55.3	13.3	3.1	20.0	1200
Venezuela	2000		28.4	62.9	7.7	1.0		1050
	2001		25.2	59.5	11.3	4.0		935
	2003	5.5	13.8	39.5	15.2	7.3	18.7	1201
	2005	4.9	17.4	48.2	7.8	4.1	17.6	1200

Table 96. *Latinobarometro (2002)*: Opinion about and knowledge of the EU (in percentages)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very good	Never heard	N
Argentina	5.0	1.7	2.6	3.4	10.9	7.0	6.0	6.7	3.2	4.7	48.8	963
Bolivia	3.4	1.5	1.6	2.2	6.6	1.6	2.1	2.3	1.7	4.5	72.6	1153
Brazil	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.6	9.2	3.9	4.8	5.2	1.4	3.5	63.5	912
Colombia	1.4	.7	1.5	1.3	4.0	2.9	2.1	3.9	2.2	3.8	76.2	1105
Costa Rica	.7	1.1	1.4	1.5	3.1	2.3	3.3	7.6	2.7	5.9	70.5	918
Chile	1.4	1.2	3.0	7.1	11.4	10.7	6.1	6.1	2.0	3.5	47.5	1033
Ecuador El	1.0	1.2	.7	3.4	4.7	3.9	3.6	3.2	1.2	2.9	74.1	1048
Salvador	.1	.1	.4	1.1	4.3	3.6	3.4	6.2	4.2	4.6	71.9	948
Guatemala	.2	.9	.6	.6	8.7	3.4	4.1	6.6	3.1	11.6	60.1	850
Honduras	1.2	.5	.5	1.5	7.4	1.4	2.3	3.8	2.7	22.6	55.9	733
Mexico	2.4	.8	.3	1.7	6.3	4.5	5.4	7.3	5.2	10.2	55.7	1145
Nicaragua	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.6	5.0	3.0	4.3	8.7	5.5	32.5	35.7	739
Panama	1.7	.6	1.6	1.3	2.7	.7	1.1	1.7	1.0	5.9	81.7	827
Paraguay	.6	.6	2.0	2.0	9.6	4.2	4.4	5.3	3.7	8.3	59.3	543
Peru	1.3	1.3	2.0	2.1	5.9	3.1	3.0	3.3	1.8	4.0	72.4	1107
Uruguay	1.4	2.1	3.0	3.2	12.7	7.4	3.2	6.1	2.3	4.5	54.1	867
Venezuela	1.6	1.0	2.0	.9	5.6	3.0	3.6	4.1	3.2	13.1	61.8	1118

Table 97. *Latinobarometro (2002)*: Knowledge of international institutions: NAFTA, EU, WTO (in percentages)

		<b>Not mentioned</b>	<b>Mentioned</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	NAFTA	49.9	50.1	1162
Bolivia	NAFTA	47.3	52.7	1022
Brazil	NAFTA	34.3	65.7	977
Colombia	NAFTA	53.0	47.0	1132
Costa Rica	NAFTA	54.8	45.2	910
Chile	NAFTA	58.4	41.6	1147
Ecuador	NAFTA	52.8	47.2	1098
El Salvador	NAFTA	46.6	53.4	950
Guatemala	NAFTA	65.1	34.9	920
Honduras	NAFTA	63.1	36.9	931
Mexico	NAFTA	72.5	27.5	1125
Nicaragua	NAFTA	55.3	44.7	990
Panama	NAFTA	52.9	47.1	900
Paraguay	NAFTA	57.5	42.5	602
Peru	NAFTA	50.1	49.9	989
Uruguay	NAFTA	53.0	47.0	1161
Venezuela	NAFTA	43.3	56.7	1050
Argentina	EU	54.9	45.1	1162
Bolivia	EU	44.1	55.9	1022
Brazil	EU	43.2	56.8	977
Colombia	EU	50.0	50.0	1132
Costa Rica	EU	41.7	58.3	910
Chile	EU	45.7	54.3	1147
Ecuador	EU	48.8	51.2	1098
El Salvador	EU	49.5	50.5	950
Guatemala	EU	63.3	36.7	920
Honduras	EU	61.1	38.9	931
Mexico	EU	35.0	65.0	1125
Nicaragua	EU	60.6	39.4	990
Panama	EU	51.6	48.4	900
Paraguay	EU	60.2	39.8	602
Peru	EU	50.9	49.1	989
Uruguay	EU	65.2	34.8	1161
Venezuela	EU	43.3	56.7	1050

Argentina	WTO	37.9	62.1	1162
Bolivia	WTO	31.2	68.8	1022
Brazil	WTO	38.5	61.5	977
Colombia	WTO	40.5	59.5	1132
Costa Rica	WTO	45.1	54.9	910
Chile	WTO	36.8	63.2	1147
Ecuador	WTO	42.7	57.3	1098
El Salvador	WTO	38.7	61.3	950
Guatemala	WTO	46.2	53.8	920
Honduras	WTO	47.2	52.8	931
Mexico	WTO	27.2	72.8	1125
Nicaragua	WTO	36.4	63.6	990
Panama	WTO	54.8	45.2	900
Paraguay	WTO	45.3	54.7	602
Peru	WTO	40.1	59.9	989
Uruguay	WTO	43.4	56.6	1161
Venezuela	WTO	38.1	61.9	1050

Table 98. *Latinobarometro (2003)*: Knowledge of international institutions: FTAA, IMF, World Bank, InterAmerican Bank, UN, OEA (in percentages)

		<b>Not mentioned</b>	<b>Mentioned</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	FTAA	66.9	33.1	1200
Bolivia	FTAA	81.2	18.8	1075
Brazil	FTAA	76.3	23.7	1000
Colombia	FTAA	90.5	9.5	1199
Costa Rica	FTAA	84.1	15.9	1000
Chile	FTAA	72.0	28.0	1174
Ecuador	FTAA	74.2	25.8	1200
El Salvador	FTAA	85.5	14.5	1000
Guatemala	FTAA	84.3	15.7	1002
Honduras	FTAA	83.1	16.9	1000
Mexico	FTAA	83.3	16.7	1253
Nicaragua	FTAA	84.6	15.4	1005
Panama	FTAA	85.0	15.0	1000
Paraguay	FTAA	79.1	20.9	604
Peru	FTAA	88.7	11.3	1023
Uruguay	FTAA	67.0	33.0	1200
Venezuela	FTAA	80.1	19.9	1200
Argentina	IMF	33.2	66.8	1200
Bolivia	IMF	53.4	46.6	1075
Brazil	IMF	53.0	47.0	1000
Colombia	IMF	80.9	19.1	1199
Costa Rica	IMF	73.2	26.8	1000
Chile	IMF	67.8	32.2	1174
Ecuador	IMF	48.4	51.6	1200
El Salvador	IMF	82.4	17.6	1000
Guatemala	IMF	74.5	25.5	1002
Honduras	IMF	58.6	41.4	1000
Mexico	IMF	63.4	36.6	1253
Nicaragua	IMF	66.2	33.8	1005
Panama	IMF	77.5	22.5	1000
Paraguay	IMF	61.1	38.9	604
Peru	IMF	45.8	54.2	1023
Uruguay	IMF	37.3	62.7	1200
Venezuela	IMF	58.8	41.2	1200

Argentina	World Bank	46.5	53.5	1200
Bolivia	World Bank	48.2	51.8	1075
Brazil	World Bank	57.2	42.8	1000
Colombia	World Bank	79.4	20.6	1199
Costa Rica	World Bank	72.8	27.2	1000
Chile	World Bank	60.3	39.7	1174
Ecuador	World Bank	55.7	44.3	1200
El Salvador	World Bank	80.0	20.0	1000
Guatemala	World Bank	67.6	32.4	1002
Honduras	World Bank	51.7	48.3	1000
Mexico	World Bank	59.3	40.7	1253
Nicaragua	World Bank	52.3	47.7	1005
Panama	World Bank	71.1	28.9	1000
Paraguay	World Bank	57.6	42.4	604
Peru	World Bank	48.7	51.3	1023
Uruguay	World Bank	45.5	54.5	1200
Venezuela	World Bank	61.5	38.5	1200
Argentina	InterAm Bank	63.2	36.8	1200
Bolivia	InterAm Bank	56.8	43.2	1075
Brazil	InterAm Bank	71.8	28.2	1000
Colombia	InterAm Bank	85.7	14.3	1199
Costa Rica	InterAm Bank	72.0	28.0	1000
Chile	InterAm Bank	59.4	40.6	1174
Ecuador	InterAm Bank	59.9	40.1	1200
El Salvador	InterAm Bank	79.6	20.4	1000
Guatemala	InterAm Bank	70.9	29.1	1002
Honduras	InterAm Bank	53.7	46.3	1000
Mexico	InterAm Bank	70.9	29.1	1253

	Bank			
	InterAm			
Nicaragua	Bank	52.0	48.0	1005
	InterAm			
Panama	Bank	69.9	30.1	1000
	InterAm			
Paraguay	Bank	57.0	43.0	604
	InterAm			
Peru	Bank	52.6	47.4	1023
	InterAm			
Uruguay	Bank	38.2	61.8	1200
	InterAm			
Venezuela	Bank	63.7	36.3	1200
Argentina	UN	36.9	63.1	1200
Bolivia	UN	41.7	58.3	1075
Brazil	UN	48.9	51.1	1000
Colombia	UN	59.8	40.2	1199
Costa Rica	UN	47.5	52.5	1000
Chile	UN	36.0	64.0	1174
Ecuador	UN	43.3	56.7	1200
El	UN			
Salvador		62.1	37.9	1000
	UN			
Guatemala	UN	46.9	53.1	1002
Honduras	UN	49.4	50.6	1000
Mexico	UN	32.2	67.8	1253
Nicaragua	UN	45.1	54.9	1005
Panama	UN	46.2	53.8	1000
Paraguay	UN	45.5	54.5	604
Peru	UN	31.2	68.8	1023
Uruguay	UN	28.9	71.1	1200
Venezuela	UN	50.3	49.7	1200
Argentina	OEA	47.4	52.6	1200
Bolivia	OEA	45.0	55.0	1075
Brazil	OEA	71.6	28.4	1000
Colombia	OEA	60.1	39.9	1199
Costa Rica	OEA	53.5	46.5	1000
Chile	OEA	41.6	58.4	1174
Ecuador	OEA	46.4	53.6	1200
El	OEA			
Salvador		67.7	32.3	1000
	OEA			
Guatemala	OEA	57.8	42.2	1002
Honduras	OEA	52.4	47.6	1000
Mexico	OEA	63.2	36.8	1253
Nicaragua	OEA	45.8	54.2	1005

Panama	OEA	45.0	55.0	1000
Paraguay	OEA	44.5	55.5	604
Peru	OEA	30.9	69.1	1023
Uruguay	OEA	36.8	63.2	1200
Venezuela	OEA	50.3	49.7	1200



Table 99. *Latinobarometro* (2003, 2005): Opinion about Spain (in percentages)

		No opinion	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad	DK	N
Argentina	2003	.0	9.3	52.9	15.7	3.3	18.8	1200
	2005	1.8	14.8	53.2	11.2	4.2	14.8	1200
Bolivia	2003	1.3	6.8	46.9	15.2	3.8	26.0	1201
	2005	2.5	8.7	55.8	14.4	3.3	15.3	1200
Brazil	2003	4.2	4.9	55.0	10.2	3.1	22.6	1199
	2005	3.2	7.1	53.2	12.1	3.5	20.8	1204
Chile	2003	2.7	6.7	58.8	18.9	2.9	10.0	1200
	2005	2.3	13.9	56.1	16.8	3.0	7.8	1200
Colombia	2003	.6	9.0	55.8	10.0	3.7	20.9	1201
	2005	.8	12.0	60.8	9.8	.9	15.8	1200
Costa Rica	2003	1.9	5.8	45.5	7.2	2.9	36.7	1002
	2005	7.1	9.9	50.4	5.7	2.4	24.5	1000
Dominican Republic	2005	6.3	27.0	46.1	4.8	2.4	13.4	1000
Ecuador	2003	.1	17.0	51.5	17.4	6.0	8.0	1199
	2005	.8	16.1	55.8	9.8	3.4	14.2	1200
El Salvador	2003	2.4	11.2	39.6	4.2	2.2	40.5	1007
	2005	3.8	15.8	44.2	6.7	2.7	26.8	1010
Guatemala	2003	7.2	9.0	37.3	5.8	2.3	38.5	1006
	2005	3.7	14.2	49.7	9.7	1.6	21.1	1000
Honduras	2003	2.7	14.1	41.1	3.0	1.1	38.1	1006
	2005	1.3	28.9	40.6	2.7	1.6	24.9	1000
Mexico	2003	1.3	3.8	49.2	25.6	5.6	14.5	1200
	2005	7.0	8.9	52.4	16.3	4.8	10.6	1200
Nicaragua	2003	2.7	10.1	44.8	9.2	3.1	30.2	1011
	2005	5.0	13.8	45.1	6.6	2.2	27.3	1000
Panama	2003	6.6	9.9	46.2	7.7	3.1	26.6	1004
	2005	2.7	7.2	47.9	6.0	1.8	34.4	1008
Paraguay	2003	.0	17.3	53.8	6.5	1.2	21.2	600
	2005	.2	15.8	52.7	6.0	1.6	23.8	1200
Peru	2003	1.5	9.9	54.5	14.4	3.8	15.8	1200
	2005	1.8	11.4	53.1	10.8	2.8	20.2	1200
Uruguay	2003	.8	10.6	60.6	8.2	2.2	17.6	1200
	2005	2.6	10.2	56.4	11.2	1.8	17.8	1200
Venezuela	2003	5.9	13.2	34.9	17.6	11.9	16.4	1201
	2005	4.5	23.8	46.2	7.1	3.2	15.2	1200

Table 100. *Latinobarometro* (2003, 2005): Opinion about own country's relations with the USA (in percentages)

		No opinion	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad	DK	N
Argentina	2003	.6	1.3	42.8	32.6	7.2	15.5	1200
	2005	.8	5.5	48.6	22.5	6.8	15.8	1200
Bolivia	2003	.6	12.8	44.4	21.2	9.0	12.0	1201
	2005	.0	11.6	49.8	19.3	7.2	12.1	1200
Brazil	2003	1.7	10.0	63.2	12.9	4.2	8.0	1199
	2005	1.2	10.0	57.9	12.7	4.7	13.5	1204
Chile	2003	1.5	11.2	69.8	8.5	.7	8.4	1200
	2005	1.1	11.5	71.2	6.8	.9	8.5	1200
Colombia	2003	.5	17.8	58.5	13.7	2.7	6.8	1201
	2005	.2	34.8	51.2	6.6	2.2	4.9	1200
Costa Rica	2003	.8	14.1	68.3	5.5	1.5	9.9	1002
	2005	1.3	31.5	49.6	5.0	1.6	11.0	1000
Dominican Republic	2005	3.3	43.4	36.3	5.0	2.9	9.1	1000
Ecuador	2003	.3	20.1	54.0	15.6	4.2	5.8	1199
	2005	.6	11.9	54.0	13.8	4.9	14.8	1200
El Salvador	2003	1.3	28.1	51.1	7.0	3.1	9.4	1007
	2005	.9	49.9	39.1	3.3	1.7	5.1	1010
Guatemala	2003	3.5	11.3	49.1	11.8	1.8	22.5	1006
	2005	1.9	25.9	56.6	7.3	1.7	6.6	1000
Honduras	2003	.7	23.5	55.7	10.3	1.6	8.3	1006
	2005	.5	54.0	36.6	2.0	2.4	4.5	1000
Mexico	2003	.2	10.9	46.5	31.7	7.8	2.8	1200
	2005	1.8	13.5	49.2	23.6	10.6	1.2	1200
Nicaragua	2003	1.1	20.0	56.6	10.3	2.2	9.8	1011
	2005	2.2	27.9	43.9	8.1	4.6	13.3	1000
Panama	2003	2.8	23.7	54.2	7.9	2.4	9.1	1004
	2005	1.1	29.4	56.2	4.1	1.3	7.9	1008
Paraguay	2003	.3	8.0	54.0	24.2	3.8	9.7	600
	2005	.5	10.4	54.0	9.5	2.6	23.0	1200
Peru	2003	.5	17.5	55.1	15.3	4.6	7.0	1200
	2005	.9	25.8	49.7	7.7	5.1	10.8	1200
Uruguay	2003	.4	10.7	70.1	8.7	2.6	7.6	1200
	2005	1.5	7.4	59.3	13.0	5.3	13.4	1200
Venezuela	2003	2.1	14.2	34.6	27.3	11.3	10.5	1201
	2005	2.2	5.9	15.3	39.8	27.7	9.1	1200

Table 101. *Latinobarometro (2003, 2005)*: Opinion about own country's relations with the EU (in percentages)

		No opinion	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad	DK	N
Argentina	2003	.7	2.6	46.1	13.7	2.3	34.7	1200
	2005	1.3	8.1	51.7	11.2	2.9	24.8	1200
Bolivia	2003	1.0	6.8	37.8	13.7	3.6	37.2	1201
	2005	.2	10.2	53.3	8.6	1.8	25.8	1200
Brazil	2003	2.8	6.9	50.7	12.2	2.8	24.8	1199
	2005	2.1	7.9	51.8	11.2	3.2	23.8	1204
Chile	2003	1.6	10.3	61.6	5.3	.6	20.8	1200
	2005	1.1	20.0	62.0	2.8	.2	13.9	1200
Colombia	2003	1.8	7.3	44.7	8.2	1.2	36.8	1201
	2005	.7	17.2	50.4	9.3	1.9	20.5	1200
Costa Rica	2003	1.5	3.3	39.8	7.4	.6	47.5	1002
	2005	6.6	14.8	38.3	6.9	2.7	30.7	1000
Dominican Republic	2005	4.8	31.1	38.9	5.2	2.7	17.3	1000
Ecuador	2003	2.4	9.5	50.0	14.9	3.2	20.0	1199
	2005	1.2	11.1	46.3	10.0	2.8	28.7	1200
El Salvador	2003	1.6	12.3	36.7	6.5	1.2	41.7	1007
	2005	3.8	28.1	35.8	4.3	2.8	25.2	1010
Guatemala	2003	6.0	7.5	39.0	8.0	1.6	38.1	1006
	2005	4.0	19.1	50.3	5.9	1.6	19.1	1000
Honduras	2003	2.9	11.4	30.8	4.0	.6	50.2	1006
	2005	1.2	35.4	29.1	2.8	2.0	29.5	1000
Mexico	2003	1.0	12.0	50.6	17.3	4.2	14.9	1200
	2005	6.8	9.4	59.7	13.3	2.3	8.5	1200
Nicaragua	2003	.9	12.2	47.6	7.8	.9	30.6	1011
	2005	3.2	24.5	38.6	4.6	3.1	26.0	1000
Panama	2003	5.9	7.9	41.6	10.1	2.9	31.7	1004
	2005	2.3	7.2	46.2	5.1	2.0	37.2	1008
Paraguay	2003	.8	7.8	55.5	9.2	1.0	25.7	600
	2005	.8	8.5	46.2	4.4	.9	39.2	1200
Peru	2003	1.2	8.7	42.9	11.1	4.1	32.1	1200
	2005	2.1	18.2	41.9	7.5	3.4	26.9	1200
Uruguay	2003	.6	7.2	58.7	8.6	1.7	23.3	1200
	2005	1.6	8.0	62.8	5.9	.9	20.8	1200
Venezuela	2003	3.2	11.2	34.8	21.1	9.9	19.8	1201
	2005	3.3	19.4	43.6	9.1	4.2	20.3	1200

Table 102. *Latinobarometro (2003, 2005)*: Opinion about own country's relations with Spain (in percentages)

		No opinion	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad	DK	N
Argentina	2003	.3	8.0	53.8	11.8	2.0	24.1	1200
	2005	1.2	16.3	54.5	7.8	2.0	18.2	1200
Bolivia	2003	1.4	10.9	44.5	12.5	4.1	26.5	1201
	2005	.2	11.0	55.6	9.2	2.8	21.2	1200
Brazil	2003	3.7	8.5	49.8	11.8	2.5	23.8	1199
	2005	2.3	10.1	45.3	11.2	4.0	27.1	1204
Chile	2003	1.9	10.5	62.1	8.0	.8	16.7	1200
	2005	1.1	21.6	61.5	4.2	.7	11.0	1200
Colombia	2003	2.2	8.2	49.9	8.4	2.6	28.8	1201
	2005	.7	21.2	53.2	6.4	1.8	16.8	1200
Costa Rica	2003	2.4	4.3	45.1	6.0	1.0	41.3	1002
	2005	6.6	16.7	37.0	5.8	2.8	31.1	1000
Dominican Republic	2005	4.2	32.8	42.6	3.7	2.7	14.0	1000
Ecuador	2003	.2	17.2	50.3	16.7	5.9	9.7	1199
	2005	.9	16.9	53.5	8.3	2.9	17.4	1200
El Salvador	2003	1.9	15.5	36.8	4.3	1.0	40.5	1007
	2005	3.5	29.0	36.4	4.0	2.0	25.1	1010
Guatemala	2003	7.0	7.6	39.3	6.9	2.3	37.1	1006
	2005	3.9	19.6	47.6	5.7	2.1	21.1	1000
Honduras	2003	2.6	15.2	42.6	3.9	.6	35.1	1006
	2005	1.3	42.2	27.8	2.5	1.1	25.1	1000
Mexico	2003	.5	13.2	54.4	15.4	3.8	12.7	1200
	2005	7.5	13.7	52.5	11.0	5.3	10.0	1200
Nicaragua	2003	1.0	9.8	47.3	8.2	1.5	32.2	1011
	2005	3.5	21.9	38.7	4.7	2.9	28.3	1000
Panama	2003	5.9	7.7	47.2	7.9	2.8	28.6	1004
	2005	2.5	10.5	45.7	4.2	1.0	36.1	1008
Paraguay	2003	.7	15.4	59.1	3.5	1.0	20.4	600
	2005	.5	12.8	52.2	2.7	.9	30.9	1200
Peru	2003	.9	11.5	48.2	13.7	4.5	21.2	1200
	2005	1.7	20.2	41.7	7.1	4.2	25.1	1200
Uruguay	2003	.6	11.7	64.6	4.9	1.8	16.3	1200
	2005	1.6	9.5	60.7	8.5	1.2	18.6	1200
Venezuela	2003	3.7	9.4	33.7	20.3	14.0	18.9	1201
	2005	3.8	19.0	48.5	6.4	2.3	20.0	1200

Table 103. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Leaders which you admire: Juan Carlos (in percentages)

	Very bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very good	No answer	Doesn't know	N
Argentina	.0	1.9	1.2	2.2	3.2	13.3	8.1	11.5	6.9	2.1	3.2	2.6	43.8	1200
Bolivia	1.3	1.5	2.2	2.5	3.0	10.2	5.2	3.6	2.9	1.4	2.2	3.0	60.8	1200
Brazil	2.4	1.2	1.5	2.2	2.2	6.7	3.3	3.6	3.0	.5	.9	5.6	66.9	1204
Colombia	2.6	1.0	3.2	3.5	5.7	8.2	6.5	8.3	8.2	2.0	4.8	1.7	44.3	1200
Costa Rica	.9	.6	1.5	2.5	3.9	8.2	6.4	7.0	11.5	3.8	7.5	1.5	44.7	1000
Chile	1.6	1.9	1.8	5.4	6.2	16.7	10.2	8.9	5.1	2.5	4.5	3.5	31.8	1200
Ecuador El	1.3	.5	1.8	2.6	3.3	9.2	6.8	4.8	5.4	1.7	2.6	2.1	57.9	1200
Salvador	1.2	.2	.4	.9	.9	3.8	5.4	5.2	4.9	2.0	3.1	.9	71.2	1010
Guatemala	1.5	.6	2.0	1.7	2.3	6.8	3.7	2.9	3.3	1.1	1.6	1.3	71.2	1000
Honduras	.6	.3	.8	1.1	1.6	5.6	1.8	3.0	4.5	2.9	5.5	1.9	70.4	1000
Mexico	3.2	1.5	1.8	6.9	5.7	9.2	8.2	6.7	10.6	2.7	4.2	.2	39.1	1200
Nicaragua	1.4	1.0	.3	1.3	1.3	3.4	2.0	1.9	3.1	1.0	5.0	4.3	74.0	1000
Panama	2.6	1.7	.9	2.0	2.4	6.7	4.0	2.7	6.2	2.1	5.8	1.1	61.9	1008
Paraguay	.5	.8	1.1	1.8	1.8	7.3	3.6	5.0	5.8	1.8	4.0	.3	66.2	1200
Peru	1.7	.9	1.6	4.4	4.5	7.9	3.8	4.7	4.9	1.1	2.3	2.5	59.7	1200
Uruguay	2.9	1.7	2.4	3.8	4.2	14.9	8.1	6.2	8.0	2.9	9.8	1.8	33.3	1200
Venezuela	4.2	1.8	3.1	3.6	4.8	9.8	5.0	5.2	6.4	1.8	4.2	4.3	45.8	1200
Dominican Republic	3.0	3.1	2.7	1.8	2.4	4.3	3.9	2.1	4.1	1.9	6.6	3.6	60.5	1000

Table 104. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Leaders which you admire: Blair (in percentages)

	<b>Very bad</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>Doesn't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	13.9	9.8	6.1	6.3	5.5	9.6	4.5	3.2	1.5	.5	1.2	1.6	36.2	1200
Bolivia	2.3	1.8	2.4	2.7	2.8	3.9	1.5	2.1	.9	.2	.5	3.7	75.2	1200
Brazil	5.9	2.8	3.2	6.1	4.0	9.7	4.6	4.5	4.2	1.4	1.6	4.2	47.8	1204
Colombia	3.1	1.1	1.8	2.7	3.6	5.9	4.8	5.3	4.8	1.9	2.2	1.3	61.7	1200
Costa Rica	1.1	.9	1.6	1.2	2.4	4.8	4.4	5.3	4.4	2.5	2.8	.5	68.1	1000
Chile	2.6	3.8	4.0	6.5	9.4	16.6	9.3	6.4	4.4	1.0	1.6	3.4	30.9	1200
Ecuador El	1.2	1.0	1.7	3.1	2.6	6.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	1.2	.8	1.5	69.9	1200
Salvador	1.6	.3	.4	1.1	1.3	3.2	3.4	4.4	2.6	1.4	1.0	1.2	78.3	1010
Guatemala	1.4	1.2	.6	1.6	3.1	3.7	2.5	1.6	1.7	.4	.4	1.1	80.7	1000
Honduras	.9	.0	.6	.7	.7	2.0	1.6	1.6	1.8	.6	2.2	1.5	85.8	1000
Mexico	6.8	1.4	3.6	5.8	4.9	11.2	5.9	6.9	6.4	1.7	1.2	.2	43.9	1200
Nicaragua	3.5	.6	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.8	1.8	1.5	.5	.4	2.3	3.7	79.7	1000
Panama	1.7	.5	1.7	2.7	2.0	6.2	2.7	3.2	2.8	1.7	3.1	1.1	70.8	1008
Paraguay	2.4	.7	1.2	2.6	2.4	5.3	2.7	2.8	3.0	.8	1.0	.4	74.7	1200
Peru	1.8	.8	1.6	2.2	2.2	4.4	3.1	2.9	1.2	.6	.6	2.1	76.6	1200
Uruguay	14.6	4.8	6.3	5.2	5.2	9.5	4.2	3.2	3.0	.8	1.7	2.2	39.2	1200
Venezuela	7.4	2.8	3.1	4.2	4.9	8.5	3.8	4.0	2.7	.9	2.0	4.2	51.6	1200
Dominican Republic	3.8	1.9	2.5	3.1	2.1	4.7	2.1	2.2	1.9	.8	2.7	3.0	69.2	1000

Table 105. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Leaders which you admire: Bush (in percentages)

	Very bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very good	No answer	Doesn't know	N
Argentina	27.5	17.7	6.6	7.0	6.1	7.7	4.4	3.9	2.3	1.7	2.0	1.6	11.6	1200
Bolivia	6.9	4.3	5.2	5.8	6.4	14.1	7.5	5.9	5.2	1.7	3.1	2.5	31.4	1200
Brazil	22.3	5.2	5.6	6.8	5.7	11.3	4.7	4.0	4.9	2.0	3.8	2.0	21.7	1204
Colombia	4.8	3.1	3.9	4.8	4.9	10.9	8.7	10.4	12.6	6.5	9.3	1.8	18.2	1200
Costa Rica	5.3	1.9	2.3	4.5	5.1	12.9	7.8	10.0	16.0	7.0	10.8	1.3	15.1	1000
Chile	9.5	10.7	6.5	9.4	12.1	16.8	8.1	5.5	2.9	1.0	3.0	2.4	12.1	1200
Ecuador El	3.0	3.8	4.7	5.3	5.8	13.8	7.9	8.2	8.5	3.3	5.2	1.3	29.2	1200
Salvador	5.1	.9	1.6	1.4	3.8	8.8	7.4	11.0	12.7	6.6	9.9	2.0	28.8	1010
Guatemala	2.2	1.1	3.0	4.4	5.4	18.4	10.5	7.0	9.2	2.0	5.0	2.0	29.8	1000
Honduras	5.3	1.0	1.8	1.8	1.3	11.1	4.3	5.1	10.2	4.9	17.6	2.0	33.6	1000
Mexico	21.6	6.2	6.2	4.0	6.4	11.0	6.3	5.7	8.7	5.2	4.2	.2	14.3	1200
Nicaragua	9.0	3.2	2.1	3.4	2.1	10.4	3.0	4.2	7.4	3.3	13.6	3.2	35.1	1000
Panama	4.5	1.7	1.9	3.6	3.2	16.4	6.8	8.6	10.0	5.5	14.4	1.4	22.1	1008
Paraguay	5.8	5.4	3.5	4.8	4.2	12.4	4.2	6.0	5.1	1.2	4.7	.5	42.1	1200
Peru	4.7	2.2	3.2	4.4	6.8	14.8	7.8	7.2	8.4	4.3	4.7	1.5	30.1	1200
Uruguay	32.8	9.1	7.2	5.2	3.3	10.7	3.8	2.9	3.1	1.2	2.5	1.8	16.6	1200
Venezuela	22.3	4.9	5.6	8.0	5.7	7.2	4.2	3.9	4.0	1.3	4.2	3.2	25.4	1200
Dominican Republic	6.1	5.4	5.3	4.9	3.9	9.8	4.0	4.8	7.5	4.1	14.3	3.6	26.3	1000

Table 106. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Leaders which you admire: Schröder (in percentages)

	<b>Very bad</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>Doesn't know</b>	<b>N</b>
Argentina	2.8	1.6	1.2	1.9	1.8	4.2	2.6	1.3	1.2	.8	.8	2.2	77.7	1200
Bolivia	1.1	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.6	2.6	2.0	.9	.4	.2	.2	4.6	82.3	1200
Brazil	3.3	.9	1.8	2.3	1.9	4.7	2.7	1.8	1.2	.5	.5	5.9	72.4	1204
Colombia	2.8	.6	1.0	1.0	1.2	3.0	1.8	2.7	1.7	.2	.5	1.5	82.1	1200
Costa Rica	.5	.3	.7	1.0	.7	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.8	.3	.2	.6	89.2	1000
Chile	2.0	.8	.7	1.6	3.2	7.1	3.7	1.9	1.0	.3	.2	6.4	71.1	1200
Ecuador El	1.9	.6	.9	1.6	2.4	2.5	2.8	.8	1.3	.5	.5	2.2	81.8	1200
Salvador	.8	.1	.5	.2	1.4	3.0	1.8	2.2	.8	.6	.5	2.2	86.0	1010
Guatemala	1.5	.2	.3	1.0	1.2	1.5	.4	.9	.6	.3	.0	1.1	91.0	1000
Honduras	.6	.3	.4	.1	.1	1.1	.5	.2	.4	.1	1.4	1.4	93.4	1000
Mexico	2.0	.8	2.6	2.9	2.7	7.1	4.1	5.8	4.4	1.2	.5	.2	65.8	1200
Nicaragua	1.7	.5	.6	.5	.3	.5	.6	.9	.5	.2	1.0	3.9	88.8	1000
Panama	1.4	.4	.8	1.1	1.3	3.2	1.2	.8	1.0	.2	1.4	1.4	85.9	1008
Paraguay	1.0	.7	.8	1.0	.5	2.7	1.5	1.8	1.2	.3	.9	.6	87.1	1200
Peru	1.1	.4	.5	1.2	1.8	2.7	1.2	1.2	.3	.4	.2	2.3	86.7	1200
Uruguay	2.7	.8	2.8	2.6	2.1	4.8	2.0	1.4	.8	.2	.2	2.8	76.8	1200
Venezuela	5.1	2.3	2.1	3.6	4.1	6.7	3.2	2.7	2.1	.7	.9	5.3	61.3	1200
Dominican Republic	4.2	.5	1.6	1.5	1.1	1.7	.7	.7	1.1	.5	.5	4.5	81.4	1000



Table 107. *Latinobarometro (2005)*: Leaders which you admire: Zapatero (in percentages)

	Very bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very good	No answer	Doesn't know	N
Argentina	2.9	1.7	1.8	3.7	5.2	10.7	11.4	9.6	7.8	2.4	2.1	2.2	38.6	1200
Bolivia	.8	1.1	1.5	2.3	3.2	8.9	5.2	3.6	2.8	1.2	1.5	3.8	64.0	1200
Brazil	3.4	.9	2.1	2.7	2.1	3.8	2.0	2.1	.8	.3	.4	5.7	73.7	1204
Colombia	2.2	1.4	1.8	2.2	3.3	5.7	7.2	8.0	6.7	2.8	2.9	1.2	54.5	1200
Costa Rica	.5	1.0	1.1	2.3	2.3	3.8	3.8	4.2	3.6	1.6	1.3	.3	74.2	1000
Chile	1.6	1.2	1.6	2.7	6.6	15.5	8.2	5.8	3.2	1.8	1.0	4.6	46.4	1200
Ecuador El	1.1	.8	1.3	2.1	3.2	7.3	4.8	3.2	4.6	1.2	1.2	1.6	67.4	1200
Salvador	1.2	.1	.7	.9	1.0	3.7	4.6	4.8	4.6	1.1	2.1	1.8	73.7	1010
Guatemala	1.5	.4	.9	.7	1.1	2.2	2.1	1.1	1.6	.6	.2	1.1	86.5	1000
Honduras	.9	.2	.2	.7	1.1	2.4	2.1	2.3	1.5	1.1	2.7	1.5	83.3	1000
Mexico	2.7	1.4	.8	2.7	4.4	6.8	6.4	7.5	8.7	2.5	2.1	.2	53.8	1200
Nicaragua	1.2	.5	.8	.7	.6	3.1	1.0	1.1	1.6	.6	1.7	3.8	83.3	1000
Panama	1.3	.5	1.5	2.1	1.8	4.7	2.2	2.0	2.9	.9	1.5	1.3	77.5	1008
Paraguay	1.2	.2	1.0	1.7	1.5	5.9	3.2	4.6	3.4	1.1	2.0	.4	73.7	1200
Peru	1.0	.5	.8	1.6	2.2	4.0	2.6	2.2	2.1	.5	.2	1.9	80.4	1200
Uruguay	2.2	1.2	2.1	4.4	5.7	14.3	9.6	8.0	7.3	1.5	4.5	2.6	36.6	1200
Venezuela	2.6	1.2	1.9	3.4	4.3	12.8	7.6	6.2	6.8	2.7	7.6	3.7	39.3	1200
Dominican Republic	2.5	2.1	3.2	2.4	2.2	3.4	2.5	2.6	2.5	1.4	3.2	2.7	69.3	1000

## THE PROJECT

In an era of global flux, emerging powers and growing interconnectedness, transatlantic relations appear to have lost their bearings. As the international system fragments into different constellations of state and non-state powers across different policy domains, the US and the EU can no longer claim exclusive leadership in global governance. Traditional paradigms to understand the transatlantic relationship are thus wanting. A new approach is needed to pinpoint the direction transatlantic relations are taking. TRANSWORLD provides such an approach by a) ascertaining, differentiating among four policy domains (economic, security, environment, and human rights/democracy), whether transatlantic relations are drifting apart, adapting along an ad hoc cooperation-based pattern, or evolving into a different but resilient special partnership; b) assessing the role of a re-defined transatlantic relationship in the global governance architecture; c) providing tested policy recommendations on how the US and the EU could best cooperate to enhance the viability, effectiveness, and accountability of governance structures.

## CONSORTIUM

Mainly funded under the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme, TRANSWORLD is carried out by a consortium of 13 academic and research centres from the EU, the US and Turkey:

Istituto Affari Internazionali, *Coordinator*  
German Marshall Fund of the United States  
University of Edinburgh  
Free University of Berlin  
Fondation Nationales des Sciences Politiques  
Sabanci University of Istanbul  
Chatham House  
European University Institute  
University of Siena  
Charles University of Prague  
University of Mannheim  
TNS Opinion  
American University of Washington

## ADVISORY BOARD

Shaun Breslin, University of Warwick  
Zhimin Chen, Fudan University, Shanghai  
Renato G. Flores Jr., FGV, Rio de Janeiro  
Ranabir Samaddar, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Centre  
Dmitri Trenin, Carnegie Moscow Center  
Stephen Walt, Harvard University

[WWW.TRANSWORLD-FP7.EU](http://WWW.TRANSWORLD-FP7.EU)