



## AMERICANS ON GLOBAL WARMING

### Appendix: Questionnaire and Results

#### April, 1998 Poll

Dates:	Margin of Error
February 13-17	Sample of 600 +/- 4%
March 15-17	Sample of 1200 +/- 3%
April 16-20, 1998	Full Sample of 2,747 +/- 2%

[Sample of 600]

GW-2. Just from your general impression--is it your hunch that the countries of the European Union probably:

Generate more pollution and greenhouse gases per person than the US	22.9%
Generate less per person than the US	37.8%
Generate about the same per person as the US	32.5%
Don't know /Refused	6.7%

[Sample of 600]

GW-1. There is a controversy over what the countries of the world, including the US, should do about the problem of global warming. I'm going to read you three statements. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your own point of view. [ARO]

Until we are sure that global warming is really a problem we should not take any steps that would have economic costs.	14.9%
The problem of global warming should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost.	44.1%
Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs.	38.8%
Don't know [volunteered]	1.9%

[Sample of 600]

GW-3. As you may know recently there was a world conference in Kyoto on the problem of global warming. How much have you heard about this conference?

A great deal	4.6%
Some	19.5%
Not very much	39.1%
Nothing at all	35.1%
Don't know / Refused	1.7%

[Sample of 300]

GW-4. At the conference there was a dispute between the European Union and the US over how much to reduce the emission of gasses that produce global warming . The debate was about how much the industrialized countries should commit to reduce their emissions by about the year 2010. The US wanted to see reductions to the level these countries were emitting in 1990. The Europeans wanted to see reductions of 15% below the levels these countries were emitting in 1990. At the conference in Kyoto the US and Europe agreed to cut their greenhouse gas emissions by 7-8% below 1990 levels.

Would you say you favor the European position calling for deeper cuts, favor the American position calling for less deep cuts, or do you think the agreement is about right? . (Which way would you say you lean more toward?)

The American position calling for less deep cuts in emissions	20.8%
Toward US position for less deep cuts in emissions	19.7%
The agreement is about right	10.3%
Toward European position for deeper cuts in emissions	13.7%
The European position calling for deeper cuts in emissions	28.9%

[Sample of 300]

GW-5. At the conference there was a dispute about how much to reduce the emission of gasses that produce global warming. The debate was about how much the industrialized countries should commit to reduce their emissions by about the year 2010. Some wanted to see reductions to the level these countries were emitting in 1990. Others wanted to see reductions of 15% below the levels these countries were emitting in 1990. At the conference in Kyoto it was agreed that most industrialized countries would reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 7-8% below 1990 levels. Do you feel that, the reductions this agreement calls for are too deep, not deep enough, or about right? (Which way would you say you lean?)

Reductions are too deep	8.5%
Toward reductions too deep	7.5%
The agreement is about right	23.4%
Toward reductions not deep enough	18.1%
Reductions not deep enough	30.2%
Don't know /Refused	12.2%

[Sample of 600]

international system of trading emission permits. In such a system, a country which reduces its emissions even more than promised, gets credits it can sell. Other countries could buy these credits instead of reducing their own emissions. Some say this system is a good idea, because it would encourage reductions to happen wherever they can be done most cheaply and efficiently. Others say it is a bad idea, because it would allow rich countries to pay for reducing emissions abroad while doing less to reduce them at home. Do you think it would be better to have this system or not to have this system? Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

Strongly; Good idea to have a system trading emission permits	10.3%
Somewhat; Good idea to have a system trading emission permits	19.4%
Somewhat; Bad idea to have a system trading emission permits	25.2%
Strongly; Bad idea to have a system trading emission permits	35.9%
Don't know [volunteer]	8.0%
Refused/Not ascertained	1.2%

[Sample of 600]

GW-7 Another controversy is whether the less economically-developed countries should also be expected to cut their emissions of the greenhouse gasses that cause global warming. Please tell me which of the following positions comes closest to yours?

[ARO]

A. On a per person basis, less-developed countries produce far less greenhouse gasses than developed countries. Therefore, the less-developed countries should not be required to limit their emissions until they develop their economies more.

B. The less-developed countries produces a substantial and growing amount of greenhouse gasses. Therefore they should be required to limit their emissions.

Statement A	38.3%
Statement B	55.3%
Don't know [volunteer]	4.8%
Refused/ Not ascertained	1.5%

[Sample of 600]

GW-8. If the less-developed countries are willing to limit their emissions do you think the developed countries should provide the technology and training necessary to help them make their industries less polluting?

Yes should help less-developed countries	90.1%
No should not provide technology	6.9%
Don't know [volunteer]	2.6%

Refused/Not ascertained	0.4%
-------------------------	------

## Demographics

D1. How closely do you follow foreign Affairs

Very Closely	12.6%
Somewhat Closely	55.8%
Not Very Closely	26.2%
Not at all	5.0%
Don't know / Refused	0.5%

D2. What is your age?

18 to 29	17.7%
30 to 45	32.1%
46 to 65	33.5%
Over 65	16.3%
Don't know/refused	2.0%

D3. Are you a registered voter?

Yes	85.7%
No	13.8%
Don't know/refused	0.4%

D4. In politics today, do you think of yourself as:

Strongly Republican	17.9%
Leaning toward Republican	12.4%
Leaning toward Democrat	10.4%
Strongly Democrat	21.5%
Independent	32.3%
Other	2.4%
Don't know/refused	3.1%

D5. What is the highest level of education that you have had:

Up through high school (no degree)	18.0%
High school graduate	34.4%
Some college	26.3%
4 year college degree	13.8%
Advanced degree	7.0%
Don't know/refused	0.6%

D4. Here is a range of household incomes. Just stop me when I read an amount that is more than the correct category for your household.

\$15,000	13.4%
\$25,000	17.4%
\$45,000	29.0%
\$70,000	20.6%
\$100,000	7.1%
More than \$100,000	4.7%
Don't know / refused	7.8%

D5. Sex of respondent

Male	49.0%
Female	51.0%

### October, 1998 Poll

Dates: October 22-27, 1998

Total sample size: 800 respondents

Margin of error: +/-3.5 to 4%

Q1. As you may know, in the next few weeks there will be a world conference in Buenos Aires on the problem of global warming caused by greenhouse gas emissions, which are released by the burning of coal, gasoline and other fossil fuels. How much have you heard about global warming-a great deal, some, not very much or nothing at all?

A great deal	32.0%
Some	39.1%
Not very much	18.1%
Nothing at all	10.9%

Q2. There is a controversy on what the countries of the world, including the US, should do about the problem of global warming. I'm going to read you three statements. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your own point of view. [Randomly reverse order of the statements A, B, and C].

A. Until we are sure that global warming is really a problem we should not take any steps that would have	15.1%
---	-------

economic costs.

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| B. The problem of global warming should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost. | 42.4% |
| C. Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs.   | 40.8% |
| Don't know/refused   | 1.8%  |

Q3. Late last year, there was a world conference in Kyoto, Japan on global warming. At this conference, the major industrialized countries - including the US - agreed that they would reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by about 5 to 8% below the levels they were emitting in 1990. Just based on what you know, would you say you favor or oppose the Senate ratifying the treaty, known as the Kyoto treaty, based on this agreement?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Favor              | 58.7% |
| Oppose             | 21.1% |
| Don't know/refused | 20.2% |

Q4. As you may know, there is some controversy about how much it will cost the US to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 5 to 8% below 1990 levels, as the Kyoto Treaty requires. There are different estimates because there are uncertainties about how difficult it will be to make reductions and also different preferences for how to pursue reductions. I would like to get a sense of what you think about some of the estimates that have been made. According to one estimate, cutting our emissions as much as the treaty requires will increase energy costs for an average American household by about \$50 a month. I'd just like your hunch, do you tend to feel that this estimate is on the high side, on the low side, or approximately correct?

- |                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
| On the high side      | 59.2% |
| On the low side       | 9.2%  |
| Approximately correct | 20.2% |
| Don't know/refused    | 11.4% |

Q4a. If in fact it appears that it would cost an extra \$50 a month for an average household, would you favor or oppose signing the Kyoto treaty?

- |       |       |
|-------|-------|
| Favor | 36.0% |
|-------|-------|

Oppose	52.2%
Oppose treaty regardless of cost [volunteered]	2.0%
Favor signing treaty no matter what it costs [volunteered]	0.1%
Don't know/refused	9.6%

[Those who answer Oppose or Don't know to Q4a hear:]

Q4b. If in fact it would cost an extra \$25 a month for an average household, would you favor or oppose signing the Kyoto treaty?

	% of total favoring at \$25 or more	62.7%
Favor		41.5%
Oppose		48.8%
Don't know/refused		9.8%

[Those who answer Oppose to Q4b hear:]

Q4c. If in fact it would cost an extra \$10 a month for an average household, would you favor or oppose signing the Kyoto treaty?

	% of total favoring at \$10 or more	75.6%
Favor		42.1%
Oppose		52.7%
Don't know/refused		5.2%

[Those who answer Favor to Q4a hear:]

Q4d. If in fact it would cost an extra \$75 a month for an average household, would you favor or oppose signing the Kyoto treaty?

	% of total favoring at \$75 or more	19.3%
Favor		52.4%
Oppose		40.2%
Don't know/refused		7.4%

[Those who answer Favor to Q4d hear:]

Q4e. If in fact it would cost an extra \$100 a month for an average household, would you favor or oppose signing the Kyoto treaty?

	% of total favoring at \$100 or more	10.5%
Favor		54.4%
Oppose		42.6%

Don't know/refused

3.0%

Statement: There are many ideas about the least expensive way to try to reduce emissions. In fact, it is much cheaper to control emissions in the less-developed countries because their industries are much less efficient. So, some suggest that the more-developed countries should be able to get credit toward their treaty requirements if they help the less-developed countries control their emissions. Here are some arguments that have been made about this idea. For each one I would like to know if you find the argument convincing or not convincing, and whether you feel that way strongly or somewhat. Here's the first one. [Each respondent hears two pro reasons and two con reasons. Whether pros or cons come first is randomized. Within each group, the two reasons are randomly chosen and randomly ordered]

### Pro reasons

Q5. Fulfilling the requirements of the Kyoto treaty will increase the costs of energy and this will create hardships for some Americans. If we get credit for reducing emissions where it can be done most efficiently, this will save Americans money on their energy bills. Do you find this argument convincing or unconvincing? (Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?)

Strongly convincing	26.6%
Somewhat convincing	29.4%
Somewhat unconvincing	20.5%
Strongly unconvincing	19.5%
Don't know/refused	4.2%

Q6. The economies of developing countries are expected to grow rapidly. If we help them start out with cleaner, more efficient technology now, it will be better for the world environment in the future. Do you find this argument convincing or unconvincing? (Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?)

Strongly convincing	46.3%
Somewhat convincing	28.9%
Somewhat unconvincing	8.8%
Strongly unconvincing	13.4%
Don't know/refused	2.6%

### Con Reasons

Q7. The US is emitting more greenhouse gases than any other country. To try to buy our way out of the responsibility to clean up our share of the problem just isn't right. We should clean up

our own emissions. Do you find this argument convincing or unconvincing? (Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?)

Strongly convincing	54.2%
Somewhat convincing	24.9%
Somewhat unconvincing	9.9%
Strongly unconvincing	8.8%
Don't know/refused	2.2%

Q8. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions will also result in cleaner air. Instead of spending our money to clean up air in other countries, we should clean up our own air and get these benefits here at home. Do you find this argument convincing or unconvincing? (Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?)

Strongly convincing	24.6%
Somewhat convincing	19.6%
Somewhat unconvincing	9.2%
Strongly unconvincing	14.4%
Don't know/refused	2.3%

Q9a. Of course, it is hard to fully judge this idea without a sense of the potential cost savings. Some people have estimated that if the US is required to make all of the reductions inside the US, energy costs will have to go up about \$50 a month per household. While if the US gets credit for paying to help less-developed countries reduce their emissions, the US can fulfill its treaty obligations while only increasing energy costs about \$10 a month per household. Assuming that these estimates are reasonably accurate, would you prefer to see:

All reductions made inside the US at a cost of approximately \$50 a month per household	19.6%
The US also pay for some reductions in less-developed countries at a cost of approximately \$10 a month per household	66.2%
Don't know/refused	14.2%

Statement: If such a system was put in place, another question is how this would be done.

Q10. One idea is to give credits to the less-developed countries for the amount they keep their emissions below certain established levels. The more-developed countries could then buy these credits from the less-developed countries if it would be a less expensive way to meet their treaty obligations. This would also create financial incentives for the less-developed countries to be more energy efficient. Do you think this would be a good idea or not a good idea?

Strongly good idea	31.3%
Somewhat good idea	33.9%

Somewhat NOT a good idea	7.7%
Strongly NOT a good idea	17.7%
Don't know/refused	9.5%

Q11. Here is another idea. First, a United Nations agency would determine how much it would cost to reduce emissions in less-developed countries. Assuming this would be a less expensive way to make reductions, more-developed countries could meet some of their treaty obligations by contributing to the UN agency. The UN agency would use the money to make reductions in the less-developed countries. Do you think this would be a good idea or not a good idea?

Strongly good idea	22.6%
Somewhat good idea	36.3%
Somewhat NOT a good idea	12.0%
Strongly NOT a good idea	19.9%
Don't know/refused	9.1%

Q12. Another controversy is whether the less-developed countries should also be expected to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Please tell me which of the following positions comes closest to yours. [Randomly reverse order of the statements A and B, but not C].

A. The more-developed countries produce far more greenhouse gas emissions and have not begun to make meaningful reductions. So the less-developed countries should NOT be required to limit their emissions UNTIL the more-developed countries reduce theirs.	19%
B. The less-developed countries produce a substantial and growing amount of greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore they should be required to CUT their emissions.	31.0%
C. Because the less-developed countries are poorer and produce far lower emissions, they should not be required to cut back. But they should be required to MINIMIZE the increase of their emissions through greater energy efficiency.	45.2%
None of these [volunteered]	2.1%
Don't know/refused	2.8%

Q13. At present, some less-developed countries feel that they should not have to commit to limits on their emissions until their economies are more developed. If these countries refuse to make such a commitment do you think:  
[Randomized order].

A. The more-developed countries and the US should proceed with the Kyoto Treaty with as many countries as will commit to limits.	53.1%
B. The US should refuse to sign the Kyoto Treaty until all the	43.8%

less-developed countries commit to limits.	
Don't know/refused	3.2%

Q14. Overall, compared to the average American, would say you are more supportive or less supportive of taking steps to reduce global warming?

More supportive	67.9%
Less supportive	21.6%
About the same [volunteered]	4.6%
Don't Know/refused	5.9%

D1. What is your age?

18 to 29	16.5%
30 to 45	33.0%
46 to 65	35.6%
Over 65	13.0%
Don't know/refused	2.0%

D2. In politics today, do you think of yourself as:

Strongly Republican	12.7%
Leaning toward Republican	10.9%
Leaning toward Democrat	14.8%
Strongly Democrat	22.4%
Independent	32.3%
Other	1.7%
Don't know/refused	5.2%

D3. What is the highest level of education that you have had:

Up through high school (no degree)	18.7%
High school graduate	33.1%
Some college	26.2%
4 year college degree	14.0%
Advanced degree	6.7%
Don't know/refused	1.3%

D4. Here is a range of household incomes. Just stop me when I read an amount that is more than the correct category for your household.

\$15,000	12.2%
\$25,000	26.0%

\$70,000	19.7%
\$100,000	6.2%
More than \$100,000	5.9%
Don't know / refused	10.4%

D5. Sex of respondent

Male	48.5%
Female	51.5%

[If at any point in the interview a respondent asked for a definition of either global warming or greenhouses gases the following was read: Some gases trap heat in the earth's atmosphere. These are called greenhouse gases because they act like the glass of a greenhouse. Many of the things we do increase the amount of these gases in the air, such as burning oil, coal and other fossil fuels. Some scientists say that so many of these gases have built up that the earth is getting warmer, changing weather all over the world and causing droughts and floods. Other scientists disagree, saying that the weather has not really changed, that there are no more droughts and floods than normal.]

Heard definition	8.9%
Did not hear definition	91.1%