

American Public Opinion on Global Warming in the American States:

An In-Depth Study of Florida, Maine, and Massachusetts

Ana Villar and Jon A. Krosnick

Stanford University

August, 2010

This research was supported by the Woods Institute for the Environment. Address correspondence to Jon Krosnick, 432 McClatchy Hall, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305; email: Krosnick@stanford.edu.

**American Public Opinion on Global Warming in the American States:
An In-Depth Study of Florida, Maine, and Massachusetts**

Introduction

This document reports the results of three surveys conducted in Florida, Massachusetts, and Maine from July 9 through 18, 2010, to measure attitudes and beliefs on climate change, and compares the results of those surveys to survey data collected in those states between 2006 and 2010 and with a national survey conducted in June, 2010.

The topics addressed in the survey include:

- Whether global warming has been happening
- What might have caused global warming
- Whether global warming will be undesirable
- The personal importance of the global warming issue
- What government should and should not do on the issue
- Expected economic consequences of mitigation efforts
- Willingness to pay for mitigation efforts
- The impact of a political candidate making a statement about global warming on his/her likely electoral success in a U.S. Senate race.

The principal findings are:

- The three states resemble one another and the nation, in that large majorities of all believe that global warming has been happening, is human caused, will be problematic, and should be addressed by government.
- An experiment suggests that if a candidate running for U.S. Senate campaigns endorsed the views held on this issue by the majorities of the States' residents, the

proportion of citizens voting for the candidate could increase by 24 percentage points in Florida, 7 percentage points in Main, and 9 percentage points in Massachusetts. The impact of the statement about global warming on vote intentions was greatest among Democrats, less among Independents, and non-existent among Republicans.

Data Collection Methods

Telephone interviews were conducted with representative samples of adults living in Florida (N=600), Massachusetts (N=600), and Maine (N=600). In each state, approximately 400 respondents were interviewed on a landline telephone, and approximately 200 were interviewed on a cell phone. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish. Persons with residential landlines were not screened out of the cell phone sample. The combined sample in each state was weighted to match demographic benchmarks from the American Community Survey (ACS) and telephone service benchmarks modeled from National Health Interview Survey.

The target population for the study is non-institutionalized persons age 18 and over, living in Florida, Massachusetts, and Maine. Samples were drawn from both the landline and cellular random digit dial (RDD) frames provided by Survey Sampling International, LLC according to Abt SRBI specifications. Numbers for the landline sample were drawn with equal probabilities from active blocks (area code + exchange + two-digit block number) that contained one or more residential directory listings. The cellular sample was drawn through a systematic sampling from 1000-blocks dedicated to cellular service according to the Telcordia database.

A maximum of seven call attempts were made to numbers in the landline and cell phone samples. Refusal conversion was attempted on soft refusal cases in the landline sample. Calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chance of making

contact with potential respondents. The sample was released for interviewing in replicates, which are representative subsamples of the larger sample.

For the landline sample, the respondent was randomly selected from all of the adults in the household. For the cell sample, interviews were conducted with the person who answered the phone. Interviewers verified that the person was an adult and in a safe place before administering the survey. Cell sample respondents were offered a post-paid reimbursement of \$5 for their participation.

Comparison With Prior Surveys

The results of the July surveys in Florida, Maine, and Massachusetts are compared with the results of a national survey conducted in June, 2010. In addition, the results of the July surveys done in Florida and Massachusetts are compared with results obtained from combining data from national surveys conducted between 2006 and 2010 that asked the same questions in those two states.¹ The following national RDD telephone surveys were combined for the latter analysis:

- ABC News/Time/Stanford University survey conducted in March, 2006;
- ABC News/Washington Post/Stanford University survey conducted in April, 2007;
- ABC News/Planet Green/Stanford University survey conducted in July, 2008;
- Associated Press/Stanford University survey conducted in November, 2009;
- ABC News/Washington Post survey conducted in November, 2009;
- GfK Omnibus survey conducted in June, 2010;
- Stanford University survey conducted in June, 2010.

¹ Fewer than 50 respondents from Maine had been interviewed in the prior surveys. We therefore do not report any results for Maine from those prior surveys here.

Weighting

All estimates are weighted. Weights for the 2006-2010 combined surveys were computed for each of those surveys separately. The weights for 2006 and 2007 post-stratified using demographic information from the CPS. Respondents were classified into one of 48 cells based on age, race, sex, and education. Weights were assigned so the proportion of respondents in each of these 48 cells matched the actual population proportion. For the 2008 survey, the sample was rim-weighted to full-population Census parameters for age, race, sex and education. Weights smaller than .2 were changed to .2, and weights larger than 6 were changed to 6.²

Weights for the November 17-29, 2009 survey account for unequal probabilities of selection and post-stratify to population proportions of age, sex, education and race, using targets from the March 2008 supplement of the CPS. The weighting was also designed to combine interviews done on landlines and cell phones taking into account the rates of landline and cell phone usage by region documented by the 2008 Spring estimates provided by Mediamark Research Inc.

Weights for the June 2010 survey account for unequal probabilities of selection (due to varying numbers of telephone lines that could reach the respondent and varying numbers of adults living in each household), and post-stratify on age, sex, education and race, using targets from the March 2009 supplement of the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS). The weighting was also designed to combine interviews done on landlines and cell phones taking into account the rates of landline and cell phone usage by region documented by the 2009 Fall

² ABC's methods report says: "Surveys commonly are weighted to the number of telephone lines in each respondent's home to adjust for the higher probability of selection of multiple-line households. ABC News has studied the effect of such weighting (Merkle and Langer, Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 72 No.1, Spring 2008) concluding that it carries the risk of distortion, and, when done properly, has no meaningful impact on the data. ABC News polls therefore are not weighted to the number of household phone lines."

estimates provided by Mediamark Research Inc.

Weights for the July 2010 surveys done in Florida, Maine, and Massachusetts account for unequal probabilities of selection, post-stratify to population proportions of age, sex, education, ethnicity and race, using targets from the 2006-2008 American Community Survey for Florida, Maine, and Massachusetts. The weighting was also designed to combine interviews done on landlines and cell phones taking into account the rates of landline and cell phone usage from the NHIS. Weights larger than 5 were changed to 5.

Cell phones were not called for any of the surveys done between 2006 and 2008; the 2009 and 2010 surveys did involve calling landlines and cell-phones. The survey done between November 12 and 15, 2009, employed the same weighting approach as was used with the 2008 survey, but steps were added to account for the dual-frame design. Cell-only and landline samples were first weighted by Census region to their respective proportions of the population (per NHIS cell-only estimates). The combined sample was then rim-weighted to full-population parameters for age, race, sex and education. A post-weight was applied to the cell-only sample if needed to correct its final proportion within the full sample. Weights smaller than .2 were changed to .2, and weights larger than 6 were changed to 6.

Ns are reported in parentheses below percentages. For the 2006-2010 surveys, the reported Ns are unweighted.

Table 1. Belief About the Existence of Global Warming

	Respondent believed global warming is happening
Nationwide – June 2010	74.30% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	78.44% (319)
Florida – July 2010	81.38% (600)
Maine – July 2010	78.24% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	87.59% (114)
Massachusetts July 2010	83.71% (600)

A random half of the sample was asked each of the following questions

You may have heard about the idea that the world's temperature may have been going up slowly over the past 100 years. What is your personal opinion on this - do you think this has probably been happening, or do you think it probably has not been happening?

What is your personal opinion? Do you think that the world's temperature probably has been going up slowly over the past 100 years, or do you think this probably has not been happening?

Table 2. Certainty About the Existence of Global Warming

	Percent extremely sure or very sure		
	Among respondents who think GW has been happening	Among respondents who think GW has NOT been happening	All respondents ³
Nationwide – June 2010	46.73% (741)	38.98% (239)	44.84% (980)
Florida – 2006-2010	53.37% (208)	53.92% (54)	52.65% (266)
Florida – July 2010	59.17% (488)	51.64% (84)	58.06% (573)
Maine – July 2010	60.25% (469)	55.77% (106)	59.43% (575)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	56.83% (74)	37.49% (13)	54.50% (90)
Massachusetts July 2010	49.52% (502)	35.12% (79)	47.56% (581)

How sure are you that the world's temperature has/has not been going up - extremely sure, very sure, somewhat sure, or not sure at all?

³ In the 2006-2008 surveys, all respondents were asked to report their level of certainty about global warming's existence. The percentages in the last column of this table are based on all respondents who contributed to the figures in the prior two columns and respondents who said don't know when asked or refused to answer the question about global warming existence. Therefore, the N for the final column is larger than the sum of the Ns for the prior two columns.

Table 3. Belief That Human Behavior Has Been At Least Partly Causing Global Warming

	Human action has been at least partly causing GW
Nationwide – June 2010	74.76% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	74.31% (260)
Florida – July 2010	72.54% (600)
Maine – July 2010	75.86% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	82.72% (89)
Massachusetts July 2010	79.64% (600)

Do you think a rise in the world’s temperature is being caused mostly by things people do, mostly by natural causes, or about equally by things people do and by natural causes?⁴

⁴ If a respondent said “probably has not been happening” or “don’t know” or refused when asked Q12, “Assuming its happening” and “would be” were included in the question wording.

Table 4. Percent of Respondents Who Thought Global Warming Would Be Bad

	GW would be bad ⁵
National sample – June 2010	63.98% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	63.67% (207)
Florida – July 2010	68.29% (600)
Maine – July 2010	66.88% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	85.88% (74)
Massachusetts July 2010	72.88% (600)

Scientists use the term "global warming" to refer to the idea that the world's average temperature may be about five degrees Fahrenheit higher in 75 years than it is now. Overall, would you say that global warming would be good, bad, or neither good nor bad?

Do you lean toward thinking it would be good, lean toward thinking it would be bad, or don't you lean either way?

⁵ Includes respondents who said they leaned toward thinking that global warming would be bad.

Table 5. Perception of the Seriousness of Global Warming

	GW will be a very or somewhat serious problem for the world	GW will be a very or somewhat serious problem for the USA
Nationwide – June 2010	80.70% (1,000)	78.01% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	79.32% (148)	74.06% (266)
Florida – July 2010	81.95% (600)	81.58% (600)
Maine – July 2010	81.86% (600)	76.76% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	83.69% (58)	82.79% (90)
Massachusetts July 2010	84.95% (600)	82.35% (600)

If nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it will be for THE UNITED STATES – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all?⁶

If nothing is done to reduce global warming in the future, how serious of a problem do you think it will be for THE WORLD – very serious, somewhat serious, not so serious, or not serious at all?⁶

⁶ If a respondent said “probably has not been happening” or “don’t know” or refused when asked Q12, “Assuming its happening” and “would be” were included in the question wording.

Table 6. Personal Importance of Global Warming (the Issue Public)

	Percent who said GW was extremely important to them personally
Nationwide – June 2010	13.72% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	24.57% (266)
Florida – July 2010	17.40% (600)
Maine – July 2010	14.27% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	29.09% (90)
Massachusetts July 2010	14.89% (600)

How important is the issue of global warming to you personally – extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

Table 7. Governments and Businesses Should do More to Deal With Global Warming

	U.S. government	Governments of other countries ⁷	U.S. businesses ⁷
Nationwide – June 2010	59.35% (1000)	69.59% (1000)	64.33% (1000)
Florida – 2006-2010	59.16% (265)		
Florida – July 2010	63.08% (600)	69.17% (600)	63.39% (600)
Maine – July 2010	64.89% (600)	65.95% (600)	61.79% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	79.15% (90)		
Massachusetts July 2010	66.00% (600)	69.58% (600)	67.97% (600)

How much do you think the U.S. government should do about global warming? A great deal, quite a bit, some, a little, or nothing?

How much do you think governments in other countries around the world should do about global warming? A great deal, quite a bit, some, a little, or nothing?

How much should U.S. businesses do about global warming? A great deal, quite a bit, some, a little, or nothing?

How much do you think the U.S. government is doing now to deal with global warming? A great deal, quite a bit, some, a little, or nothing?

How much do you think governments in other countries are doing now to deal with global warming? A great deal, quite a bit, some, a little, or nothing?

How much do you think U.S. businesses are doing now to deal with global warming? A great deal, quite a bit, some, a little, or nothing?

⁷ The question was not asked in the 2006-2008 surveys.

Table 8. Should the Government Limit Greenhouse Gas Emissions by U.S. Businesses⁸

	The government should limit GHG emissions
National sample – June 2010	76.19% (496)
Florida – July 2010	73.53% (600)
Maine – July 2010	76.96% (600)
Massachusetts – July 2010	76.93% (600)

Some people believe that the United States government should limit the amount of greenhouse gasses thought to cause global warming that U.S. businesses can produce. Other people believe that the government should not limit the amount of greenhouse gasses that U.S. businesses put out. What about you? Do you think the government should or should not limit the amount of greenhouse gasses that U.S. businesses put out?

⁸ This question was not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 9. Should the Government Start Limiting Emission of GHG Right Away⁹

	Of respondents who said the government should limit GHG emissions, the proportion who said limits should be imposed right away
Florida – July 2010	77.26% (441)
Maine – July 2010	80.20% (462)
Massachusetts – July 2010	74.47% (462)

Do you think that the federal government should limit greenhouse gasses from U.S. businesses right away, or do you think the government should start this limiting later in the future?

⁹ The question was not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 10. In How Many Years Should the Government Start Limiting Emission of Greenhouse Gasses¹⁰

	Percentage among respondents who said the government should limit greenhouse gas emissions		
	Florida July 2010	Maine July 2010	Massachusetts July 2010
...Right away	77.26%	80.20%	74.47%
In 1 year or less	4.03%	1.76%	2.64%
In 2 years	1.81%	1.00%	3.32%
In 3 years	2.12%	.75%	3.25%
In 4 years	.84%	1.55%	.27%
In 5 years	5.80%	5.82%	7.87%
In 6 years	-	-	.07%
In 7 years	.48%	.26%	.95%
In 8 years	.06%	.17%	.08%
In 9 years			
In 10 years	2.59%	2.72%	4.24%
In 13 years	-	-	.26%
In 15 years	-	.44%	-
In 20 years	.16%	.81%	1.03%
In 32 years	.39%	-	-
In 100 years	-	.05%	.33%
Don't know	4.23%	4.37%	1.16%
Refused	.23%	.10%	.05%
Total	100%	100%	100%
N	441	462	462

How many years do you think the federal government should wait before limiting greenhouse gasses from U.S. businesses?

¹⁰ The question was not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 11. Percent of Respondents Who Favored Policies to Try to Reduce Global Warming

	Favor the federal government...				
	Increasing taxes on electricity	Increasing taxes on gasoline	Giving tax breaks to build nuclear plants	Giving tax breaks to produce clean energy	Giving tax breaks for underground pollution storage ¹¹
Nationwide – June 2010	21.66% (1,000)	28.28% (1,000)	48.04% (1,000)	84.32% (1,000)	65.39% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	23.90% (200)	28.07% (200)	49.29% (148)	84.63% (148)	
Florida – July 2010	20.38% (600)	32.87% (600)	50.98% (600)	78.12% (600)	60.66% (600)
Maine – July 2010	20.81% (600)	32.46% (600)	38.57% (600)	83.66% (600)	58.97% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	28.22% (76)	35.38% (76)	55.42% (58)	88.56% (58)	
Massachusetts July 2010	25.83% (600)	36.10% (600)	38.00% (600)	85.05% (600)	61.24% (600)

For each of the following, please tell me whether you favor or oppose it as a way for the federal government to try to reduce future global warming:

- Do you favor or oppose the federal government increasing taxes on electricity so people use less of it
- Do you favor or oppose the federal government increasing taxes on gasoline so people either drive less, or buy cars that use less gas
- Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving companies tax breaks to build nuclear power plants
- Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving companies tax breaks to produce more electricity from water, wind, and solar power
- Do you favor or oppose the federal government giving tax breaks to companies that burn coal to make electricity if they use new methods to put the air pollution they generate into underground storage areas instead of letting that air pollution go up the smokestacks at their factories

¹¹ The question was not asked in the 2006-2008 surveys.

Table 12. Percent of Respondents Who Favored the Government Requiring by Law or Encouraging with Tax Breaks Policies to Try to Reduce Global Warming

	Percent of respondents who favored the government requiring by law or encouraging with tax breaks...				
	Build more efficient cars	Build electric cars ¹²	Build more efficient appliances	Build more efficient buildings	Lower GHG emissions by power plants ¹²
Nationwide – June 2010	80.56% (1,000)	66.90% (1,000)	80.20% (1,000)	80.22% (1,000)	79.66% (1,000)
Florida – 2006-2010	81.13% (200)		76.26% (200)	78.35% (200)	
Florida – July 2010	75.89% (600)	60.03% (600)	77.98% (600)	78.87% (600)	78.14% (600)
Maine – July 2010	75.56% (600)	61.52% (600)	70.24% (600)	75.19% (600)	78.88% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	87.75% (76)		78.80% (76)	82.07% (76)	
Massachusetts July 2010	79.66% (600)	70.40% (600)	78.92% (600)	85.09% (600)	83.47% (600)

For the next items, please tell me for each one whether it's something the government should require by law, encourage with tax breaks but not require, or stay out of entirely

- Building cars that use less gasoline
- Building cars that run completely on electricity
- Building air conditioners, refrigerators, and other appliances that use less electricity
- Building new homes and offices that use less energy for heating and cooling
- Lowering the amount of greenhouse gases that power plants are allowed to release into the air

¹² The question was not asked in the 2006-2008 surveys.

Table 13. Perception of the Possible Consequences of Implementing Global Warming Policies

	The U.S. doing things to reduce global warming will ...			
	Result in fewer jobs for people around the country	Hurt the U.S. economy	Result in fewer jobs for people in the state where you live ¹³	Hurt the economy in the state where you live ¹³
Nationwide – June 2010	17.92% (1,000)	20.22% (1,000)		
Florida – 2006-2010	20.53% (89)	29.25% (155)		
Florida – July 2010	17.70% (600)	21.83% (600)	17.44% (600)	19.10% (600)
Maine – July 2010	16.85% (600)	22.09% (600)	19.68% (600)	18.53% (600)
Massachusetts 2006-2010	20.12% (42)	19.93% (56)		
Massachusetts July 2010	12.94% (600)	17.05% (600)	11.77% (600)	13.82% (600)

Do you think that the United States doing things to reduce global warming in the future would cause there to be more jobs for people around the country, would cause there to be fewer jobs, or wouldn't affect the number of jobs for people around the country?

Do you think that the United States doing things to reduce global warming in the future would hurt the U.S. economy, would help the economy, or would have no effect on the U.S. economy?

Do you think that the United States doing things to reduce global warming in the future would cause there to be more jobs for people in the State where you live, would cause there to be fewer jobs, or wouldn't affect the number of jobs for people in the State where you live?

Do you think that the United States doing things to reduce global warming in the future would hurt the economy in the State where you live, would help the economy, or would have no effect on the economy in the State where you live?

¹³ The question was not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 14. Percent of Respondents Who Favored a “Cap and Trade” System¹⁴

	Favored a “cap and trade” system
Nationwide – June 2010	74.46% (497)
Florida – July 2010	67.93% (600)
Maine – July 2010	72.00% (600)
Massachusetts July 2010	76.77% (600)

There’s a proposed system called “cap and trade.” The government would issue permits limiting the amount of greenhouse gases companies can put out. Companies that did not use all their permits could sell them to other companies. Companies that need more permits can buy them, or these companies can pay money to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that other people or organizations put out. This will cause companies to figure out the cheapest way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This type of permit system has worked successfully in the past to reduce the air pollution that companies put out. For example, in 1990, the federal government passed a law like this, called the Clean Air Act, which caused companies to put out a lot less of the air pollution that causes acid rain. Would you favor or oppose a cap and trade system to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that companies put out?

¹⁴ This question was not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 15. Percent of Respondents Who Thought the U.S. Should Take Action to Deal with Global Warming Regardless of What Other Countries Do¹⁵

	The U.S. should take action even if other industrialized countries don't
Nationwide –	67.55%
June 2010	(1,000)
Florida –	66.72%
July 2010	(600)
Maine –	66.22%
July 2010	(600)
Massachusetts	70.52%
July 2010	(600)

Do you think the United States should take action on global warming only if other major industrial countries such as China and India agree to do equally effective things, that the United States should take action even if these other countries do less, or that the United States should not take action on this at all?

¹⁵ This question was not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 16. Percent of Respondents Who Would Vote for a Law to Reduce Air Pollution by 85% by the Year 2050¹⁶

	Would vote for this law ¹⁷		
	If it cost \$100 extra in taxes	If it cost \$150 extra in taxes	If it cost \$200 extra in taxes
Florida – July 2010	59.89% (600)	50.02% (600)	43.53% (600)
Maine – July 2010	62.09% (600)	53.38% (600)	47.47% (600)
Massachusetts July 2010	66.07% (600)	56.24% (600)	52.93% (600)

If the U.S. Congress were thinking of passing a law that would reduce the amount of air pollution that the country puts out by 85% by the year 2050 and if that would cost your household an extra \$100 in taxes every year on average, would you vote for this law or against it?

If the U.S. Congress were thinking of passing a law that would reduce the amount of air pollution that the country puts out by 85% by the year 2050 and if that would cost your household an extra \$150 in taxes every year on average, would you vote for this law or against it?

If the U.S. Congress were thinking of passing a law that would reduce the amount of air pollution that the country puts out by 85% by the year 2050 and if that would cost your household an extra \$200 in taxes every year on average, would you vote for this law or against it?

¹⁶ These questions were not asked in any previous surveys.

¹⁷ Combines responses “definitely would vote” and “probably would vote”

Experiment Simulating Voting in a Senate Election

The survey included an experiment to assess the impact of hearing a candidate running for U.S. Senate make a statement about global warming endorsing the existence of the problem and the need to implement solutions. All respondents heard two quotes from a hypothetical candidate. The introduction to this portion of the interview was worded as follows:

“Next, I’d like to read you a few things that a person running for U.S. Senate in your State might say. After you listen to each one, I’ll ask you whether you mostly agree with it, mostly disagree with it, or neither agree nor disagree with it.”

The respondents in Florida then heard two quotes, one on relations with Cuba¹⁸ and the other on terrorism¹⁹ and reported their agreement with each. The respondents in Massachusetts heard two other quotes, one on terrorism²⁰ and the other on health care²¹ and reported their

¹⁸ Lifting the Cuba travel ban represents a blatant disregard of the human rights violations that the Castro regime commits against the Cuban people. This attempt to appease the Cuban dictatorship is wholly inconsistent with the United States’ role as a beacon of freedom in this hemisphere, and around the world. This effort puts narrow corporate interests ahead of the need to protect the Cuban people from the Castro regime’s brutal oppression. Canadian and European tourists have long made their way to Cuba, despite the fact that the Cuban regime has grown more repressive and living conditions for a majority of Cubans have declined to unprecedented low levels. The money they spend there is handed over to the Castro regime’s desperate totalitarian machine. Americans cannot allow themselves to be caught in the same trap of funding brutality

¹⁹ When we are dealing with foreign-born suspects with known ties to terrorist organizations, and these people are carrying out plans to indiscriminately kill Americans, we need to NOT treat them like they’re common criminals. Treating these people like common criminals is dangerous, and it limits the intelligence information that we can gather from suspects. The suspected Christmas Day bomber could have provided valuable information about potential terror plots. Instead, he was charged in the civilian court system where he got a lawyer and stopped talking. When someone is given Miranda rights and access to a lawyer, gathering valuable information about possible terrorist plots is greatly diminished.

²⁰ I believe that terrorism is not a political issue; it is a national security issue. To win the war against terrorism, we must be able to quickly adapt to ever-changing terrorist tactics. Congress and the Administration must work together in a bipartisan fashion to continue support for all elements of national security, to increase information sharing and collective security efforts around the globe, and to expand vital law enforcement partnerships. Our Constitution and laws exist to protect this nation — they do not grant rights and privileges to enemies in wartime. In dealing with terrorists, our tax dollars should pay for weapons to stop them, not lawyers to defend them.

agreement with each. And the respondents in Maine heard two other quotes, one on terrorism²² and the other on the economy²³, and reported their agreement with each.

Finally, a randomly selected half of the respondents in each state heard a third quote from the hypothetical candidate, worded as follows:

“Like most Americans and most of the residents of our great State, I believe that global warming has been happening for the last 100 years, mainly because we have been burning fossil fuels and putting out greenhouse gasses. Now is the time for us to stop this by ending our dependence on imported oil and coal to run our cars and heat our houses. We need to begin using new forms of energy that are made in America and will be renewable forever. We can build better cars that use less gasoline. We can build better appliances that use less electricity. And we can make power from the sun and from wind.

²¹ I believe that all Americans deserve quality, affordable health care, and that we must address the issues of rising health care costs and accessibility. Unfortunately, the recently enacted Federal health care legislation does not accomplish these goals and instead raises taxes on individuals and businesses, increases government spending, and will result in higher costs for consumers. I believe we must focus on fixing and replacing this law with common-sense health care reforms that drive down costs, make it easier for people to purchase affordable insurance, and strengthen the existing private market system.

²² Our nation remains a target for terrorists. Terrorists are unrelenting in their desire to kill Americans. We cannot let down our guard, and we must continue to meet this ongoing threat with strength and resilience. During the past eight years, significant resources have been devoted to the prevention of a terrorist attack using a biological, chemical, or nuclear weapon. But the improvised explosive device remains the weapon of choice for terrorists. And terrorists can also choose to use firearms. For many Americans, including many Maine families, the right to own guns is part of their heritage and way of life. This right is protected by the Second Amendment. And so our government confronts a difficult issue today: how do we protect the constitutional right of Americans to bear arms, while preventing terrorists from using guns to carry out their murderous plans? None of us wants a terrorist to be able to purchase a gun. But neither should we want to infringe upon a constitutional right of law-abiding Americans.

²³ It makes no sense that the capital and risk standards for our nation's largest financial institutions are more lenient than those that apply to smaller depository banks, when the failure of larger institutions is much more likely to have a broad economic impact. Yet that is currently the case. We must give the regulators the tools and the direction to address this problem. I have proposed an amendment that will strengthen the economic foundation of these firms, increase oversight and accountability, and help prevent the excesses that contributed to the deep recession that has cost millions of Americans their jobs. Increasing capital requirements as firms grow provides a disincentive to their becoming “too big to fail” and ensures an adequate capital cushion in difficult economic times.

We don't have to change our lifestyles, but we do need to reshape the way our country does business. We need to end our long-term addiction to polluting the environment and instead let American genius do what it does best – transform our outdated ways of generating energy into new ones that create jobs and entire industries, and stop the damage we've been doing to the environment.”

After hearing and reporting agreement with that quote, these respondents and the respondents who did not hear the quote about global warming were asked this question:

“Now based on all these things that you have heard the candidate say, how likely do you think you would be to vote for this candidate in an election for U.S. Senate? Do you think you **DEFINITELY WOULD** vote for this candidate, **PROBABLY WOULD** vote for this candidate, **PROBABLY** would **NOT** vote for this candidate, or **DEFINITELY** would **NOT** vote for this candidate?”

Table 17. Percent of Respondents Who Mostly Agreed With the Candidate’s Statement²⁴

	Mostly agreed with what a candidate for Senate said on the issue						
	Statement on global warming	Statement on Terrorism, Florida	Statement on Cuba, Florida	Statement on terrorism, Maine	Statement on economy, Maine	Statement on health care, Massachusetts	Statement on terrorism, Massachusetts
Florida – July 2010	79.91% (302)	52.09% (600)	45.57% (600)				
Maine – July 2010	75.52% (320)			61.42% (600)	49.54% (600)		
Massachusetts July 2010	81.92% (311)					67.85% (600)	65.42% (600)

Overall, do you mostly agree with what I just read, mostly disagree with it, or neither agree nor disagree with it?

²⁴ These questions were not asked in any previous surveys.

Table 18. The Effect of Hearing the Statement About Global Warming on Predicted Voting for the Candidate

Percent who would vote for the candidate ²⁵			
	Among respondents who did NOT hear the global warming statement	Among respondents who did hear the global warming statement	Difference ²⁶
Florida – July 2010	49.10% (297)	72.73% (302)	23.63***
Maine – July 2010	63.76% (278)	70.53% (318)	6.77†
Massachusetts July 2010	67.22% (288)	76.91% (306)	9.69*
Democrats	58.18% (257)	83.03% (283)	24.85***
Independents	56.99% (449)	71.22% (481)	14.23***
Republicans	70.85% (157)	62.74% (162)	-8.11

*** $p < .001$ * $p < .05$ † $p < .10$

Now based on all these things that you have heard the candidate say, how likely do you think you would be to vote for this candidate in an election for U.S. Senate? Do you think you DEFINITELY WOULD vote for this candidate, PROBABLY WOULD vote for this candidate, PROBABLY would NOT vote for this candidate, or DEFINITELY would NOT vote for this candidate?

²⁵ Combines people who said “definitely would vote” and “probably would vote.” Respondents who answered “I can’t vote” were excluded from this analysis.

²⁶ One-tailed Rao-Scott Chi-Square test.

Table 19. The Effect of Hearing the Statement About Global Warming on Predicted Voting for the Candidate Controlling for Demographics

	Logistic Regression Coefficients		
	Florida	Maine	Massachusetts
GW statement was heard	1.06 ***	.50 *	.62 **
Female	.31	-.82 **	-.24
Age (continuous)	-.05	-.01	.03
Age Squared	.00	.00	-.00
White ²⁷	.47	.48	-.20
Black	-.27	13.88 ***	.68
Hispanic	.46	-.35	-.17
High school degree ²⁸	.66	-.86 *	-.83
Some college	1.16 *	-.82 †	-.57
College degree	1.19 *	-.75 †	.28
Graduate degree	1.31 *	-1.31 **	.40
The respondent has children	-.08	-.27	-.13
Income \$30,000-\$99,999	-.19	-.30	.18
Income is \$100,000 or higher	-.28	-.51	-.12
Cell phone owner	-.33	-.06	.54
Landline owner	.19	-.13	.12
N	564	566	564
Nagelkerke's R ²	.17	.12	.12

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$ † $p < .10$

²⁷ Race categories were not mutually exclusive

²⁸ "Less than high school" is the reference category for education.

Table 20. The Effect of Hearing the Statement About Global Warming on Predicted Voting for the Candidate Controlling for Demographics, Separately by Party Identification

Logistic Regression Coefficients				
	Full sample	Democrat	Independent	Republican
GW statement was heard	.70 ***	1.44 ***	.72 ***	-.23
Female	-.22	-.13	-.31	-.09
Age (continuous)	-.01	.01	-.02	-.00
Age Squared	.00	-.00	.00	.00
White ²⁹	.03	.12	.32	.08
Black	-.16	-.16	-.33	-.66
Hispanic	.04	.19	.02	.75
High school degree ³⁰	-.27	.07	-.11 **	-1.97 **
Some college	-.04	.76	-.02 *	-1.43 *
College degree	.29	1.14 *	.38 *	-1.41 *
Graduate degree	.24	.99 †	.34 **	-2.38 **
The respondent has children	-.17	-.22	.17 †	-.85 †
Income \$30,000-\$99,999	-.05	-.45	.09	.03
Income is \$100,000 or higher	-.21	.25	-.13 *	-1.11 *
Cell phone owner	-.00	-.31	-.17	.51
Landline owner	.06	.20	-.19	.48
N	1694	522	864	308
Nagelkerke's R ²	.05	.19	.06	.20

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$ † $p < .10$

²⁹ Race categories were not mutually exclusive.

³⁰ "Less than high school" is the reference category for education.

Table 21. The Effect of Hearing the Statement About Global Warming on Predicted Voting for the Candidate Controlling for Demographics, Separately by Belief About Global Warming's Existence

	Logistic Regression Coefficients	
	Among respondents who thought GW has been happening	Among respondents who thought GW has NOT been happening
GW statement was heard	.84 ***	.46
Female	-.15	-.26
Age (continuous)	-.03	.01
Age Squared	.00	-.00
White ³¹	.09	.04
Black	-.20	-.13
Hispanic	-.05	.05
High school degree ³²	-.33 †	-.10
Some college	.32 †	.21
College degree	.28	.01
Graduate degree	-.20	-.11
The respondent has children	-.48 †	-1.20 *
Income \$30,000-\$99,999	-.56 *	-.37
Income is \$100,000 or higher	-.44	-1.46 **
Cell phone owner	-.04	-.23
Landline owner	.04	.03
N	1384	310
Nagelkerke's R ²	.07	.12

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$ † $p < .10$

³¹ Race categories were not mutually exclusive.

³² "Less than high school" is the reference category for education.