

TRANSWORLD

THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP AND THE FUTURE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

ISSN 2281-5252

WORKING PAPER 31 | JUNE 2014

This paper compares mass and elite perceptions of environmental issues in the United States, the European Union, and Turkey. It covers four topics related to the importance of the issue area, general attitudes, the role of individuals and institutions as well as policy instruments aiming to manage environmental problems. Drawing on survey data from the last decade, there is no doubt that environmental problems are taken seriously in the US and Europe. However, personal concerns and environmental friendly attitudes can hardly be translated into concrete

actions if these require financial contribution. Americans, nevertheless, appear somewhat more likely to make personal expenses for the environment than Europeans. While in general the EU is perceived as not doing enough for environmental problems, it seems to be delivering more than the American stakeholders. Turning to policy instruments, there is broad support for a wide range of actions which do not differ drastically among Europeans or Americans, the public or elites. Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is a target policy aim and specific instruments are already under consideration.

Attitudes Towards Environmental Issues: Empirical Evidences in Europe and the United States

Darina Peycheva,
Jana Pötzschke,
Theron Delano Hall
and Hans Rattinger



Attitudes Towards Environmental Issues: Empirical Evidences in Europe and the United States

Darina Peycheva, Jana Pötzschke,
Theron Delano Hall and Hans Rattinger*

EU

US

Turkey

Public opinion

Environment

Introduction

Today, a variety of environmental problems affect our world. As globalisation continues to open up nations to each other and the Earth's natural processes transform local problems into international ones, few societies are left untouched by major environmental problems. Some of the more serious problems affecting the world nowadays are air pollution, water pollution, climate change and global warming to name a few. However, it is not only in the recent years that these problems have become matters of serious concern. Issues that affect the planet have been debated for decades. Institutions such as the United Nations and its many sub-divisions have been established throughout the years to address these issues, as well as to stimulate debate and implement policies for combating these threats in an efficient manner.

A major step in fighting environmental threats is the increased knowledge about the environment and the awareness that many environmental problems are largely human-made. Moreover, the lack of environmental knowledge is a major barrier to personal engagement with protecting the environment. Nevertheless, efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge on environmental problems, while laying the foundations for the measures needed to counteract the issues, have recently made a strong presence in the environmental issues agenda.

Although the environmental problems are of global concern, the degree of their importance as well as public attitudes towards ways to dealing with them is different for different nations. This may be due to a number of factors. There may be costs associated with implementing policies and these policies may impact both industrialised countries and developing countries (Newell and Paterson 1998). When it comes to climate change, for example, Thomas C. Schelling found that "any costs of mitigating climate change during the coming decades will surely be borne by the high-income countries" (Schelling 1997: 8). This perhaps provoked Lorenzoni and Pigeon (2006) to point out that the response to the threat of global warming has been quite different on both sides of the Atlantic.

** Darina Peycheva was a Guest Researcher at the University of Mannheim and Ph.D. candidate in Survey Methodology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Jana Pötzschke is Research Associate at the Chair of Comparative Political Behaviour, University of Mannheim. Theron Delano Hall is Research Assistant at the Chair of Comparative Political Behavior, University of Mannheim. Hans Rattinger is Professor of Comparative Political Behaviour, University of Mannheim. The authors are grateful to Vivienne Brando for excellent research assistance and to the participants at the Transworld WP7 workshop in February 2013 for constructive comments.*

Moreover, historical evidence suggests that Americans have been lukewarm about the issue of climate change, at least on the political level.¹ This perception is also evident because on several occasions the US Senate has impeded pieces of legislation that would enact policies confronting the environmental issues.² However, that is not to say that Americans generally do not believe climate change is an issue. As the present analysis will later show, most Americans do believe it is a serious international threat.

The aim of this paper is to provide a secondary data analysis³ on public attitudes towards the environment, and whenever possible, to exploit similarities and differences between the general public and elites. It is limited to empirical evidences from the European Union countries and the United States. Additionally, Turkey is included in the analysis as it is member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), an important actor in transatlantic relations and a potentially interesting non-EU country. The paper covers four topics of scientific interest related to salience and importance of the issue area and general attitudes towards environmental problems. Furthermore, the role of individuals and institutions in addressing and fighting environmental challenges is analysed at both national and international levels. The paper also covers policies and policy instruments aiming to manage the environmental problems and the extent to which they are supported in the society. The following analysis focuses on surveys conducted during the last decade in order to draw a relevant and up-to-date image of public and elite perceptions towards environmental problems.⁴

1. Importance of Environmental Issues

How seriously have environmental issues been perceived by the public and elites? Do opinions of Europeans and Americans differ with regard to the seriousness of environmental problems? In the first step we focus on perceptions of the salience of environmental problems in general facing the world. This way, we can evaluate the importance of environmental issues with comparison to other socio-economic issues such as nuclear proliferation, religious and ethnic hatred, AIDS and other infectious diseases. In the second step, the analysis turns to specific environmental problems and tries to indicate whether these environmental issues are of concern.

In a global context, environmental problems are not the greatest cause. There are other major threats people are more concerned about. As late as 2007, the agreed perception of both Europeans (25%) and Americans (29%) is that religious and ethnic hatred is the greatest threat to the world (table 1). However, in 2002, the Americans had a different view on what was the greatest threat to the world. One year after the terror attacks, 34 percent of Americans believed spread of nuclear weapons were the greatest threat to the world, but for the EU, religious and ethnic hatred (32%) was still seen as the greatest threat to the world. However, after further analysis of several European countries, we can observe differences on what they consider greatest threats to the world. In 2007, Bulgaria (28%), Poland (36%), and Spain (27%), consider the growing gap between the rich

1 Under the Clinton administration, the Senate voted 95-0 against the Kyoto Protocol.

2 The US House of Representatives passed a nationwide cap and trade system for carbon trade - the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (ACES) - but this was blocked by the Senate, who did not bring the issue up for a vote. Though this is and was not the Kyoto protocol, it was some semblance of a concerted effort to address the issue in the US. For more information and a detail breakdown of the votes, see the official roll call vote <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2009/roll477.xml>. For more information and attitudes of Senators towards that particular legislation visit the US Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works' minority webpage: *EPW Republicans to Majority: American Public Deserves to Know What Is In the Global Warming Bill*, 7 July 2009, http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.PressReleases&ContentRecord_id=567bcb03-802a-23ad-43b2-c9ad4c60bf02.

3 A full list with the surveys and data analysed is provided in the appendix.

4 Whenever the number of item non-response is unusually high, we present the exact percentages within the tables.

and the poor as the world's greatest threat. The only country which is most concerned about pollution and other environmental issues is Sweden (43%). The position of Slovakia also appears to be interesting as the country's citizens found it difficult to determine the most important threat. They equally rated environmental problems and the spread of nuclear weapons (27%) as threatening global societies nowadays. When analysing the opinion of the Turkish people, in 2007, we can see that the spread of nuclear weapons (35%) is seen as the greatest threat to the world; in 2002, the spread of nuclear weapons was only 28 percent. Whereas the growing gap between the rich and the poor (40%) was seen as the greatest threat to the world in 2002. For Turkey, the rationale for this change in attitude could be because of several reasons. One possibility may be its geographical closeness to Iran and the concern for that country's nuclear program.

When asked what posed the second greatest threat to the world (table 2), in the opinions of both Americans and the Europeans, pollution and other environmental problems pose the second greatest problem to the world (US 23%, EU 27%). However, Turkey deviates from the dominant considerations once again; 27 percent of Turks believe that spread of nuclear weapons is the second greatest threat to the world. Consequently, environmental issues seem to be estimated as global concerns (18%).

Having focused on a range of threats facing the world, we now shift the focus to specific environmental issues at the local level. How serious do we consider poor water quality, poor air quality, and poor sewage and sanitation in our own communities? The perception of the seriousness of specific types of municipal environmental problems varies between Americans, Europeans, and Turkey. US citizens appear to be more concerned than EU citizens. Surprising is the finding that there is an almost equal distribution of the Europeans responding "very serious" (29%) and "not serious at all" (32%) in regards to the issues listed above. However, there are again significant differences across the EU countries (table 3). In Germany, 44 percent of respondents believe poor air quality is "not serious at all"; whereas only 13 percent believe that it is "very serious". The same attitude can also be seen in Sweden and Finland. In Sweden, 82 percent of respondents see poor water quality as "not serious at all", and 39 percent of Fins also see poor water quality as "not serious at all".

With regard to poor water quality, some EU member states such as Bulgaria and Cyprus, also join Turkey in seeing this problem as "very serious". In Turkey, 73 percent see the issue as "very serious", while Bulgaria see it as 60 percent and Cyprus as 63 percent. In regards to poor air quality seems to, a similar pattern develops as to seriousness. In Turkey, 68 percent see this as "very serious". Cyprus (63%) and Bulgaria (58%) also see poor air quality as "very serious".

In general, the US citizens generally consider the problem of poor water quality more important. 36 percent of Americans see poor water quality as "very serious", when compared to the Europeans (29%). Americans also evaluate poor air quality more seriously than the Europeans (US 38%, EU 29%). The picture does not change much with regard to poor sewage and sanitation. In general, there is no strong difference between the opinion of European and American citizens who consider the problem as "very serious". However, the Americans do not appear to be as extreme in their evaluation as the Europeans. For example, over 30 percent of the European citizens determine the poor sewage and sanitation as "not serious at all". This percentage is two times higher when compared to Americans sharing this view. Once again, the problem is "very serious" in countries like Turkey (67%), Cyprus (61%), and Bulgaria (56%), and "not serious at all" in Sweden (69%), Germany (52%), and Finland (50%).

Summarising which environmental issues are of the greatest concern at the local level, the results show that for Americans the quality of the air is most important (67%), for Europeans it is poor sewage and sanitation (49%) and in Turkey it is the quality of the water (86%).

As it is evident, perceptions about several key environmental issues tend to vary when changing the focus from national to global level. Perceived internationally, environmental problems become more serious and more real. That's why environmental challenges can hardly be limited to national borders and their overall importance appears more seriously at the global level. This becomes even clearer in the following example. When asked "How important is global warming, the greenhouse effect, the loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity, the pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans, considered as a world problem?", over 80 percent of Americans and over 90 percent of Europeans agree that these issues are serious environmental problems facing the world (table 4); the percentage for Turkey is over 96.

Unlike previous evaluations of European countries where there were differences among member states as far as greatest threat to the world, or serious threat, there seems to be a genuine consensus on the issue of global warming. Global warming and greenhouse effect appear as very serious world problems in Cyprus (95%), Finland (91%), and Germany (90%) – among the European Union countries. With regards to biodiversity, pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans, which are once again estimated as very serious world problems in all European countries (90%), but higher in Turkey (97%). However, if we try to point out the main environmental concern in the world, it will be "pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans" – equally high numbers of Americans (94%), Europeans (95%) and Turkish people (98%) identified these as "very serious" or "somewhat serious".

Delving further into Europeans, Americans, and Turkish citizens attitudes towards global issues, we analyse a Global Attitudes Project (GAP) 2010 survey on how serious people of these countries view global climate change (table 5). The results show that global climate change is a serious environmental problem for the majority of both Europeans and Americans. On this issue, the Europeans (84%) show stronger awareness towards the issue when compared to the Americans (69%); however, this is still a significant percent of the population. Within the European Union countries, Germany (86%) considers global climate change most seriously, while Poland (85%) and the United Kingdom (76%) tend to underrate it. Apparently, the problem of climate change has been perceived as a "very serious" threat in Turkey; overall 94 percent of Turks perceive it as a very serious or somewhat serious problem.

In a trend perspective, during the time period from 2007 to 2009, global warming was perceived as a very serious problem. It is especially evident in Turkey, where during 2007, 2008, and 2009, over 70 percent believed that global warming is a very serious problem (table 6). Once more, the seriousness of the problem seems to be undervalued by the Americans. The opinion of Americans (44%, 2009) on whether global warming is a very serious problem does not correspond to the opinion of Europeans (56%, 2009). Within the European Union countries, United Kingdom (50%) and Poland (38%) tend to have closer views to those of the Americans, while countries like France (68%) and Spain (63%) find global warming "very serious".

Now transitioning to the opinion of the transatlantic elites, do the elites have a different perspective on the importance of environmental issues than their respective public? How seriously do elites perceive the environmental threats? Following the same approach, starting from a range of issues to the specific environmental problems, we see similar attitudes among the American elites. It is not climate change specifically, nor the environmental problems in general that are the biggest challenges currently facing the transatlantic

community (table 7). The major threats for the American elites appear to be the global economy and economic decline (44%), followed by the lack of international cooperation (18%) and terrorism (13%). Following the global economic crises and that of the EU, the elites rank the EU's internal problems fourth (11%), as biggest challenge currently facing the transatlantic community. Climate change comes right after these issues; only 10 percent of the surveyed American elites define the problem as biggest challenge to the transatlantic community. Environmental problems (2%), presented in a separate response category, can be found at the bottom of the ranking.

An interesting observation is the difference between the European public and the European elites with regard to the seriousness of the effects of global warming within the next 10 years (table 8). More than 60 percent of the general public consider the effects of global warming as a very important threat to Europe in the next 10 years; whereas for the elites this percentage is much lower - only 40 percent. When analysing members of the European member states independently, vast differences of opinions appears. As for the general public opinion, only 34 percent of Poles see global warming as a very important threat, when compared to Spain (85%). However, when observing the views of the elites in these same two countries, the trend is similar; 7 percent of Poland elites see effects of global warming as very important compared to Spanish elites (40%). However, there seems to be one exception where the elites see effects of global warming as a very important threat when compared to the general public of the same country, and that is the Netherlands (62% for elites vs. 46% for general public).

2. General Attitudes towards Environmental Issues

Considering the seriousness of the environmental warnings, especially for states that will be most affected, the important question becomes, whose responsibility is the environment? Are environmental problems the responsibility of an individual, institutions, or both? Can the environmental sensitiveness of individuals always be translated into concrete individual actions?

Individuals have an environmental consciousness about climate change and the way they should fight it. The majorities of both Europeans (66%) and Americans (65%) disagree with the statement that climate change is an unstoppable process and that we cannot do anything about it (table 9). Moreover, the dominant opinion in the United States (76%), the European Union countries (84%), and Turkey (79%) is that the personal actions that we take to fight climate change can make a difference (table 10).

Both Americans (67%) and Europeans (78%) share the opinion that we should do as much as we can to fight climate change, even if others do less (table 11). Although the majority of Turkish citizens support the statement, their percentage is lower, only 48 percent share the opinion compared to Americans and Europeans. Moreover, among the European Union countries, this statement receives a very high support in Portugal (90%), Italy (87%), Germany (86%), and Spain (84%). However, this ideal picture of individual concern is about to change with a series of somewhat inconsistent responses of the Europeans and Turkish residents. First, the ambivalence appears in their dominating agreement that it is the companies and industries, not citizens, which have to change their behaviour. This could be understood as a way of transferring the responsibility from the individual to the state level. Second, although personally concerned for the environment, there is little evidence that their environmental friendly attitude be translated into concrete actions.

How willing are the Europeans and the Americans to fight climate change, if it is considered to slow down the progress of the economy (table 12)? Based on the results, 67 percent of European members believe that “we should fight climate change even if it slows economic growth”. This position is strongly supported in France (79%), Italy (78%), and Spain (76%). Major shares of the US respondents, approximately 43 percent, also consider it more important to combat climate change. However, 40 percent of the surveyed Americans supported the position of maximising the economic growth at the expense of the effort to combat climate change. Consequently, the Americans’ position is separated along the economic progress lines.

Based on the evidence, there is little doubt that the environment concerns both Europeans and Americans, to a certain degree. However, it appears it does not concern them enough to make personal expenses for environmental protection. Worrying about the environment and realizing the importance of the personal actions in fighting environmental problems, individuals are still not likely to bear personal expenses for environment protection. The number of those willing to cut their standard of living or to pay higher prices and taxes in order to protect the environment is extremely limited (table 13). Americans (47%) are more likely to pay much higher prices to protect the environment than Europeans (27%); in Turkey only 25 percent are willing to pay higher prices. The attitudes of Americans and Europeans differ even more considering the option to pay much higher taxes for the environment. Evidently, an important share of Europeans (58%) is very unwilling to pay higher taxes, especially Latvia (78%), Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic (both 68%). The opinion of Turkey (55%) is, again, closer to the one of the EU countries. A cut in the standard of living is appreciated by the public as a way to fight environmental problems. Further analysis also reveals that almost 70 percent of Americans favour paying 15 dollars per month per an average household in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (table 14).

3. The Role of the Main Stakeholders in the Area of Environmental Issues

From the public standpoint we already saw that personal actions are perceived to be effective in dealing with environmental problems, even taking into consideration the prevailing reluctance to personally finance this endeavour. Another important question to raise here is if the individuals are primarily responsible for dealing with environmental problems or if there is a need for political attention? How do individuals see the role of institutions in tackling environmental warnings? Do national governments have a more important role in addressing environmental issues than international institutions?

Here, the difference in perceptions prevails as well as the different estimations of Americans and Europeans continue. A majority of Americans (60%) tend to disagree with the statement that it is governments, not citizens that are primarily responsible for dealing with climate change; whereas the majority of Europeans (57%) tend to agree with this statement (table 15). An overwhelming 74 percent of Turkish respondents share the opinion that it is the government needs to take the main responsibility towards environmental challenges. Among all discussed publics, there is a strong consensus that the government should pass laws to make ordinary people protect the environment; 63 percent of Americans, 76 percent of Europeans and 73 percent of Turkish share this view (table 16). For Europeans, it is mainly the national government that should be held responsible for fighting climate change. As table 17 suggests, there is some degree of dissatisfaction with respect to how much national governments have done to counter climate change; over 76 percent of respondents in Turkey and 73 percent in the EU share this negative opinion (table 17).

Delving further into the results, we find that people from Bulgaria and Latvia (both 93%) as well as from Slovenia (87%), Hungary (85%), and Greece (84%) are very unsatisfied with their national governments' performance to address environmental issues. The assessment of Americans does not seem to be very different. A majority of the general public in the US (47%) shares the opinion that the US government is not doing enough to deal with the problem of climate change. Approximately 32 percent, on the contrary, think the government is doing about the right amount, and only about 11 percent hold the opinion that it is doing too much (table 18).

This negative evaluation of the role and the effort of national governments could be the reason for transferring the responsibility for environmental problems to higher political levels – to international and supranational institutions. Otherwise it could be the perception that global problems need global response. Americans and Europeans tend to agree that climate change can only be addressed effectively at the international level (table 19). However, the attitude of Europeans seems to be somewhat clearer as 78 percent of the EU citizens share this view. As for Turkey, 64 percent of Turkish citizens agree that climate change should be addressed at the international level. Although the majority of Americans share the same opinion, this is categorically lower (53%). This somewhat position probably does not surprise, as an important first step towards the global emission reduction has already been taken by the international agreement on climate change (the Kyoto Protocol) which has not been ratified by the US.

The European public's dissatisfaction with dealing with climate change at the national level is evident on the international level as well. When asked whether enough effort was put into combating climate change by the EU the general attitude is negative. The majority of Europeans (67%) share the opinion that the European Union is not doing enough to combat the environmental challenge (table 20). This point of view is also supported by the Turkish respondents in the survey (63%). Within the EU, strong majorities in France (80%), Austria (80%), Slovenia (79%), Sweden (79%), and Latvia (78%) share the opinion that the European Union is not doing enough to fight climate change.

The inconsistency in the European attitudes is particularly interesting. This time, however, it is found in the assurance that the European Union is ahead of the United States when it comes to environmental protection (table 21). This is especially peculiar, because previously we observed high levels of dissatisfaction of Europeans with the institutions on both the national and international levels. This trend seems to be stable since 2005 (2009: 51%, 2005: 55%). Moreover, based on the results (table 22a, 22b), the Europeans believe that the United States play a negative role regarding environmental protection, while the European Union plays a predominantly positive role.

The self-assessment of Americans, on the other hand, on the role of the US in fighting environmental problems, appears to be more modest. For example, the majority of Americans (52%) considers the US to be willing to do about the average in limiting the greenhouse gases compared to other developed countries. Actually, in the opinion of 47 percent of Americans, it is doing about the average (table 23); although about a third of Americans (28%) thinks that the US is doing less than average to limit the greenhouse gases.

With regard to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, almost 75 percent of the Americans support the opinion that the US should participate in a new international treaty to address climate change (table 24). However, 31 percent of these hold the opinion that the US should participate in a treaty to counter climate change. They share the opinion that the US should only participate in the treaty if it does not have to make greater economic sacrifices than the large developing countries like China and India (table 25). Moreover, considering new

agreements on climate change, more than a half of the respondents oppose the US providing technological and financial aid to developing countries like China and India in order to help them limit the growth of their emissions. However, approximately 47 percent favour this type of foreign assistance (table 26).

4. Policies and Instruments Applied in the Area of Environmental Issues

What should be done to tackle environmental problems? How should environmental problems be approached? What policies and policy instruments are considered important?

Europeans strongly support the implementation of new policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Almost 90 percent of Europeans agree that the European Union should urgently put new policies in place to reduce greenhouse gas emission by at least 20 percent by 2020 (table 27). This position seems to be also strongly supported in Turkey (69%). Even so, one out of four Turkish respondents cannot give an answer to this question (don't know/refusal: 26%). Among the EU member states such as Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, Poland, and Spain, roughly 10 percent are indifferent on the matter. Given the fact that a majority of member states respondents agree that reducing greenhouse gas emissions is right, across all member states, a substantial percentage appear not to be sure if the European Union is the level to handle this problem or the target of reducing at least 20 percent by 2020 might be too ambitious for the EU.

Increasing energy efficiency in the EU by 20 percent by 2020 is supported by almost 60 percent of Europeans (table 28). Increasing the share of renewable energy in the EU by 20 percent by 2020 is supported by more than 56 percent of Europeans. Furthermore, more than 80 percent of Europeans agree that a minimum percentage of the usage of renewable energy sources should be set in each member state (table 29). Whereas some of the new member states like Bulgaria (56%), Latvia (58%), and Estonia (55%) support this idea more reservedly.

Considering that one third of the electricity in the EU comes from nuclear energy, a major share of Europeans (60%) tend to support the statement that the share of nuclear energy should be decreased, as it poses safety problems like nuclear waste, or the danger of accidents (table 30). On the contrary, almost 30 percent consider that the share of nuclear energy should be increased, as it does not negatively contribute to climate change and global warming. People in Bulgaria (51%), Czech Republic (48%), Sweden (44%), and Slovakia (42%) tend to agree more on this issue than the general public in other EU member states.

Among the specific policy instruments aiming to fight environmental problems, the Europeans point out the importance of a refocused research on climate change. According to them, thinking about innovation and renewable energy sources, specific research on climate change, energy and resource efficiency should be the first priority to Europeans. Moreover, such scientific research should be financially supported, and also small businesses and households should receive financial support to make their energy consumption more efficient (table 31).

The position of Americans towards limiting greenhouse gas emissions has already been shown. We saw that Americans generally support introducing taxes on each household in order to implement the policy. Moreover, asked if there was a survey of scientists who found that global warming is occurring and poses a significant threat, the following response of the majority of Americans, 38 percent, was that the US should take steps to reduce greenhouse gases even if this involves significant costs. Not surprisingly, the majority, 45 percent, shared

the opinion that the US should take steps to reduce greenhouse gases, but only those that are low in cost (table 32). To make it more clear, 71 percent of Americans said the US economy will become more competitive, because the efforts to reduce the release of greenhouse gases will result in a more efficient energy use, saving money in the long run (table 33). With regard to possible approaches to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which may contribute to climate change, 85 percent of Americans favour the provision of tax incentives to utility companies to encourage them to sell environmentally clean energy. Likewise, 85 percent of Americans favour cash incentives like tax credits and rebates to individual households that upgrade to more energy efficient appliances like refrigerators and air conditioners. Almost 82 percent favour the continuation of the tax credit for purchasing a hybrid-electric car (table 34).

Although the position of the US general public is to reduce its greenhouse gases, the country has not ratified yet the UNFCCC⁵ international environmental treaty aiming at the stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. In 2001, approximately 44 percent of Americans disapproved President Bush's decision to reject the Kyoto Protocol; with more than 26 percent of the respondents who did not have an opinion on this issue (table 35). Furthermore, Bush's decision has not been approved by almost 85 percent of Europeans. On the contrary, in 2010, the public opinion towards the policies of President Obama in dealing with climate change generally approved his handling of the issue in the US and in the EU (table 36). However, respondents in Turkey tended to be more sceptical. Actually, the opinion of the public has not yet changed: in 2009, both Americans and Europeans share the opinion that Obama will take significant measures to control global climate change (table 37). Whereas Turkey has the opposite position as approximately 40 percent of the Turkish citizens considered that Obama will not take significant measures to address the problem.

Conclusion

Not the most important global problem, but a serious world concern – this is how both the general public and the elites, the EU and the US opinion on environment and environmental warnings could be summarised. There is no doubt that environmental problems are taken seriously and that the environment plays an important role in people's everyday lives. Moreover, people feel they can play a vital role in solving today's environmental problems.

However, this is where the ambivalence starts. Personal concerns and environmental friendly attitudes can hardly be translated into concrete actions if these require financial contribution. Americans, nevertheless, appear somewhat more likely to make personal expenses for the environment than Europeans or the Turkish populace. Moreover, the American household seems to be willing to pay specific amounts in order to protect the environment. The position of the Europeans on this issue cannot be considered coherent as they categorically state they will do as much as they can for environmental protection, even sacrificing economic growth. But when confronted with compensating for tackling environmental problems, this attitude somehow disappears.

Ambivalent towards the environmental protection – this appears not to be the only description of Europeans, which to some extent, could also be relevant for the Americans. But also dissatisfied – with the way environmental problems are dealt with. Dissatisfied with tackling the issues on national levels, and dissatisfied with addressing it at the international level. However, while in general the European Union is not doing enough for these specific problems, it seems to be doing more than the American stakeholders.

5 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Americans on the other side appear more constraint in their self-assessment when dealing with environmental problems. Based on the results, there appears to be many conflicts on how to do with the issues. While continuously rejecting already existing international attempts to protect the environment through emissions cut and setting standards, Americans are looking forward to a new international treaty aiming to fight the problem. Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is a target policy aim and specific instruments are already considered.

When we turn to policy actions aiming to help fight environmental problems, we find broad support for a wide range of actions which do not differ drastically among Europeans or Americans, public or elites. The lack of polarisation in supporting specific policies and policy tools certainly shows that a global problem needs a global response. And while there obviously are some differences in the opinions, we could not say these are drastically differing views.

References

Lorenzoni, Irene, and Pidgeon, Nick F. (2006), "Public Views on Climate Change: European and USA Perspectives", *Climatic Change*, Vol. 77, No. 1-2 (July), p. 73-95

Newell, Peter, and Paterson, Matthew (1998), "A Climate for Business: Global Warming, the State and Capital", *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Winter), p. 679-703

Schelling, Thomas C. (1997), "The Cost of Combating Global Warming. Facing the Tradeoffs", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 76, No. 6 (November/December), p. 8-14, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/node/53573>

Data

Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (CCFR), Worldviews 2002, http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/files/Studies_Publications/POS/POS2002/comparinmg_.aspx.

Eurobarometer (EB), http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb_arch_en.htm.

European Elites Survey (EES), <http://www.compagniadisanpaolo.it/Pubblicazioni>.

Flash Eurobarometer (FEB), http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_252_en.pdf.

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), <http://www.issp.org/page.php?pagelid=4>.

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

PIPA, <http://worldpublicopinion.org>.

Transatlantic Trends Leaders (TTL), <http://trends.gmfus.org/leaders>.

Transatlantic Trends Survey (TTS), <http://trends.gmfus.org/archives/transatlantic-trends>.

World Values Survey (WVS), http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/index_surveys.

Annex

Data Sources: The current secondary data analysis is based on a number of cross-national comparative surveys. Taking into account the differences in surveys methodology we consider important that the reader is aware of the key aspects in the surveys design and refer to them when comparing data between surveys.

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (CCFR)				
2008	Mass	1,027	US	CATI
2010	Mass	2,717	US	CATI
Eurobarometer (EB)				
2004	Mass	29,334	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F
2005	Mass	29,430	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F
2006	Mass	29,152	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HU, HR, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F
2007	Mass	30,224	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F
2008	Mass	30,170	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MK, MT, NL, PL, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F
2009	Mass	30,238	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MK, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
Eurobarometer (EB)				
2011	Mass	31,769	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV, ME, MK, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR, UK	F2F
European Elites Survey (EES)				
2006	Elite	255	Members of European Parliament and top-level officials of the EU Commission	CATI
Flash Eurobarometer (FEB)				
2007	Mass	25,809	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, UK	CATI
Global Attitudes Project (GAP)				
2001	Mass	5,188	DE, FR, IT, UK, US	CATI
2002	Mass	38,263	AO, AR, BD, BO, BR, BG, CA, CN, CZ, EG, FR, DE, GH, 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, UK, US, UZ, VE, VN	F2F, CATI
2008	Mass	24,717	AU, AR, BR, CN, DE, EG, ES, FR, ID, IN, JO, JP, KR, LB, MX, NG, PK, PL, RU, TR, TZ, UK, US, ZA	F2F, CATI
2009	Mass	26,397	AR, BR, CA, CN, DE, EG, ES, FR, ID, IL, IN, JO, JP, KE, KR, LB, MX, NG, PK, PL, PS, RU, TR, UK, US	F2F, CATI
2010	Mass	24,790	AR, BR, CN, DE, EG, ES, FR, ID, IN, JP, JO, KE, KR, LB, MX, NG, PK, PL, RU, TR, UK, US	F2F, CATI
International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)				
2010	Mass	41,923	AR, AT, BE, BG, CA, CH, CL, CN, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, HR, IL, JP, KR, LV, MX, NO, NZ, PH, RU, SE, SI, SK, TR, TW, UK, US, ZA	F2F, CAPI, CATI, CAWI, PAPI

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

Survey	Sample	N	Coverage	Method
Program of International Policy Attitudes (PIPA)				
2004	Mass	753	US	CAWI
2005	Mass	812	US	CAWI
Transatlantic Trends Leaders (TTL)				
2010	Elite	519	DE, EU, FR, IT, PL, SP, UK, US	CATI, CAWI
Transatlantic Trends Survey (TTS)				
2006	Mass	13,044	BG, DE, FR, IT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SK, SP, TR, UK, US	CAPI, CATI, PAPI
2009	Mass	13,095	BG, DE, FR, IT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SK, SP, TR, UK, US	CAPI, CATI, PAPI
World Values Survey (WVS)				
2005	Mass	67,268	AD, AR, AU, BR, BG, BF, CA, CL, CN, CY, EG, ET, FI, GE, DE, GH, GT, IN, ID, IT, JP, JP, MY, ML, MX, MD, MA, NO, PE, PL, RO, RW, RS, SI, ZA, KR, ES, SE, CH, TW, TH, TT, TR, UA, UY, US, VN, ZM	F2F

Note: The analysis is limited to the US, EU member countries, and Turkey.

1. Importance of Environmental Issues

Table 1. *GAP (2007, 2002):* Now turning to the world situation, here is a list of five dangers in the world today. In your opinion, which one of these poses the greatest threat to the world? (in percentages)

	Spread of nuclear weapons	Religious and ethnic hatred	AIDS and other infectious diseases	Pollution and other environmental problems	Growing gap between the rich and poor	N
US						
2007	25.7	29.2	10.7	16.2	18.2	959
2002	34.0	33.1	11.5	7.5	13.9	1,466
EU						
2007	19.5	25.3	9.8	23.0	22.4	4,832
2002	22.8	31.5	10.2	11.2	24.3	3,948
Bulgaria						
2007	26.2	9.3	15.7	20.4	28.4	485
2002	25.3	16.1	12.6	8.1	37.9	494
Czech Republic						
2007	22.7	29.3	8.6	26.8	12.6	444
2002	20.0	39.3	8.9	16.6	15.2	495
France						
2007	9.6	31.9	11.4	23.0	24.1	502
2002	15.5	38.1	15.3	11.7	19.4	504
Germany						
2007	16.3	35.0	2.6	18.7	27.4	492
2002	23.6	34.7	4.1	9.4	28.3	983
Italy						
2007	24.5	27.1	7.2	24.7	16.5	498
2002	22.3	27.8	15.2	16.0	18.7	507
Poland						
2007	22.9	13.3	19.3	8.7	35.8	497
2002	26.4	23.4	13.8	4.6	31.8	478
Slovakia						
2007	26.8	19.8	8.4	26.9	18.1	443
2002	26.9	25.9	8.2	14.6	24.4	487
Spain						
2007	20.6	17.8	13.6	21.1	26.9	494
Sweden						
2007	10.9	23.2	4.7	43.3	17.9	487
United Kingdom						
2007	15.9	45.7	6.3	17.6	14.5	490
2002	22.0	43.2	9.7	9.5	15.6	495
Turkey						
2007	34.7	21.4	7.3	10.4	26.2	924
2002	28.3	15.5	10.0	6.7	39.5	966

Table 2. GAP (2007, 2002): And which of these poses the second greatest threat to the world? (in percentages)

	Spread of nuclear weapons	Religious and ethnic hatred	AIDS and other infectious diseases	Pollution and other environmental problems	Growing gap between the rich and poor	N
US						
2007	21.5	18.5	20.5	22.7	16.8	934
2002	26.2	20.1	21.3	16.3	16.1	1,438
EU						
2007	19.9	19.6	14.4	26.6	19.5	4,722
2002	20.0	21.3	18.6	20.7	19.4	4,381
Bulgaria						
2007	19.2	13.3	20.6	26.9	20.0	475
2002	17.2	15.5	24.3	22.0	21.0	477
Czech Republic						
2007	23.2	21.4	15.0	22.8	17.6	439
2002	19.8	19.4	19.2	25.6	16.0	495
France						
2007	11.8	23.1	15.2	28.7	21.2	501
2002	14.3	21.5	21.7	17.9	24.5	502
Germany						
2007	18.3	23.7	6.5	27.6	23.9	490
2002	18.6	27.1	13.4	18.0	22.9	971
Italy						
2007	22.5	18.9	13.5	27.7	17.4	476
2002	26.4	18.8	17.6	23.8	13.4	500
Poland						
2007	25.5	9.8	19.0	25.9	19.8	478
2002	22.3	15.9	23.8	16.3	21.7	466
Slovakia						
2007	24.4	19.4	17.4	24.4	14.4	438
2002	24.4	19.4	15.8	23.1	17.3	480
Spain						
2007	20.9	17.8	14.6	26.6	20.1	494
Sweden						
2007	16.9	26.1	9.8	25.4	21.8	468
United Kingdom						
2007	16.5	22.5	12.9	29.5	18.6	484
2002	18.2	26.5	18.8	21.4	15.1	490
Turkey						
2007	26.6	19.9	15.1	18.3	20.1	885
2002	20.1	24.5	14.1	16.8	24.5	926

Table 3. *WVS (2005):* I am going to read out a list of environmental problems facing many communities. Please, tell me how serious you consider each one to be here in your own community. Is it very serious, somewhat serious, not very serious or not serious at all? (in percentages)

		Very serious	Some-what serious	Not very serious	Not serious at all	N
US	Poor water quality	36.3	24.2	24.9	14.6	1,221
	Poor air quality	38.0	29.0	22.2	10.8	1,218
	Poor sewage and sanitation	32.9	22.7	28.1	16.3	1,212
EU	Poor water quality	29.6	17.0	19.2	34.2	10,785
	Poor air quality	28.3	19.8	22.4	29.5	10,811
	Poor sewage and sanitation	29.2	19.6	19.9	31.3	10,740
Bulgaria	Poor water quality	60.2	23.0	7.8	9.0	971
	Poor air quality	58.3	22.1	9.4	10.2	972
	Poor sewage and sanitation	56.1	27.7	8.7	7.5	950
Cyprus	Poor water quality	69.3	12.8	9.6	8.3	1,046
	Poor air quality	63.2	15.0	10.5	11.3	1,046
	Poor sewage and sanitation	60.6	16.7	12.4	10.3	1,046
Finland	Poor water quality	15.1	11.5	25.0	48.4	1,013
	Poor air quality	13.9	15.1	31.7	39.3	1,013
	Poor sewage and sanitation	12.3	10.2	27.8	49.7	1,012
Germany	Poor water quality	12.3	14.1	25.4	48.2	2,029
	Poor air quality	13.0	19.2	23.9	43.9	2,036
	Poor sewage and sanitation	11.3	13.2	23.5	52.0	2,022
Italy	Poor water quality	16.5	19.8	28.8	34.9	991
	Poor air quality	19.9	23.5	30.1	26.5	998
	Poor sewage and sanitation	24.4	24.8	25.4	25.4	988
Poland	Poor water quality	47.5	28.4	16.9	7.2	997
	Poor air quality	46.8	27.9	17.6	7.7	997
	Poor sewage and sanitation	45.7	31.3	15.8	7.2	993
Romania	Poor water quality	35.4	20.4	17.1	27.1	1,724
	Poor air quality	30.4	18.9	20.1	30.6	1,723
	Poor sewage and sanitation	40.5	26.5	15.7	17.3	1,729

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

		Very serious	Some-what serious	Not very serious	Not serious at all	N
Slovenia	Poor water quality	18.6	20.1	27.3	34.0	1,019
	Poor air quality	16.5	22.7	30.6	30.2	1,029
	Poor sewage and sanitation	16.6	21.2	28.3	33.9	1,018
Sweden	Poor water quality	4.9	3.7	9.7	81.7	995
	Poor air quality	7.0	15.1	27.5	50.4	997
	Poor sewage and sanitation	4.9	6.5	20.0	68.6	982
Turkey	Poor water quality	73.3	12.5	8.7	5.5	1,339
	Poor air quality	68.3	12.9	10.2	8.6	1,336
	Poor sewage and sanitation	66.9	16.8	10.1	6.2	1,333

Table 4. *WVS (2005)*: Now let's consider environmental problems in the world as a whole. Please, tell me how serious you consider each of the following to be for the world as a whole. Is it very serious, somewhat serious, not very serious or not serious at all? (in percentages)

		Very serious	Some-what serious	Not very serious	Not serious at all	N
US	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	46.8	34.0	13.6	5.6	1,216
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	44.0	39.6	13.3	3.1	1,215
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	64.6	29.7	4.9	0.8	1,212
EU	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	60.1	32.8	5.9	1.2	11,418
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	54.4	35.6	8.7	1.3	11,581
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	66.2	28.3	4.7	.8	11,756
Bulgaria	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	64.3	29.5	4.5	1.7	863
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	63.1	30.8	4.9	1.2	912
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	75.3	21.9	1.6	1.2	949
Cyprus	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	76.1	19.1	3.8	1.0	1,044
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	71.6	22.8	5.0	0.6	1,045
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	80.3	15.8	3.5	0.4	1,046
Finland	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	51.2	39.6	8.4	0.8	1,006
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	40.7	45.9	12.0	1.4	1,005
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	61.4	34.6	3.7	0.3	1,013
Germany	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	49.7	40.7	8.9	0.7	2,010
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	37.0	43.9	17.5	1.6	2,016
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	43.4	41.6	14.0	1.0	2,025

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

		Very serious	Some-what serious	Not very serious	Not serious at all	N
Italy	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	71.4	24.5	3.5	0.6	982
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	58.4	35.6	5.5	0.5	982
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	77.0	22.2	0.7	0.1	996
Poland	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	53.4	40.4	5.1	1.1	983
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	57.6	37.6	4.2	0.6	991
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	70.1	27.8	1.7	0.4	995
Romania	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	48.9	39.8	7.7	3.6	1,420
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	43.9	40.7	11.7	3.7	1,471
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	57.3	34.5	5.5	2.7	1,546
Slovenia	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	59.8	32.2	6.1	1.9	965
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	55.7	36.9	6.1	1.3	994
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	67.6	29.4	2.5	0.5	1,014
Spain	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	74.7	22.5	2.5	0.3	1,156
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	75.2	21.5	3.0	0.3	1,166
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	81.4	16.0	2.4	0.2	1,170
Sweden	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	64.0	30.9	4.8	0.3	989
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	60.7	32.0	6.9	0.4	999
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	74.2	24.0	1.7	0.1	1,002
Turkey	Global warming or the greenhouse effect	88.7	8.4	2.1	0.8	1,250
	Loss of plant or animal species or biodiversity	82.2	14.3	2.5	1.0	1,266
	Pollution of rivers, lakes, and oceans	86.8	11.2	1.4	0.6	1,274

Table 5. *GAP (2010)*: In your view, is global climate change a very serious problem, somewhat serious, or not a problem? (in percentages)

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	N
US	35.2	33.5	16.9	14.4	979
EU	44.0	40.0	10.7	5.3	3,713
France	46.0	39.2	9.3	5.5	752
Germany	53.3	32.4	10.0	4.3	749
Poland	30.8	54.5	11.3	3.4	723
Spain	49.5	37.7	7.6	5.2	748
United Kingdom	39.7	36.7	15.5	8.1	741
Turkey	80.3	13.2	3.4	3.1	929

Table 6. GAP (2009, 2008, 2007): In your view, is global warming a very serious problem, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not a problem at all? (in percentages)

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	N
US					
2009	44.3	30.5	13.8	11.4	982
2008	43.9	31.3	13.2	11.6	968
2007	48.6	28.9	13.3	9.2	979
EU					
2009	56.2	34.2	7.0	2.6	3,681
2008	62.1	29.5	6.0	2.4	3,708
2007	61.4	30.8	5.6	2.2	4,758
Bulgaria					
2007	71.8	21.0	5.9	1.3	461
Czech Republic					
2007	60.9	28.8	7.6	2.7	448
Italy					
2007	60.1	37.6	1.7	0.6	471
France					
2009	67.6	27.6	3.5	1.3	753
2008	71.9	24.5	2.8	0.8	754
2007	68.2	26.8	3.6	1.4	503
Germany					
2009	60.7	30.5	6.5	2.3	742
2008	61.0	29.5	7.5	2.0	746
2007	61.1	26.7	8.1	4.1	491
Poland					
2009	38.0	49.0	10.6	2.4	715
2008	53.5	37.2	7.8	1.5	716
2007	41.6	48.7	7.8	1.9	485
Spain					
2009	63.2	29.8	4.5	2.5	729
2008	67.4	28.5	2.1	2.0	745
2007	72.5	25.5	1.7	0.3	483
Slovakia					
2007	65.5	28.2	5.2	1.1	447
Sweden					
2007	66.6	26.3	5.0	2.1	482
United Kingdom					
2009	50.4	34.9	10.1	4.6	742
2008	56.4	28.3	9.8	5.5	747
2007	46.6	38.0	9.9	5.5	487
Turkey					
2009	72.0	20.7	3.8	3.5	913
2008	87.1	7.5	3.6	1.8	949
2007	75.8	19.7	3.6	0.9	894

Table 7. TTL (2010): What is the biggest challenge currently facing the transatlantic community?

	Percentage	N
	44.4	106
Economic decline	18.0	43
Lack of International cooperation	13.4	32
Terrorism	10.9	26
EUs internal problems/failure as a partner	10.0	24
Climate change	5.4	13
Iran	4.6	11
Afghanistan	4.2	10
Trade/Balance of trade/Free trade agreements	3.8	9
Hot spots/Wars	3.8	9
US National security	3.8	9
(elites) Middle East	3.3	8
Debt	2.9	7
Human rights/Poverty	2.5	6
Energy/fossil fuel issues	2.1	5
Demographics/Population changes	2.1	5
China	2.1	5
Environmental issues	1.7	4
Unemployment/Job development	0.8	2
Monetary policy	12.1	29
Some other response		
Total	151.9	363

Note: Multiple response.

Table 8. *TTS (2006), EES (2006)*: I am going to read you a list of possible international threats to [EUROPE / US] in the next 10 years, please tell me if you think each one on the list is very important threat. (in percentages)
 ---The effects of global warming

	Very important threat	Somewhat important threat	Not very important threat	Not an important threat at all	N
EU (general public)	60.4	28.6	8.5	2.5	5,323
Bulgaria	40.2	41.1	13.0	5.7	460
France	80.0	15.2	3.4	1.4	501
Germany	61.1	28.8	9.3	0.8	483
Italy	58.4	32.2	7.4	2.0	502
Netherlands	45.6	37.7	12.3	4.4	472
Poland	34.0	47.3	14.7	4.0	476
Portugal	89.7	7.5	1.6	1.2	494
Romania	56.5	33.4	9.4	0.7	437
Slovakia	33.3	42.8	18.7	5.2	481
Spain	84.6	12.6	1.8	1.0	500
United Kingdom	75.8	19.3	3.9	1.0	517
EU (elites)	39.8	39.0	16.7	4.5	251
Bulgaria					
France	57.8	34.6	3.8	3.8	26
Germany	32.5	40.0	27.5	0.0	40
Italy	43.9	39.0	12.2	4.9	41
Netherlands	61.5	23.1	15.4	0.0	13
Poland	7.1	32.1	50.0	10.8	28
Portugal	36.4	63.6	0.0	0.0	11
Slovakia	28.6	28.5	42.9	0.0	7
Spain	40.0	53.3	6.7	0.0	15
United Kingdom	45.7	40.0	7.2	7.1	70

2. General Attitudes towards Environmental Issues

Table 9. *TTS (2009)*: For each of the following statements, please tell me whether you totally agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree or totally disagree. (in percentages)

--- Climate change is an unstoppable process, we cannot do anything about it.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	N
US	21.8	12.9	22.2	43.1	952
EU	13.2	21.1	31.2	34.5	10,675
Bulgaria	17.8	28.9	29.4	23.9	942
France	11.4	15.9	25.3	47.4	991
Germany	11.5	18.6	30.9	39.0	991
Italy	7.8	17.2	32.3	42.7	996
Netherlands	10.2	20.3	32.2	37.3	994
Portugal	23.5	12.5	18.8	45.2	966
Poland	10.0	30.1	41.9	18.0	887
Romania	19.7	30.0	31.4	18.9	942
Slovakia	10.3	26.3	40.2	23.2	988
Spain	5.8	13.2	38.8	42.2	992
United Kingdom	17.5	21.1	22.3	39.0	986
Turkey	18.3	32.2	22.6	26.9	804

Table 10. TTS (2009): To what extent do you agree with the following statements about climate change? (in percentages)

--- The personal actions that we take to fight climate can make a difference.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	N
US	52.8	23.6	8.0	15.6	952
EU	43.7	39.8	11.2	5.3	10,711
Bulgaria	32.2	46.0	13.6	8.2	943
France	49.5	37.0	8.5	5.0	997
Germany	49.0	35.8	10.6	4.6	989
Italy	54.3	33.2	9.7	2.8	998
Netherlands	40.1	43.5	10.4	6.0	1,000
Poland	26.0	51.3	17.3	5.4	913
Portugal	70.0	22.2	3.9	3.9	964
Romania	29.8	48.6	16.4	5.2	943
Slovakia	33.7	49.3	13.3	3.7	986
Spain	38.9	44.0	12.0	5.1	996
United Kingdom	55.3	28.4	7.7	8.6	982
Turkey	33.1	45.9	13.3	7.7	809

Table 11. *TTS (2009):* Some people say that (in Europe: the European countries/ in USA: the US) should do as much as it can to fight climate change, even if others do less. Others says that (in Europe: the European countries/ in USA: the US) should do only as much as others do. Which view comes closest to your own? (in percentages)

	We should do as much as we can, even if others do less	We should only do as much as others do	DK/RF	N
US	67.2	21.6	11.2	1,000
EU	78.2	17.9	3.9	11,093
Bulgaria	65.0	24.3	10.7	1,030
France	82.3	16.0	1.7	1,004
Germany	86.0	12.9	1.1	1,000
Italy	87.2	11.8	1.0	1,000
Netherlands	73.8	24.0	2.2	1,009
Poland	67.3	23.9	8.8	1,000
Portugal	90.4	7.6	2.0	1,001
Romania	71.1	21.2	7.7	1,028
Slovakia	72.1	22.6	5.3	1,018
Spain	84.4	14.6	1.0	1,002
United Kingdom	81.3	17.1	1.6	1,001
Turkey	48.1	30.7	21.2	1,002

Table 12. *TTS (2009)*: Some people say that we should do everything possible to fight climate change, even if it slows economic growth. Others say that we should do everything possible to maximize economic growth, even if it hurts efforts to combat climate change. Which view comes closest to your own? (in percentages)

	We should fight climate change even if it slows economic growth	We should maximize economic growth even if it hurts efforts to combat climate change	DK/RF	N
US	42.8	39.6	17.6	1,000
EU	66.5	21.2	12.3	11,093
Bulgaria	62.8	15.4	21.8	1,030
France	79.3	16.6	4.1	1,004
Germany	67.8	23.2	9.0	1,000
Italy	77.8	17.4	4.8	1,000
Netherlands	66.9	24.4	8.7	1,009
Poland	53.5	24.8	21.7	1,000
Portugal	73.6	17.1	9.3	1,001
Romania	59.7	19.3	21.0	1,028
Slovakia	53.2	25.2	21.6	1,018
Spain	76.0	20.4	3.6	1,002
United Kingdom	61.2	29.9	8.9	1,001
Turkey	56.5	19.9	23.6	1,002

Table 13. *ISSP (2010):* How willing would you be to pay much higher prices, to pay much higher taxes, to accept cuts in your standard of living in order to protect the environment? (in percentages)

		Very willing	Fairly willing	Neither nor	Fairly un-willing	Very un-willing	N
US	higher prices	8.1	38.7	21.5	16.3	15.4	1,361
	higher taxes	6.0	27.6	20.7	20.7	25.0	1,368
	standard of living	5.6	29.8	21.0	20.0	23.6	1,374
EU	higher prices	3.2	24.1	26.5	25.6	20.6	18,929
	higher taxes	2.3	16.6	23.3	28.4	29.4	18,932
	standard of living	3.9	25.5	25.4	24.0	21.2	18,904
Austria	higher prices	3.7	27.1	20.0	28.1	21.1	992
	higher taxes	2.1	15.6	19.5	31.9	30.9	990
	standard of living	6.7	41.3	21.0	19.9	11.1	978
Belgium	higher prices	2.8	30.5	29.5	20.0	17.2	1,093
	higher taxes	2.1	19.1	25.8	21.8	31.2	1,103
	standard of living	3.7	27.7	32.2	21.7	14.7	1,092
Bulgaria	higher prices	3.3	21.6	13.9	22.2	39.0	988
	higher taxes	3.0	15.2	13.4	22.2	46.2	985
	standard of living	2.1	11.5	12.2	22.0	52.2	984
Czech Republic	higher prices	1.2	14.9	23.4	31.0	29.5	1,407
	higher taxes	1.4	10.4	20.3	29.7	38.2	1,395
	standard of living	1.4	12.9	23.4	31.0	31.3	1,408
Denmark	higher prices	5.3	40.2	34.1	14.2	6.2	1,231
	higher taxes	5.4	31.2	29.4	20.8	13.2	1,238
	standard of living	5.6	34.2	34.6	17.8	7.8	1,235
Finland	higher prices	1.9	25.3	27.9	29.5	15.4	1,171
	higher taxes	2.0	16.8	25.6	32.2	23.4	1,178
	standard of living	4.3	34.0	29.2	22.7	9.8	1,161
France	higher prices	4.3	25.3	26.3	24.9	19.2	2,165
	higher taxes	2.3	14.1	23.0	25.5	35.1	2,177
	standard of living	5.6	27.0	26.3	20.9	20.2	2,188
Germany	higher prices	4.9	32.2	30.8	22.1	10.0	1,350
	higher taxes	2.6	19.8	27.8	30.5	19.3	1,326
	standard of living	4.6	34.8	25.7	22.9	12.0	1,335
Latvia	higher prices	1.3	9.2	18.3	35.0	36.2	947
	higher taxes	0.7	7.3	14.2	33.9	43.9	943
	standard of living	1.0	5.7	14.8	33.2	45.3	945
Lithuania	higher prices	1.5	11.5	27.1	27.5	32.4	956
	higher taxes	0.9	11.4	24.7	28.7	34.3	954
	standard of living	1.1	8.8	19.2	31.5	39.4	947

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

		Very willing	Fairly willing	Neither nor	Fairly unwilling	Very unwilling	N
Slovakia	higher prices	2.3	17.2	29.0	27.3	24.2	1,089
	higher taxes	1.8	12.1	28.8	28.2	29.1	1,085
	standard of living	4.1	21.2	31.3	25.5	17.9	1,090
Slovenia	higher prices	2.8	25.5	33.2	16.9	21.6	1,025
	higher taxes	1.7	15.9	28.3	23.6	30.5	1,037
	standard of living	3.2	29.8	32.4	16.0	18.6	1,034
Spain	higher prices	3.0	23.8	25.7	29.5	18.0	2,495
	higher taxes	2.1	18.3	20.1	35.2	24.3	2,492
	standard of living	3.5	27.9	24.0	26.7	17.9	2,480
Sweden	higher prices	4.0	27.9	24.3	31.1	12.7	1,138
	higher taxes	3.1	20.4	24.1	31.8	20.6	1,142
	standard of living	6.6	35.6	25.8	22.0	10.0	1,142
United Kingdom	higher prices	3.7	23.6	33.8	20.0	18.9	882
	higher taxes	3.6	19.2	26.2	22.0	29.0	887
	standard of living	2.5	19.0	24.1	27.2	27.2	885
Turkey	higher prices	6.0	19.3	24.5	29.6	20.6	1,594
	higher taxes	6.1	16.8	22.6	33.0	21.5	1,601
	standard of living	4.8	13.4	26.1	34.1	21.6	1,576

Table 14. *PIPA (2004)*: If in fact it appears that it would likely cost \$15 a month for an average household, would you favour or oppose enacting such a bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? (in percentages)

		Percentage	N
US	Favour	69.2	501
	Oppose	30.8	223
	Total		724

3. The Role of the Main Stakeholders in the Area of Environmental Issues

Table 15. *TTS (2009):* To what extent do you agree with the following statements about climate change? (in percentages)

--- It is governments, not citizens, that are primarily responsible for dealing with climate change.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	N
US	15.3	24.4	25.0	35.3	917
EU	25.3	31.4	26.6	16.7	10,669
Bulgaria	33.4	35.6	22.6	8.4	949
France	18.9	22.0	30.4	28.7	992
Germany	23.2	28.2	30.3	18.3	985
Italy	22.8	37.0	24.4	15.8	996
Netherlands	16.5	24.9	30.7	27.9	992
Poland	17.7	38.3	33.2	10.8	901
Portugal	25.9	23.0	25.6	25.5	965
Romania	35.7	35.4	21.6	7.3	939
Slovakia	29.1	40.7	25.0	5.2	983
Spain	26.4	34.3	25.8	13.5	992
United Kingdom	29.1	27.2	22.7	21.0	975
Turkey	29.8	43.7	19.2	7.3	838

Table 16. *ISSP (2010)*: If you had to choose, which one of the following would be closest to your views? (in percentages)

	Government should let ordinary people decide for themselves how to protect environment	Government should pass laws to make ordinary people protect environment	N
US	37.3	62.7	1,032
EU	23.6	76.4	16,755
Austria	26.0	74.0	1,019
Belgium	30.7	69.3	902
Bulgaria	9.0	91.0	927
Czech Republic	31.8	68.2	1,256
Denmark	12.7	87.3	1,123
Finland	41.9	58.1	946
France	21.9	78.1	1,682
Germany	20.4	79.6	1,182
Latvia	42.1	57.9	805
Lithuania	25.5	74.5	847
Slovakia	19.9	80.1	1,031
Slovenia	19.9	80.1	955
Spain	14.1	85.9	2,417
Sweden	19.7	80.3	947
United Kingdom	42.3	57.7	716
Turkey	27.1	72.9	1,456

Table 17. EB (2008): In your opinion, has the government done too little, too much or the right amount to address the environmental issues in this country? (in percentages)

	Too much	About the right amount	Not enough	N
EU	2.8	24.1	73.1	24,404
Austria	2.3	23.8	73.9	908
Belgium	3.1	30.0	66.9	960
Bulgaria	0.5	6.6	92.9	792
Cyprus	2.5	31.7	65.8	477
Czech Republic	2.3	21.7	76.0	961
Denmark	2.6	38.8	58.6	979
Estonia	.9	28.2	70.9	880
Finland	2.3	40.6	57.1	976
France	2.0	18.0	80.0	980
Germany East	8.1	33.4	58.5	494
Germany West	8.8	41.6	49.6	984
Great Britain	7.6	36.4	56.0	923
Greece	1.0	14.7	84.3	998
Hungary	0.9	14.1	85.0	936
Ireland	2.3	37.7	60.0	815
Italy	2.2	17.0	80.8	920
Latvia	0.4	6.9	92.7	933
Lithuania	0.6	15.0	84.4	899
Luxembourg	4.7	42.5	52.8	464
Malta	2.9	26.9	70.2	442
Netherlands	8.3	30.5	61.2	996
Northern Ireland	3.6	22.7	73.7	278
Poland	2.1	17.2	80.7	895
Portugal	1.7	19.0	79.3	858
Romania	2.4	16.4	81.2	850
Slovakia	0.7	31.7	67.6	1,016
Slovenia	0.6	12.9	86.5	973
Spain	2.8	19.7	77.5	844
Sweden	3.9	35.3	60.8	973
Turkey	4.7	19.0	76.3	872

Table 18. CCFR (2010): To deal with the problem of climate change, do you think your government is doing:

		Percentage	N
US	Too much	10.4	273
	About the right amount	31.7	407
	Not enough	46.9	601
	Total		1,281

Table 19. TTS (2009): To what extent do you agree with the following statements about climate change? (in percentages)

--- Climate change can only be addressed effectively at the international level.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/RF	N
US	32.8	20.9	14.9	25.4	6.0	1,000
EU	52.1	25.6	11.6	7.1	3.6	11,093
Bulgaria	66.1	22.8	2.3	1.5	7.3	1,030
France	68.3	19.2	5.2	6.4	0.9	1,004
Germany	72.9	19.3	3.6	3.4	0.8	1,000
Italy	52.4	25.0	14.9	7.2	0.5	1,000
Netherlands	74.6	17.3	3.9	3.3	0.9	1,009
Portugal	31.3	21.2	22.0	21.9	3.6	1,001
Poland	28.0	39.0	19.0	5.4	8.6	1,000
Romania	41.7	28.9	13.8	6.1	9.5	1,028
Slovakia	36.3	36.4	16.9	5.2	5.2	1,018
Spain	46.2	33.5	13.1	6.5	0.7	1,002
United Kingdom	54.8	19.4	12.8	11.4	1.6	1,001
Turkey	31.3	32.8	11.1	5.8	19.0	1,002

Table 20. EB (2008): In your opinion, has the following currently doing too much, doing about the right, or not doing enough to fight climate change? (in percentages)
 --- European Union

	Too much	About the right amount	Not enough	N
EU	2.9	30.2	66.9	23,056
Austria	4.7	15.3	80.0	890
Belgium	3.9	32.8	63.3	944
Bulgaria	4.6	34.2	61.2	634
Cyprus	7.9	50.0	42.1	442
Czech Republic	3.0	39.0	58.0	905
Denmark	2.1	29.3	68.6	946
Estonia	3.0	43.0	54.0	839
Finland	2.0	31.2	66.8	950
France	2.3	17.4	80.3	919
Germany East	5.0	32.7	62.3	477
Germany West	3.5	39.4	57.1	952
Great Britain	6.3	32.6	61.1	764
Greece	2.5	25.4	72.1	990
Hungary	0.9	30.8	68.3	882
Ireland	2.8	40.1	57.1	761
Italy	2.5	22.8	74.7	882
Latvia	0.7	21.0	78.3	877
Lithuania	1.7	32.6	65.7	836
Luxembourg	2.6	35.2	62.2	454
Malta	4.5	44.9	50.6	421
Netherlands	4.1	22.2	73.7	906
Northern Ireland	2.4	29.0	68.6	255
Poland	2.7	37.1	60.2	828
Portugal	2.4	24.5	73.1	821
Romania	3.1	30.0	66.9	796
Slovakia	3.0	43.3	53.7	981
Slovenia	0.9	20.4	78.7	957
Spain	3.2	22.1	74.7	814
Sweden	1.3	20.2	78.5	933
Turkey	8.9	27.8	63.3	817

Table 21. EB (2009, 2005): For each of the following, please tell me whether in your opinion the European Union is ahead, behind or at the same level as the United States. (in percentages)
 --- Protecting the environment

	Ahead	At the same level	Behind	DK/RF	N
EU					
2009	51.4	21.1	17.2	10.3	26,731
2005	54.8	19.8	12.8	12.6	26,925
Austria					
2009	73.6	15.3	9.4	1.7	1,030
2005	68.7	15.1	7.8	8.4	1,020
Belgium					
2009	62.3	19.2	15.6	2.9	1,006
2005	74.1	15.1	7.7	3.1	1,024
Bulgaria					
2009	24.4	31.3	21.1	23.2	1,008
2005	26.1	30.0	10.5	33.4	1,001
Cyprus					
2009	64.0	14.1	7.7	14.2	506
2005	74.1	13.5	4.2	8.2	502
Czech Republic					
2009	37.3	37.0	22.1	3.6	1,056
2005	47.8	33.3	14.1	4.8	1,161
Denmark					
2009	85.4	8.1	3.4	3.1	1,006
2005	81.3	9.1	4.6	5.0	1,032
Estonia					
2009	46.1	21.9	14.4	17.6	1,002
2005	41.4	25.8	7.6	25.2	1,000
Finland					
2009	82.5	10.3	4.9	2.3	1,018
2005	78.5	12.7	5.5	3.3	1,028
France					
2009	65.0	15.7	11.1	8.2	1,005
2005	70.6	14.6	6.8	8.0	1,009
Germany East					
2009	83.5	7.7	3.5	5.3	514
2005	86.0	8.2	3.9	1.9	513
Germany West					
2009	85.8	7.1	2.2	4.9	1,000
2005	79.5	7.6	7.0	5.9	1,021

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

	Ahead	At the same level	Behind	DK/RF	N
Great Britain					
2009	53.5	18.9	16.8	10.8	1,018
2005	64.1	14.5	8.5	12.9	1,021
Greece					
2009	46.0	29.7	21.8	2.5	1,000
2005	55.4	24.9	16.4	3.3	1,000
Hungary					
2009	32.9	25.7	34.9	6.5	1,023
2005	42.2	21.6	20.8	15.4	1,000
Ireland					
2009	39.6	20.0	22.0	18.4	1,011
2005	50.0	18.9	19.9	11.2	1,009
Italy					
2009	22.2	27.3	41.5	9.0	1,036
2005	29.8	29.9	28.2	12.1	1,000
Latvia					
2009	36.1	27.7	16.8	19.4	1,006
2005	31.7	30.3	11.2	26.8	1,033
Lithuania					
2009	26.9	23.1	32.0	18.0	1,023
2005	21.7	25.7	22.0	30.6	1,020
Luxembourg					
2009	71.5	15.3	7.8	5.4	502
2005	76.6	9.6	7.1	6.7	510
Malta					
2009	29.4	28.0	18.8	23.8	500
2005	46.4	28.8	6.8	18.0	500
Northern Ireland					
2009	45.3	14.5	27.0	13.2	304
2005	57.5	16.7	12.4	13.4	299
Poland					
2009	36.8	27.4	16.4	19.4	1,000
2005	37.1	29.2	14.4	19.3	1,000
Portugal					
2009	23.6	32.0	26.0	18.4	1,025
2005	30.3	23.9	29.1	16.7	1,003

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

	Ahead	At the same level	Behind	DK/RF	N
Romania					
2009	18.2	31.9	28.1	21.8	1,021
2005	28.4	28.0	18.7	24.9	1,000
Slovakia					
2009	39.2	33.7	22.3	4.8	1,040
2005	45.1	31.0	16.2	7.7	1,096
Slovenia					
2009	70.1	13.8	9.8	6.3	1,015
2005	66.2	14.4	14.1	5.3	1,034
Spain					
2009	39.7	23.4	24.4	12.5	1,020
2005	44.4	13.7	20.6	21.3	1,015
Sweden					
2009	87.9	5.9	3.5	2.7	1,032
2005	83.6	7.5	5.1	3.8	1,033

Table 22a. EB (2006, 2004): In your opinion, does the European Union tend to play a positive role, a negative role or neither positive nor negative role regarding...? (in percentages)
 --- Protection of the environment

	Positive	Neither nor	Negative	DK/RF	N
EU					
2006	63.4	19.8	10.5	6.3	24,565
2004	62.2	19.1	10.6	8.1	24,791
Austria					
2006	44.7	32.7	19.0	3.6	1,016
2004	38.6	35.7	18.7	7.0	1,007
Belgium					
2006	66.9	18.5	13.5	1.1	1,003
2004	69.0	16.7	11.6	2.7	974
Cyprus					
2006	82.5	10.5	2.4	4.6	503
2004	76.2	12.8	3.2	7.8	500
Czech Republic					
2006	75.4	16.8	6.1	1.7	1,091
2004	73.9	17.1	4.3	4.7	1,075
Denmark					
2006	58.5	24.0	13.1	4.4	1,003
2004	52.7	16.7	23.7	6.9	1,028
Estonia					
2006	74.6	12.2	2.9	10.3	1,000
2004	76.7	9.9	2.1	11.3	1,000
Finland					
2006	68.8	21.4	7.3	2.5	1,000
2004	76.1	13.7	7.0	3.2	1,005
France					
2006	60.1	18.6	15.1	6.2	1,007
2004	57.7	19.4	15.0	7.9	1,020
Germany East					
2006	70.4	14.2	11.8	3.6	507
2004	74.0	18.3	4.9	2.8	508
Germany West					
2006	67.1	15.5	13.1	4.3	1,018
2004	63.5	18.9	11.9	5.7	1,037
Great Britain					
2006	46.8	22.9	19.5	10.8	1,000
2004	53.4	21.9	12.2	12.5	1,011
Greece					
2006	59.0	28.2	12.3	0.5	1,000
2004	58.0	26.7	9.9	5.4	1,000
Hungary					
2006	65.8	17.5	10.8	5.9	1,005
2004	70.0	16.5	4.2	9.3	1,014

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

	Positive	Neither nor	Negative	DK/RF	N
Ireland					
2006	63.8	15.1	9.6	11.5	1,000
2004	67.7	14.9	8.0	9.4	1,000
Italy					
2006	51.0	22.8	18.2	8.0	1,006
2004	43.1	24.1	24.7	8.1	1,020
Latvia					
2006	65.7	20.7	4.2	9.4	1,015
2004	61.3	19.2	6.5	13.0	1,005
Lithuania					
2006	72.0	16.6	1.9	9.5	1,000
2004	70.9	13.2	1.8	14.1	1,002
Luxembourg					
2006	69.2	17.6	9.6	3.6	500
2004	64.7	18.3	12.0	5.0	502
Malta					
2006	76.4	9.0	3.6	11.0	500
2004	84.6	6.0	3.0	6.4	500
Netherlands					
2006	59.9	22.5	13.7	3.9	1,018
2004	55.9	22.6	15.7	5.8	1,009
Northern Ireland					
2006	54.5	13.6	17.5	14.4	308
2004	50.5	16.1	11.4	22.0	299
Poland					
2006	73.0	17.4	5.0	4.6	1,000
2004	70.2	15.0	5.0	9.8	1,000
Portugal					
2006	52.8	23.2	12.6	11.4	995
2004	42.5	24.4	19.9	13.2	1,000
Slovakia					
2006	69.4	20.6	6.5	3.5	1,023
2004	65.7	23.5	5.0	5.8	1,252
Slovenia					
2006	68.8	22.6	5.6	3.0	1,031
2004	69.0	17.1	6.9	7.0	1,000
Spain					
2006	50.4	19.7	13.2	16.7	1,003
2004	54.2	20.0	15.1	10.7	1,023
Sweden					
2006	60.3	20.5	12.8	6.4	1,013
2004	54.1	24.1	15.2	6.6	1,000
Turkey					
2006	48.3	14.0	29.5	8.2	1,005
2004	60.0	10.8	19.9	9.3	1,027

Table 22b. EB (2006, 2004): In your opinion, does the United States tend to play a positive role, a negative role or neither positive nor negative role regarding ...? (in percentages)
 --- Protection of the environment

	Positive	Neither nor	Negative	DK/RF	N
EU					
2006	19.5	18.0	54.2	8.3	24,565
2004	19.7	17.7	52.5	10.1	24,791
Austria					
2006	15.6	20.6	59.4	4.4	1,016
2004	8.9	20.0	64.2	6.9	1,007
Belgium					
2006	12.8	14.5	70.7	2.0	1,003
2004	12.1	15.3	70.1	2.5	974
Cyprus					
2006	10.3	8.7	73.6	7.4	503
2004	9.8	12.4	70.2	7.6	500
Czech Republic					
2006	38.9	25.1	33.5	2.5	1,091
2004	36.8	24.5	31.1	7.6	1,075
Denmark					
2006	5.7	14.3	75.2	4.8	1,003
2004	7.9	12.1	72.5	7.5	1,028
Estonia					
2006	28.0	24.0	28.1	19.9	1,000
2004	33.8	21.4	25.6	19.2	1,000
Finland					
2006	9.5	15.8	70.2	4.5	1,000
2004	15.4	12.8	66.3	5.5	1,005
France					
2006	7.4	9.6	77.1	5.9	1,007
2004	7.9	8.4	77.0	6.7	1,020
Germany East					
2006	5.3	12.2	79.3	3.2	507
2004	6.9	10.6	78.4	4.1	508
Germany West					
2006	11.4	10.2	75.0	3.4	1,018
2004	8.1	14.5	71.5	5.9	1,037
Great Britain					
2006	14.1	12.2	66.5	7.2	1,000
2004	19.0	15.2	59.1	6.7	1,011
Greece					
2006	5.2	15.1	79.3	0.4	1,000
2004	9.2	10.2	76.6	4.0	1,000
Hungary					
2006	31.6	18.7	39.8	9.9	1,005
2004	30.5	25.5	30.4	13.6	1,014

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

	Positive	Neither nor	Negative	DK/RF	N
Ireland					
2006	20.2	17.3	49.5	13.0	1,000
2004	24.3	15.1	46.6	14.0	1,000
Italy					
2006	29.1	20.0	42.1	8.8	1,006
2004	25.4	19.1	45.6	9.9	1,020
Latvia					
2006	27.4	33.7	24.8	14.1	1,015
2004	28.8	27.5	25.6	18.1	1,005
Lithuania					
2006	47.9	23.5	13.2	15.4	1,000
2004	49.8	22.5	9.2	18.5	1,002
Luxembourg					
2006	10.2	12.4	69.8	7.6	500
2004	13.9	13.3	65.7	7.0	502
Malta					
2006	40.6	15.8	22.6	21.0	500
2004	40.8	10.6	27.2	21.4	500
Netherlands					
2006	6.6	12.5	77.6	3.3	1,018
2004	10.7	16.4	67.2	5.7	1,009
Northern Ireland					
2006	15.3	13.6	60.1	11.0	308
2004	20.4	16.7	46.5	16.4	299
Poland					
2006	36.2	27.7	24.7	11.4	1,000
2004	33.6	23.6	24.5	18.3	1,000
Portugal					
2006	18.1	15.0	52.7	14.2	995
2004	13.9	16.9	55.1	14.1	1,000
Slovakia					
2006	27.8	25.3	42.5	4.4	1,023
2004	26.4	30.2	34.5	8.9	1,252
Slovenia					
2006	14.3	22.7	59.2	3.8	1,031
2004	11.0	16.7	64.3	8.0	1,000
Spain					
2006	18.5	13.7	49.1	18.7	1,003
2004	15.4	11.6	62.4	10.6	1,023
Sweden					
2006	7.8	16.3	69.1	6.8	1,013
2004	5.8	19.7	66.2	8.3	1,000
Turkey					
2006	17.8	8.0	67.4	6.8	1,005
2004	19.8	8.6	63.7	7.9	1,027

Table 23. PIPA (2005): At the G-8 Summit some countries may be willing to do more than other countries to limit their greenhouse gases. As compared to the other developed countries do you think the US should do more than average to limit its greenhouse gases, about the average, less than average? / At present, do you think the US, compared to other developed countries does more than average to limit its greenhouse gases, about the average, less than average? (in percentages)

		More than average	About the average	Less than average	N
US	The US should do	44.2	51.9	3.9	584
	The US does	24.7	47.3	28.0	575
	Total				1,159

Table 24. CCFR (2008): Based on what you know, do you think the US should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?
 ---A new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (in percentages)

		Percentage	N
US	Should participate	74.6	728
	Should not participate	25.4	248
	Total		976

Table 25. CCFR (2008): [If answer is “should participate” in Table 24.]

You’ve indicated the US should participate in a treaty to counter climate change. Which of the following is closest to your position about the stance the US should take?

1. The United States should participate in the treaty even if it means making greater economic sacrifices than those made by large developing countries like China and India.

2. The United States should participate in the treaty only if it does not have to make greater economic sacrifices than those made by large developing countries like China and India.

(in percentages)

		Percentage	N
US	The United States should participate in the treaty even if it means making greater economic sacrifices than those made by large developing countries like China and India	31.0	221
	The United States should participate in the treaty only if it does not have to make greater economic sacrifices than those made by large developing countries like China and India	69.0	493
	Total		714

Table 26. CCFR (2008): In thinking about a new agreement on climate change, do you favour or oppose the US providing technological and financial aid to developing countries like China and India to help them limit the growth of their emissions, if they agree to make efforts to reach this goal. (in percentages)

		Percentage	N
US	Favour	46.9	457
	Oppose	53.1	518
	Total		975

4. Policies and Instruments Applied in the Area of Environmental Issues

Table 27. *EB (2007):* More precisely, please tell me to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement about climate change: The European Union should urgently put new policies in place to reduce greenhouse gas emission by at least 20%. (in percentages)

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	DK/RF	N
EU	60.8	28.5	4.0	1.0	5.7	26,717
Austria	56.0	33.5	6.5	0.6	3.4	1,011
Belgium	63.3	28.6	4.9	1.3	1.9	1,011
Bulgaria	60.2	27.1	2.4	0.1	10.2	1,039
Cyprus (Republic)	86.5	7.5	0.8	0.2	5.0	502
Czech Republic	57.2	36.6	3.5	0.6	2.1	1,043
Denmark	67.9	22.2	5.9	1.7	2.3	1,002
Estonia	48.8	32.6	4.7	2.2	11.7	1,005
Finland	50.9	38.3	6.7	1.6	2.5	1,038
France	70.5	23.2	2.2	0.7	3.4	1,013
Germany East	68.1	25.2	4.3	1.0	1.4	508
Germany West	70.1	21.8	5.3	0.6	2.2	1,005
Great Britain	54.7	30.2	5.3	2.7	7.1	1,015
Greece	86.3	11.5	1.8	0.2	0.2	1,000
Hungary	71.5	20.0	3.7	0.5	4.3	1,006
Ireland	53.8	32.7	1.8	0.8	10.9	1,000
Italy	52.6	33.6	6.8	1.9	5.1	1,010
Latvia	54.3	32.3	3.4	1.5	8.5	1,013
Lithuania	49.3	33.0	4.3	1.1	12.3	1,018
Luxembourg	65.6	25.0	5.0	2.2	2.2	511
Malta	62.6	26.0	1.8	0.2	9.4	500
Netherlands	65.5	23.4	6.1	2.3	2.7	1,009
Northern Ireland	61.8	29.3	3.0	0.3	5.6	304
Poland	41.4	42.3	4.7	0.8	10.8	1,000
Portugal	57.7	30.0	4.1	0.5	7.7	1,011
Romania	53.9	32.6	3.1	1.0	9.4	1,019
Slovakia	50.1	39.1	3.5	0.8	6.5	1,106
Slovenia	71.2	24.3	2.6	0.7	1.2	1,013
Spain	50.9	35.1	2.1	0.7	11.2	1,000
Sweden	81.7	13.6	2.2	1.2	1.3	1,005
Turkey	54.0	15.0	3.0	2.1	25.9	998

Table 28. EB (2011): Thinking about each of the following objectives to be reached by 20% in the EU, would you say that it is too ambitious, about right or too modest? (in percentages)

--- To reduce EU greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20%.

--- To increase the share of renewable energy in the EU by 20%.

--- To increase the energy efficiency in the EU by 20%.

	Too ambitious	About right	Too modest	DK/RF	N
EU					
Reduce greenhouse gas	21.3	52.9	17.9	7.9	26,713
Increase renewable energy	18.3	56.3	17.7	7.7	26,713
Increase energy efficiency	16.9	59.6	15.0	8.5	26,713
Austria					
Reduce greenhouse gas	18.5	47.1	31.7	2.7	1,018
Increase renewable energy	15.6	47.3	34.5	2.6	1,018
Increase energy efficiency	13.4	51.5	31.1	4.0	1,018
Belgium					
Reduce greenhouse gas	26.8	42.0	30.6	0.6	1,020
Increase renewable energy	20.4	46.4	32.0	1.2	1,020
Increase energy efficiency	21.0	49.8	27.8	1.4	1,020
Bulgaria					
Reduce greenhouse gas	20.7	53.8	10.0	15.5	1,000
Increase renewable energy	22.7	52.2	7.7	17.4	1,000
Increase energy efficiency	17.4	57.3	10.8	14.5	1,000
Cyprus					
Reduce greenhouse gas	24.1	45.9	23.2	6.8	501
Increase renewable energy	25.9	49.5	18.6	6.0	501
Increase energy efficiency	25.3	51.9	16.4	6.4	501
Czech Republic					
Reduce greenhouse gas	23.7	48.3	21.7	6.3	1,022
Increase renewable energy	23.0	57.0	13.7	6.3	1,022
Increase energy efficiency	23.0	57.6	12.4	7.0	1,022
Denmark					
Reduce greenhouse gas	24.0	49.2	22.7	4.1	1,007
Increase renewable energy	15.0	56.6	25.7	2.7	1,007
Increase energy efficiency	13.3	64.6	16.8	5.3	1,007
Estonia					
Reduce greenhouse gas	19.7	55.9	9.8	14.6	1,000
Increase renewable energy	20.2	58.3	9.5	12.0	1,000
Increase energy efficiency	15.5	64.2	7.7	12.6	1,000
Finland					
Reduce greenhouse gas	27.5	55.5	14.3	2.7	1,003
Increase renewable energy	20.5	64.1	13.2	2.2	1,003
Increase energy efficiency	17.0	69.7	10.8	2.5	1,003
France					
Reduce greenhouse gas	26.3	48.2	19.8	5.7	1,022
Increase renewable energy	18.9	56.5	20.1	4.5	1,022
Increase energy efficiency	19.2	56.5	15.5	8.8	1,022

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

	Too ambitious	About right	Too modest	DK/RF	N
Germany East					
Reduce greenhouse gas	21.6	55.4	18.9	4.1	523
Increase renewable energy	18.5	56.8	21.6	3.1	523
Increase energy efficiency	21.1	54.1	19.3	5.5	523
Germany West					
Reduce greenhouse gas	22.5	48.3	25.8	3.4	1,012
Increase renewable energy	17.0	50.7	29.3	3.0	1,012
Increase energy efficiency	17.7	53.7	22.9	5.7	1,012
Great Britain					
Reduce greenhouse gas	23.0	54.8	13.9	8.3	1,009
Increase renewable energy	21.1	57.9	13.8	7.2	1,009
Increase energy efficiency	17.1	60.5	15.7	6.7	1,009
Greece					
Reduce greenhouse gas	23.6	43.8	27.8	4.8	1,000
Increase renewable energy	23.1	46.0	25.2	5.7	1,000
Increase energy efficiency	20.2	50.9	22.2	6.7	1,000
Hungary					
Reduce greenhouse gas	18.6	55.1	20.2	6.1	1,019
Increase renewable energy	20.5	53.6	20.6	5.3	1,019
Increase energy efficiency	18.4	58.5	16.5	6.6	1,019
Ireland					
Reduce greenhouse gas	23.3	51.2	9.1	16.4	1,015
Increase renewable energy	17.8	56.0	9.5	16.7	1,015
Increase energy efficiency	14.7	57.3	10.4	17.6	1,015
Italy					
Reduce greenhouse gas	13.4	68.6	15.1	2.9	1,039
Increase renewable energy	12.1	69.9	14.2	3.8	1,039
Increase energy efficiency	13.0	69.5	13.4	4.1	1,039
Latvia					
Reduce greenhouse gas	12.2	63.6	11.3	12.9	1,007
Increase renewable energy	12.5	66.9	10.4	10.2	1,007
Increase energy efficiency	9.5	72.2	8.1	10.2	1,007
Lithuania					
Reduce greenhouse gas	16.3	61.6	9.7	12.4	1,026
Increase renewable energy	11.0	67.7	8.1	13.2	1,026
Increase energy efficiency	11.9	67.6	6.7	13.8	1,026
Luxembourg					
Reduce greenhouse gas	26.6	39.9	30.1	3.4	501
Increase renewable energy	18.0	44.7	34.3	3.0	501
Increase energy efficiency	18.0	47.7	28.3	6.0	501
Malta					
Reduce greenhouse gas	14.4	55.6	4.8	25.2	500
Increase renewable energy	11.6	57.2	4.6	26.8	500
Increase energy efficiency	11.4	59.6	3.4	25.6	500

Table continued on next page:

Table continued from previous page:

	Too ambitious	About right	Too modest	DK/RF	N
Netherlands					
Reduce greenhouse gas	27.3	45.7	24.8	2.2	1,016
Increase renewable energy	21.8	50.2	26.3	1.7	1,016
Increase energy efficiency	21.9	56.0	18.6	3.5	1,016
Northern Ireland					
Reduce greenhouse gas	23.3	55.3	12.1	9.3	300
Increase renewable energy	20.7	59.0	12.6	7.7	300
Increase energy efficiency	17.7	66.3	9.3	6.7	300
Poland					
Reduce greenhouse gas	20.3	55.8	9.0	14.9	1,000
Increase renewable energy	16.6	57.1	12.0	14.3	1,000
Increase energy efficiency	14.8	60.4	9.7	15.1	1,000
Portugal					
Reduce greenhouse gas	24.0	53.9	9.0	13.1	1,048
Increase renewable energy	22.5	56.1	8.1	13.3	1,048
Increase energy efficiency	23.3	54.4	8.8	13.5	1,048
Romania					
Reduce greenhouse gas	19.5	54.5	9.2	16.8	1,023
Increase renewable energy	17.8	55.3	10.2	16.7	1,023
Increase energy efficiency	15.7	57.5	10.5	16.3	1,023
Slovakia					
Reduce greenhouse gas	22.2	55.5	16.9	5.4	1,010
Increase renewable energy	23.2	56.2	14.2	6.4	1,010
Increase energy efficiency	22.1	59.4	12.4	6.1	1,010
Slovenia					
Reduce greenhouse gas	21.3	60.4	14.2	4.1	1,018
Increase renewable energy	16.8	66.9	12.0	4.3	1,018
Increase energy efficiency	15.1	69.9	9.1	5.8	1,018
Spain					
Reduce greenhouse gas	20.2	57.8	14.5	7.5	1,010
Increase renewable energy	17.1	63.2	12.6	7.1	1,010
Increase energy efficiency	16.3	64.9	11.4	7.4	1,010
Sweden					
Reduce greenhouse gas	14.1	46.1	37.5	2.3	1,044
Increase renewable energy	11.8	46.9	38.0	3.3	1,044
Increase energy efficiency	10.3	56.3	28.7	4.7	1,044
Turkey					
Reduce greenhouse gas	20.7	33.5	16.7	29.1	1,000
Increase renewable energy	18.2	38.1	14.7	29.0	1,000
Increase energy efficiency	19.2	41.2	11.6	28.0	1,000

Table 29. FEB (2007): There are energy sources, for example the wind energy, that we never run out of. These are the so-called renewable energy sources. Would you agree that the European Union sets a minimum percentage of the energy used in each Member State that should come from renewable sources, or not? (in percentages)

	Yes	No, because that would raise energy prices	No, because we should be able to decide independently	No, because this should not be regulated at all	DK/RF	N
EU	81.4	3.0	6.0	2.5	7.1	25,079
Austria	84.1	1.7	7.5	2.0	4.7	978
Belgium	92.1	1.7	0.8	1.3	4.1	979
Bulgaria	56.1	5.8	19.8	6.5	11.8	975
Cyprus	91.1	1.4	0.8	1.0	5.7	508
Czech Republic	67.9	6.6	12.8	3.7	9.0	978
Denmark	85.9	4.7	3.7	1.9	3.8	982
Estonia	54.5	6.1	20.5	2.9	16.0	1,007
Finland	83.8	1.8	6.7	2.5	5.2	949
France	89.4	2.6	2.2	1.1	4.7	995
Germany	86.5	1.7	6.3	2.2	3.3	980
Greece	91.8	1.2	1.3	1.0	4.7	996
Hungary	77.9	3.6	5.3	4.9	8.3	1,017
Ireland	94.8	0.5	1.0	0.4	3.3	993
Italy	90.8	1.6	1.6	0.7	5.3	977
Latvia	58.2	7.5	15.0	9.3	10.0	963
Lithuania	64.5	7.1	8.9	6.3	13.2	985
Luxembourg	94.8	1.0	1.0	0.2	3.0	499
Malta	90.6	0.4	0.8	0.0	8.2	500
Netherlands	91.6	0.7	2.6	0.4	4.7	969
Poland	80.8	3.7	4.6	4.2	6.7	974
Portugal	88.3	1.2	1.1	0.8	8.6	997
Romania	77.8	4.0	5.7	2.6	9.9	985
Slovakia	72.3	3.5	9.6	3.9	10.7	987
Slovenia	92.9	0.8	2.6	0.7	3.0	978
Spain	91.3	2.5	1.9	0.4	3.9	1,004
Sweden	74.1	2.5	7.7	4.0	11.7	951
United Kingdom	90.5	0.9	2.4	0.7	5.5	973

Table 30. FEB (2007): One third of EU electricity comes from nuclear energy. Regarding nuclear energy there are two fundamental approaches, which one do you tend to agree more? (in percentages)

	The share of nuclear energy should be increased, as it does	The share of nuclear energy should be decreased, as it poses	DK/RF	N
EU	29.3	59.5	11.2	25,809
Austria	14.3	78.7	7.0	1,007
Belgium	25.2	55.8	19.0	1,000
Bulgaria	51.0	33.5	15.5	1,016
Cyprus	17.7	75.9	6.4	515
Czech Republic	48.4	37.8	13.8	1,010
Denmark	25.6	67.5	6.9	1,001
Estonia	23.8	60.1	16.1	1,045
Finland	41.6	47.4	11.0	1,010
France	27.8	60.0	12.2	1,022
Germany	27.9	66.1	6.0	1,019
Greece	12.4	83.1	4.5	1,012
Hungary	26.4	58.8	14.8	1,041
Ireland	27.3	67.3	5.4	1,002
Italy	29.2	57.5	13.3	1,004
Latvia	22.5	67.3	10.2	1,005
Lithuania	31.8	54.9	13.3	1,014
Luxembourg	19.7	65.9	14.4	508
Malta	24.7	58.3	17.0	506
Netherlands	37.1	55.4	7.5	1,021
Poland	32.3	59.0	8.7	1,004
Portugal	21.2	56.4	22.4	1,010
Romania	25.9	61.1	13.0	1,016
Slovakia	41.9	44.0	14.1	1,008
Slovenia	27.4	65.7	6.9	1,002
Sweden	43.7	48.6	7.7	1,000
United Kingdom	33.7	59.1	7.2	1,000

Table 31. EB (2011): Thinking about innovation what do you think should be the EU's priority? (in percentages)

	Refocus research on new challenges such as climate change, energy and resource efficiency	Encourage cooperation between researchers	Give more financial support to research	DK/RF	N
EU	42.2	25.1	26.1	6.6	26,713
Austria	42.6	26.1	25.1	6.2	1,018
Belgium	43.3	31.9	24.0	0.8	1,020
Bulgaria	40.3	19.1	30.5	10.1	1,000
Cyprus	60.5	16.5	18.2	4.8	501
Czech Republic	48.2	27.2	20.4	4.2	1,022
Denmark	56.1	23.3	16.9	3.7	1,007
Estonia	28.4	29.6	30.5	11.5	1,000
Finland	55.7	29.5	13.1	1.7	1,003
France	32.1	30.1	31.4	6.4	1,022
Germany East	48.9	26.4	21.3	3.4	523
Germany West	53.1	21.1	21.5	4.3	1,012
Great Britain	36.9	21.5	30.5	11.1	1,009
Greece	40.1	23.5	32.2	4.2	1,000
Hungary	42.1	26.0	27.5	4.4	1,019
Ireland	36.8	23.7	27.9	11.6	1,015
Italy	31.0	33.7	30.8	4.5	1,039
Latvia	39.1	23.1	30.1	7.7	1,007
Lithuania	40.1	22.3	26.5	11.1	1,026
Luxembourg	50.1	25.1	21.2	3.6	501
Malta	40.0	15.8	30.0	14.2	500
Netherlands	51.1	31.7	14.7	2.5	1,016
Northern Ireland	41.3	19.7	28.3	10.7	300
Poland	33.1	26.1	31.0	9.8	1,000
Portugal	30.0	34.2	24.3	11.5	1,048
Romania	32.5	22.5	31.7	13.3	1,023
Slovakia	51.6	19.7	25.7	3.0	1,010
Slovenia	47.0	25.1	24.6	3.3	1,018
Spain	29.2	21.0	39.7	10.1	1,010
Sweden	57.3	20.9	20.5	1.3	1,044

Table 32. *PIPA (2005):* 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. (in percentages)

		Percentage	N
	Until we are sure that global warming is really a problem, we should not take any steps that would have economic costs	21.4	171
US	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	44.9	358
	Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs	33.7	269
	Total		798

Table 33. *PIPA (2005):* Which comes closer to your opinion? (in percentages)

1. Efforts in the United States to reduce the release of greenhouse gases will cost too much money and hurt the US economy.
2. The US economy will become more competitive because these efforts will result in more efficient energy use, saving money in the long run.

		Percentage	N
	Efforts in the United States to reduce the release of greenhouse gases will cost too much money and hurt the US economy	22.3	137
US	The US economy will become more competitive because these efforts will result in more efficient energy use, saving money in the long run	70.9	436
	DK/RF	6.8	42
	Total		615

Table 34. PIPA (2005): Here is a list of possible approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions that may contribute to climate change. For each one please say whether you favour or oppose it: (in percentages)

- Provide tax incentives to utility companies to encourage them to sell environmentally clean energy, such as solar and wind power to consumers.
- Give cash incentives like tax credits and rebates to individual households that upgrade to more energy efficient appliances like refrigerators and air conditioners.
- Continue the tax credit for purchasing a hybrid-electric car.

		Favour	Oppose	N
US	Provide tax incentives to utility companies	84.5	15.5	592
	Give cash incentives to individual households	84.7	15.3	593
	Continue the tax credit for purchasing a hybrid-electric car	81.9	18.1	592
Total				1,777

Table 35. GAP (2001): As I read some specific policies of President George W. Bush tell me if you approve or disapprove of them. (in percentages)

- Bush's decision that the US should not support the Kyoto protocol to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/RF	N
US	29.5	44.1	26.4	1,277
EU	9.7	84.6	5.7	3,911
Germany	7.9	88.5	3.6	944
Italy	11.7	80.7	7.6	1,000
France	9.4	85.6	5.0	967
United Kingdom	9.6	83.9	6.5	1,000

Table 36. GAP (2010): Please tell me if you approve or disapprove of the way President Barack Obama is dealing with ...? (in percentages)
 --- Climate change

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/RF	N
US	45.1	37.4	17.5	984
EU	52.0	32.1	15.9	3,735
Germany	63.0	28.1	8.9	740
France	45.6	53.2	1.2	752
Poland	55.7	19.3	25.0	748
Spain	51.5	30.0	18.5	746
United Kingdom	44.3	29.9	25.8	749
Turkey	15.7	44.0	40.3	987

Table 37. GAP (2009): Now I'm going to read you some statements about what President Barack Obama might do in the future. Do you think he will get the United States to take significant measures to control global climate change or don't you think so? (in percentages)

	Will	Will not	DK/RF	N
US	69.9	24.7	5.4	993
EU	69.0	23.7	7.3	3,749
Germany	76.9	20.4	2.7	746
France	81.1	18.7	0.2	753
Poland	55.7	24.0	20.3	749
Spain	64.8	28.6	6.6	749
United Kingdom	66.8	26.6	6.6	752
Turkey	25.9	39.0	35.1	990

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