

# Climate change – “new” or “old” politics? – Tables

Table 1. A typology of attitudes towards environmental protection and climate change.

	More environmental protection	Less environmental protection
Climate change is a big problem	1) Environmentalist	2) Climate only
Climate change is not a big problem	3) Nature only	4) Economic growth

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for environmental protection and climate change scales. 2009 and 2013.

	Environmental protection scale		Climate change scale	
	2009	2013	2009	2013
Mean	5.93	5.70	7.20	7.01
Standard deviation	2.202	2.213	2.461	2.529
Skewness	-.317	-.171	-.839	-.779
Kurtosis	.130	.004	.299	.180
N	1764	1705	1765	1716

Table 3. Multivariate analysis of attitudes towards environmental protection and climate change by age, gender, education, income and left-right, immigration and religious-secular values. Standardized regression coefficients (p-values in parentheses). (OLS). 2013.

	Environmental protection		Climate change	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Age (high)	.073* (.023)	.111** (.000)	-.028 (.377)	.030 (.332)
Age (medium)	.060 (.061)	.096** (.002)	-.031 (.341)	.012 (.685)
Women	.096** (.000)	.069** (.002)	.138** (.000)	.110** (.000)
Education (high)	.225** (.000)	.089* (.025)	.161** (.000)	.042 (.280)
Education (medium)	.078 (.056)	.048 (.208)	.029 (.468)	.008 (.831)
Income (high)	-.036 (.199)	-.038 (.150)	-.029 (.303)	-.028 (.296)
Income (medium)	-.001 (.976)	-.020 (.458)	-.012 (.671)	-.032 (.222)
Right		-.122** (.000)		-.176** (.000)
Immigration (positive)		.296** (.000)		.221** (.000)
Secular		-.003 (.895)		.083** (.001)
Constant	4.735** (.000)	4.443** (.000)	6.468** (.24)	6.08** (.36)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.039	.158	.034	.150
N	1676		1686	

\*\* Statistically significant at .01 level; \* statistically significant at .05 level (t-tests).

Table 4. An empirical description of environmental and climate groups. Size of four groups in 2009 and 2013. Percent of total. (N in parentheses)\*

	More environmental protection	Less environmental protection
Climate change is a big problem	2009: 39 (684) 2013: 33 (561)	2009: 13 (231) 2013: 16 (275)
Climate change is not a big problem	2009: 17 (299) 2013: 16 (279)	2009: 31 (545) 2013: 35 (589)

\*) Two 0-10 attitudinal scales divided in two equally sized parts, based on their median value. See text for question wording.

Table 5. Binomial logistic regression of “environmentalist” vs. “climate only” groups. Entries are regression coefficients (p-values in parentheses). 2009 and 2013.\*

	Environmental protection vs. only climate change			
	2009		2013	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Women	.230 (.172)	.181 (.299)	.100 (.523)	.139 (.400)
Age high	-.037 (.880)	.159 (.545)	.047 (.818)	.280 (.230)
Age medium	-.125 (.617)	.022 (.931)	-.143 (.502)	.061 (.790)
Education high	.811** (.004)	.227 (.463)	1.483** (.000)	.958** (.001)
Education medium	.212 (.437)	.102 (.722)	.689** (.007)	.605* (.026)
Income high	.376 (.086)	.495* (.031)	.295 (.113)	.254 (.198)
Income medium	.287 (.173)	.256 (.240)	.558** (.003)	.490* (.015)
Right		-.040* (.047)		-.008 (.692)
Pos. immigration		.128** (.000)		.176** (.000)
Secular		.017 (.387)		-.022 (.286)
Constant	.446 (.171)	-.243 (.604)	-.505 (.097)	-1.542 (.004)
Nagelkerke pseduo-R <sup>2</sup>	.044	.130	.090	.215
N =	915		836	

\*\* Statistically significant at .01 level; \* statistically significant at .05 level (t-tests).

# Tables in appendix

Table A.2. Descriptive statistics for alternative measures of attitudes towards environmental protection<sup>1</sup> and climate change<sup>2</sup>: 2009 and 2013.

	Environmental protection		Climate change	
	2009	2013	2009	2013
Mean	2.69	2.60	2.20	2.18
Standard deviation	1.338	1.285	1.139	1.200
Skewness	.253	.332	.935	.954
Kurtosis	-1.313	-1.197	-.004	-.090
N	1768	1704	1739	1677

1) There is too little emphasis on environmental protection in Norway today.

2) Climate change is primarily caused by humans

Table A.3. Multivariate analysis of alternative measures of attitudes towards environmental protection<sup>1</sup> and climate change<sup>2</sup> by age, gender, education, income and left-right, immigration and religious-secular values. Standardized regression coefficients (p-values in parentheses). (OLS). 2013.<sup>3</sup>

	Environmental protection		Climate change	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Age (high)	-.009 (.782)	.020 (.541)	-.110** (.001)	-.064* (.050)
Age (medium)	-.046 (.155)	-.021 (.512)	-.036 (.264)	-.003 (.920)
Women	.171** (.000)	.152** (.000)	.092** (.000)	.070** (.003)
Education (high)	.109** (.008)	.033 (.418)	.086* (.038)	.002 (.957)
Education (medium)	.024 (.561)	.012 (.756)	.017 (.671)	.003 (.942)
Income (high)	-.023 (.405)	-.023 (.403)	.032 (.260)	.034 (.217)
Income (medium)	-.019 (.491)	-.032 (.242)	-.006 (.835)	-.021 (.454)
Right		-.118** (.000)		-.143** (.000)
Immigration (positive)		.147** (.000)		.145** (.000)
Secular		.029 (.248)		.073** (.003)
Constant	2.875** (.000)	2.910** (.000)	2.269 (.000)	2.382** ()
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.035	.082	.020	.083
N	1670		1667	

\*\* Statistically significant at .01 level; \* statistically significant at .05 level (t-tests)

1)There is too little emphasis on environmental protection in Norway today.

2)Climate change is primarily caused by humans

3)Both questions are recoded so that high values indicate pro-environment and pro-climate attitudes.

Table A.4. An empirical description of alternative classifications of environmental<sup>1</sup> and climate<sup>2</sup> groups. Size of four groups in 2009 and 2013. Percent. (N in parentheses)

	More environmental protection	Less environmental protection
Climate change is caused by humans	2009: 54 (811) 2013: 56 (795)	2009: 27 (402) 2013: 24 (349)
Climate change is not caused by humans	2009: 6 (98) 2013: 8 (111)	2009: 13 (195) 2013: 12 (169)

1) There is too little emphasis on environmental protection in Norway today.

2) Climate change is primarily caused by humans



Table A.5. Binomial logistic regression of alternative classification of “environmentalist” vs. “climate only” groups”. Entries are regression coefficients (p-values in parentheses). 2009 and 2013.\*

	Environmental protection vs. only climate change			
	2009	2009	2013	2013
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Women	.489** (.000)	.426 (.002)**	.555** (.000)	.529 (.000)**
Age high	-.119 (.547)	-.022 (.915)	.031 (.860)	.072 (.701)
Age medium	-.218 (.271)	-.165 (.417)	-.245 (.174)	-.168 (.365)
Education high	.362 (.127)	-.103 (.685)	.745** (.001)	.537* (.025)
Education medium	.021 (.928)	-.072 (.760)	.520* (.018)	.505* (.024)
Income high	-.222 (.219)	-.168 (.368)	.041 (.796)	.044 (.785)
Income medium	-.293 (.086)	-.337 (.053)	.245 (.141)	.198 (.241)
Right		-.043** (.006)		-.053** (.001)
Pos. immigration		.089** (.000)		.041* (.022)
Secular		.018 (.249)		-.004 (.806)
Constant	.620 (.025)*	.330 (.389)		.275 (.502)
Nagelkerke pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	.032	.091	.041	.073
N =	1213		1144	

\*\* Statistically significant at .01 level; \* statistically significant at .05 level (t-tests)

\*) Based on these two questions: “There is too little emphasis on environmental protection in Norway today” and “Climate change is primarily caused by humans”.