

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Political Science Department -- Theses,  
Dissertations, and Student Scholarship

Political Science, Department of

---

12-2014

# Influences on Student Attitudes About U.S. Involvement in Nation-Building

Tobin C. Beck

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/poliscitheses>



Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#), and the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

---

Beck, Tobin C., "Influences on Student Attitudes About U.S. Involvement in Nation-Building" (2014). *Political Science Department -- Theses, Dissertations, and Student Scholarship*. 35.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/poliscitheses/35>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Department -- Theses, Dissertations, and Student Scholarship by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

INFLUENCES ON STUDENT ATTITUDES  
ABOUT U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN NATION-BUILDING

by

Tobin C. Beck

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of  
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of Master of Arts

Major: Political Science

Under the Supervision of Professor Patrice McMahon

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 2014

INFLUENCES ON STUDENT ATTITUDES  
ABOUT U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN NATION-BUILDING

Tobin C. Beck, M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2014

Advisor: Patrice McMahon

How do college students form opinions about a complex foreign policy issue such as U.S. involvement in nation-building when they may only have basic information about the issue? My study shows that in 2012, students identifying as conservative tended to support nation-building in proportion to their perception of the strength of their own and their parents' conservatism. The association between perception of conservatism and support for nation-building was statistically significant at the  $p \leq .05$  level in 2012, although there was no statistically significant overall association between student political ideology and support for U.S. involvement in nation-building. However, a relationship between conservative student perception of ideology and support for nation-building was not detected in 2011 data. The results suggest that students rely asymmetrically on clusters of factors in reaching opinions about complex issues, and that these factors may be latent until activated by some triggering mechanism.

### Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Ellen.

### Acknowledgements

I want to acknowledge and thank my advisors, Patrice McMahon and Ross Miller, for their advice, encouragement and patience as I have worked on this thesis. I also want to acknowledge and thank my close friend, Ghulam Farooq Mujaddidi, for his encouragement and advice, and especially thank my son, Jonathan, and wife, Ellen, for their love, encouragement and good humor through the research and writing process.

## **Table of Contents**

1 – Introduction
4 – Literature Review
17 – Study Design and Measures
20 – Results
43 – Discussion
51 – Conclusion
53 -- Bibliography
62 – Appendix One: Nation-Building Attitudes Survey 2011
132 – Appendix Two: Nation-Building Attitudes Survey 2012

## List of Tables

- 20 -- Table 1 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis comparing views about aid and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 21 – Table 2 – 2011: Binary regression analysis of how views on aid influence support for U.S. nation-building.
- 21 – Table 3 – 2011 Crosstabulation analysis of how views on aid influence support for U.S. nation- building.
- 22 – Table 4 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of intervention and support for U.S. nation-building
- 22 – Table 5 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis of intervention and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 23 – Table 6 – 2011 Binary logistic regression analysis of intervention and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 23 – Table 7 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis of whether views on the Golden Rule influence support for U.S. nation-building.
- 24 – Table 8 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of whether views on the Golden Rule influence support for U.S. nation-building.
- 24 – Table 9 – 2011 Crosstabulation analysis of whether views on the Golden Rule influence support for U.S. nation-building.
- 24 – Table 10 – 2011 Binary logistic regression analysis of whether views on the Golden Rule influence support for nation-building.
- 25 – Table 11 – 2011-2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of how attention to news influences support for U.S. nation-building.
- 26 – Table 12 -- 2011 Binary logistic regression analysis of how time spent on news influences support for U.S. nation-building.
- 26 – Table 13 – 2011 Binary logistic regression analysis of how time spent on news influences support for U.S. nation-building.
- 27 – Table 14 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis of how time spent on cable TV news influences support for U.S. nation-building.
- 28 – Table 15 – 2011-2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of how student perception of political ideology influences support for U.S. nation-building.
- 29 – Table 16 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of perceived conservatism and its effect on student support for U.S. nation-building.
- 30 – Table 17 – 2011-2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of views on U.S. global role, perceived conservatism, and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 31 – Table 18 – 2011-2012 – Binary logistic regression analysis of views on U.S. global involvement, perceived conservatism, and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 31 – Table 19 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis of student employment and its effect on support for U.S. nation-building.
- 32 – Table 20 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of student employment and its effect on support for U.S. nation-building.
- 33 – Table 21 – 2011-2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of the influence on student political party/ideology on support for U.S. nation-building.
- 33 – Table 22 – 2011-2012 Crosstabulation analysis of the influence of student political party/ideology on support for nation-building.

- 34 – Table 23 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis of perceived global role of U.S. and association with political party/ideology.
- 35 – Table 24 – 2011 Crosstabulation analysis of perceived global role of U.S and association with political party/ideology.
- 35 – Table 25 – 2011-2012 Crosstabulation analysis of strength of student religious activity and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 36 – Table 26 – 2011-2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of student religious activity and support for U.S. nation-building.
- 37 – Table 27 – 2011 Crosstabulation analysis of association between political party and political ideology.
- 37 – Table 28 – 2012 Crosstabulation analysis of association between political party and political ideology.
- 38 – Table 29 – 2011 Binary logistic regression analysis of personality factors, strength of party/political orientation, and association with support for U.S. nation-building.
- 39 – Table 30 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of personality factors, strength of party/political orientation, and association with support for U.S. nation-building.
- 40 – Table 31 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of personality factors, strength of party/political orientation, and association with support for U.S. nation-building.
- 40 – Table 32 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of personality, strength of party/orientation, and association with support for U.S. nation-building.
- 41 – Table 33 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of personality, perceived conservatism, and association with support for U.S. nation-building.
- 42 – Table 34 – 2011 Binary logistic regression analysis of political partisanship/independence and association with support for U.S. nation-building.
- 42 – Table 35 – 2012 Binary logistic regression analysis of strength of partisanship/independence and association with support for U.S. nation-building.

**Contribution to research**

The main contribution that my research makes to the literature is my finding that students appear to form opinions about the foreign policy concept of nation-building by selectively activating and processing factors such as political ideology. While perception of their own and their parents' conservatism influenced how conservative students formed attitudes about U.S. involvement in nation-building in 2012, the effect was not detected in 2011. Political polarization did appear to have an indirect influence on the attitudes of students of all political orientations in 2012.



## **Introduction**

While research shows that most American college students tend in general to lack interest or sophisticated knowledge about foreign news including news about foreign policy issues, their opinions are important because students who are in their late teens and early 20s either are among or soon will be among the pool of American adult citizens who comprise potential voters (Panetta 2011). Their views, or lack of them, and their participation, or lack of it, will help shape the future of the country. They will be a key demographic cohort of Americans who either will participate in American democracy and thus help craft national policy, or refrain from involvement and thus empower others to make those decisions for them. Young adults who are attending college comprise a significant source of potentially influential public opinion because of the size of their demographic, and because the nature of college life can provide a potential for organized action if students mobilize to work on behalf of causes. In addition, presumably the education that students receive can equip them as elites to have an impact on national policies as a result of their enhanced skills, knowledge and personal contacts.

American college students entering adulthood in the 2010s have grown up in a country that as the world's lone superpower periodically has intervened militarily in other countries around the world when U.S. presidents and Congresses have deemed the action necessary for humanitarian or other U.S. interests. At the conclusion of these military campaigns, the United States has engaged in nation-building to try to create and sustain stable civic institutions to enable nascent governments to survive and gain sustainability.

Students and many other American adults have tended to show relatively little interest in foreign policy questions including nation-building until a crisis has brought the foreign policy issue to public salience (Burstein, p. 30; Panetta 2011). A Panetta survey

of college students in 2014 found that 69 percent of those surveyed reported that national rather than international problems will be the most difficult problems faced by their generation, and students by a plurality of 45 to 32 percent favored an isolationist approach to foreign policy (Panetta 2014, p. 3). When international problems have arisen, salience has tended to be brief and then public attention has tended to decline. Economic issues that directly affect citizens' daily lives are much more frequently at the top of the list of concerns of Americans (Panetta 2014, Riffkin).

During these periods of salience, public opinion has been an important factor in decisions leading to intervention and subsequent U.S. efforts at nation-building. Given the capabilities of the United States as possessing the world's strongest military and largest economy, and its history of philosophical commitment to people around the world having a right to self-determination and democracy, it is reasonable to assume that questions of whether and how much to intervene in conflicts around the globe will continue to face U.S. citizens and their elected leaders for as long as the country remains a global power. In 2014 such questions have been posed regarding the U.S. role in states including Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria and Libya.

If we can expect that such questions will continue to face Americans, it becomes important to try to understand how Americans answer them and make decisions based on the answers. While research shows most Americans have little knowledge about foreign affairs, research also suggests that basic knowledge may be enough for effective participation in the American political system (DelliCarpini and Keeter, pp. 2-3). But possessing only minimal information about pertinent issues suggests that other factors

gain in their relative influence over how citizens form opinions about these issues, particularly for students just entering adulthood.

When issues lack salience among college students and issue-specific knowledge is minimal, parental influence can be strong, particularly if the parents have a history of demonstrating strong political attitudes when the students were children at home. Research shows that children tend to reflect their parents' political attitudes if the parental attitudes were consistent over time and between both parents (Jennings, Stoker and Bowers, p. 795). Likewise, friends or respected elites may gain influence. Biological predispositions and environmental factors might influence decisions (Hibbing et al, p. 263).

From these observations some key questions emerge: 1) What opinions do students hold about U.S. military intervention in other countries, and how were those opinions formed? 2) If students have minimal knowledge about nation-building and pay little or no attention to global events, what factors influence them to support, oppose, or be neutral regarding nation-building (and, by extension, other foreign policy questions and issues?)

In seeking to answer these questions, my work engages several fields of research: nation-building/peace-building, American politics with a focus on the news media, political science and communication with a focus on political opinions, policy, political psychology, and studies of politics and biology including genetic influences on attitudes.

## **Literature Review**

Nation-building has become a major component of U.S. foreign policy. Nation-building was defined by Dobbins, Jones, Crane and DeGrasse as the use of armed force as part of an effort to initiate political and economic reforms that transform a post-war society into “one at peace with itself and its neighbors” (Dobbins et al. p. xvii). They pointed out that when U.S. troops invaded Iraq in March 2003, the United States had more modern nation-building experience than any other country, having intervened to help liberate and rebuild Kuwait in 1991, Somalia in 1992, Haiti in 1994, Bosnia in 1995, Kosovo in 1999 and Afghanistan in 2001 (Dobbins et al. pp. iii, xvii). The four authors also wrote that between 1945 and 1989, the U.S. launched a new military intervention about once a decade. By the end of the Cold War, the U.S. was leading a new multinational military intervention about once every two years. A Department of Defense directive made nation-building a core mission of the U.S. military and a State Department office manages civilian aspects of nation-building operations (Dobbins et al. p. v-vi). The main objective of nation-building is to make violent societies peaceful, not to make poor ones prosperous or authoritarian ones democratic, Dobbins et al contended (Dobbins et al. p. xxiii). The first priorities are public security and humanitarian assistance (Dobbins et al. p. xxiii), followed by governance, economic stabilization, democratization and development (Dobbins et al. p. xxiii).

McMahon and Western wrote that the term “nation-building” suggests a process in which people in a post-conflict society are helped to reconcile their differences and form a common national identity as well as the democratic governance and institutions to enable that nation to become self-sustaining (McMahon and Western, p. 6). They also

wrote that nation-building often refers to use of military force, after a conflict has ended, to rebuild societies, infrastructure and institutions and prevent further conflict.

Fukuyama defined nation-building as a process of building a state within a society, after conflict or war, to promote governance, sustainable institutions, and democracy. He also wrote that opposed to state-building, nation-building -- building a nation out of a state -- is a matter of luck (Fukuyama, p. 99).

An important consideration for policymakers as well as for citizens is under what circumstances would Americans approve of U.S. intervention in a foreign country's affairs for the purpose of nation-building. Humanitarian reasons frequently are given as justification for nation-building and are the aspect of nation-building that donors are most inclined to fund (Dobbins et al. p. xxix), and so my first hypothesis is drawn from political science and communication studies of how news media framing can influence issue perception, particularly when the salience of the issue becomes high.

Boettcher, examining how military intervention decisions are made regarding humanitarian crises, wrote that how the news media frame the reasons for intervention and the likely outcomes -- whether intervention poses a potential for loss or gain -- can influence public support or opposition, particularly when intervention is conducted for humanitarian purposes (Boettcher, pp. 332-334). Boettcher found that if humanitarian intervention is linked to the potential for a positive outcome, the public tends to support it. Humanitarian goals are seen as inherently good.

Boettcher identified six factors that may influence how the public supports U.S. military intervention in humanitarian crises: foreign policy frames; whether the framing source is official or unofficial; the type of humanitarian crisis; the location of the crisis

and race/ethnicity/religion of the population involved; the ratio of U.S. lives saved or lost to those of foreign citizens saved or lost; and the probability of a successful intervention free of casualties (Boettcher p. 332). Boettcher contended that framing effects can be induced by selective manipulation of affect-laden words and phrases which could be used by political elites or the news media to build public support or opposition to an intervention (Boettcher p. 334). Boettcher wrote that while expected utility theory models would predict the public to be risk-averse and generally opposed to humanitarian intervention, prospect theorists have shown that careful and explicit framing of alternatives can lead to reversals in preferences and individual analysis of risk (Boettcher p. 334; Tversky and Kahneman, p. 453). Americans will tend to support humanitarian interventions that are salient and are framed to highlight how an intervention helps people with minimal risk of U.S. casualties (Boettcher, p. 347).

The chicken-and-egg matter of salience plays a huge role in drawing public attention to the question of military intervention. Like the proverbial question of which comes first, the chicken or the egg, an issue must become salient in order to engage the public, but salience can be generated in a variety of ways that become mutually reinforcing -- by a dramatic development that triggers official action and then brings media attention, by media attention that sparks public interest and then triggers official interest and then government responses, or by official action that attracts media attention and then engages the public.

Burstein, examining the impact of public opinion on government policy, found that issue salience is a key element of democratic responsiveness, which in turn leads public officials to be responsive to citizens on highly salient issues (Burstein p. 30). He

also found that public opinion affects policy three-quarters of the time its impact is gauged, and its effect is of substantial policy importance at least one-third of the time.

For example, conflict in the Balkans over Bosnia began in 1992 but the United States and NATO did not intervene until 1995. Sobel, in a paper examining American attitudes toward intervention in Bosnia in the 1990s, wrote that most Americans were aware of events in Bosnia from early in the conflict, but until the summer of 1995 only one-third to just over half paid close attention to news about the war (Sobel 1998, p. 252). Few Americans considered the war to be the most important U.S. foreign policy issue. However, while a majority of Americans saw Europe as having responsibility to intervene militarily to resolve the conflict, a majority also believed the United States had an obligation to use military force if that was the only way to get humanitarian aid to civilians and stop atrocities as the atrocities were widely publicized (Sobel 1998, p. 252). There generally was little public support for the U.S. acting alone, but there was support for President Clinton when he acted with European allies. While the U.S. public tended to support air strikes in cooperation with NATO allies, there was little support for use of U.S. ground troops except briefly in 1995 when it looked like U.S. ground troops might be needed to rescue U.N. peacekeepers who had come under attack, and when U.S. troops were sent as part of a peacekeeping force after the war ended and the Dayton Peace Accords were signed (Sobel 1998, p. 256-257).

The U.S. and its European allies built on what they learned in the Bosnia conflict in the Kosovo crisis of 1998-1999, when the U.S. again participated in a NATO air campaign against the Serbs. Huysmans described the Kosovo conflict as a defining event for NATO in that the military alliance converted its military capital into humanitarian and

political capital, demonstrating that the military can protect human rights (Huysmans p. 618) and again focusing on the humanitarian reasons for action.

In another example, in 2003 the United States became involved in nation-building in Iraq soon after invading the country in pursuit of alleged Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. Eichenberg, looking at the level of public support for the Iraq invasion, found that intervention for humanitarian reasons was popular while intervention for reasons of state internal conflict was unpopular. He found that women were less supportive of the use of military force than were men, but women were more supportive of the use of military force for humanitarian reasons than were men (Eichenberg, p. 137-138.)

Salience can lose its intensity over time as the public loses interest in the original issue. The salience of the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan declined the longer U.S. forces were involved there before increasing again in 2014 as insurgent forces reemerged as threats to the existing government.

The last U.S. combat forces left Iraq in August 2010, but 47,000 U.S. troops remained until the end of 2011 (Logan 2011). Despite the size of the U.S. troop commitment, news coverage of Iraq dropped from 2 percent of all U.S. news stories in 2009 to 1 percent in 2010 (Rosensteil 2011). News coverage of Afghanistan, which the U.S. invaded in 2001, declined from 5 percent of all U.S. news stories in 2009 to 4 percent in 2010. Rosensteil found that the biggest change was diminished coverage of policy debates concerning the war (Rosensteil 2011).

However, the salience of conflict in Iraq greatly increased in the summer of 2014 with news coverage of the outbreak of conflict involving ethnic and religious-fueled insurgencies involving Sunni, Shiaa and Kurdish groups, particularly the ISIS militia.



While the issue again became highly salient, polls showed that Americans gave little support to the idea of sending U.S. troops to intervene but did give support to limited military response such as air strikes (Jones and Newport).

This research leads to the first hypothesis:

***Hypothesis One: Students will support nation-building when humanitarian intervention is a justification for the mission and the mission stems from a conflict that is salient.***

My second hypothesis draws on political science and communication studies that show people can acquire a basic knowledge of salient foreign issues even if they are not actively seeking information about those issues. Page and Shapiro in their study of Americans' policy preferences wrote that the mass media are the way that most people learn about foreign and domestic policy issues (Page and Shapiro, p. 32). They wrote that as a person accumulates information over time, that information may influence and even change policy preferences. As people process new information, they are likely to engage cognitive cues from trusted figures such as parents, friends, interest groups and perceived experts (Page and Shapiro, p. 17).

But what about those who do not seek out news? Baum found that people who do not intentionally seek out international news are exposed to it through entertainment and other media, which provide these otherwise inattentive Americans with basic information about foreign policy issues (Baum 2002, p. 91). Such a basic level of knowledge about an issue may be enough for effective political participation. For example, a study by Verba et al in 1966 found that public attitudes and feelings about the Vietnam War were

consistent among various groups regardless of level of education or level of knowledge about the war (Verba et al., 1967).

However, Baum found that soft news – human interest and entertainment stories or programs that incorporate elements from global issues -- depends on salience as much as does hard news. The more prominent a story becomes, particularly if there are human interest and humanitarian elements involved that can be exploited in the framing of soft news, the more likely it becomes that the story line will be incorporated into soft news programming. On the other hand, as public salience of a foreign policy issue declines, hard news coverage also declines, which in turn reduces soft news references to that issue (Baum 2002, p. 97-98).

Applying Baum's findings to the question of student attitudes about nation-building, we should expect to find that opinions about nation-building can be formed independently of the amount of time that students intentionally seek out information and knowledge, because a baseline of knowledge presumably will be available from soft news sources if the issue is at all salient. In addition, elite cues from parents and other trusted individuals may compensate for the lack of detailed knowledge and provide students with sufficient information to form an opinion that goes beyond a random guess.

***Hypothesis Two: Support for nation-building will be independent of the amount of time students intentionally spend consuming international news.***

My third hypothesis is based on the idea that people who are interested in an issue will spend the time to learn about the issue, and most of the students who feel strongly about nation-building will support it because they view it as something good the United States is doing. On the other hand, it's possible that some students may have strong views

against nation-building, viewing it as an extension of military intervention and as an unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of other countries. The assumption is that students who spend the most time learning about nation-building will be motivated to learn about the issue because they feel strongly about it, while those who don't take time to study the issue will tend to be indifferent to nation-building or will have more loosely held opinions that will be influenced by soft news exposure and factors peripheral to the issue of nation-building.

***Hypothesis Three: Students who do spend more time consuming international news will tend to support nation-building more than those who pay minimal attention to foreign news.***

Hypothesis Three at first glance seems incongruent with Hypothesis Two. However, both could be congruent if disinterested students gained baseline knowledge unintentionally, as suggested by Baum's research, and supported nation-building because they viewed the associated reasons such as humanitarian aid as inherently good; while students who were interested in international news had stronger opinions about the value of nation-building and its positive impact. Supporting this idea is research from Mondak, Carmines, Huckfeldt, Mitchell and Schraufnagel, who found that the best-informed people construct judgments based on criteria that are relevant and specific, while those who are less informed tend to draw on peripheral criteria in making their evaluations (Mondak et al, p. 34, 45).

My fourth and fifth hypotheses draw from communication and political science studies about influences on the formation of opinions, as well as political psychology, biology and genetics studies of the influence of parents on their offspring.

Supporting research comes from a variety of sources. Zaller in his 1992 study of mass opinion wrote that what he termed political predispositions – how individuals decide whether to accept or reject political communication -- result at least partially from a distillation of a person's life experiences, including childhood socialization and later work history (Zaller, pp. 22- 23). Page and Shapiro wrote that while most people learn about foreign and domestic policy issues from the mass media (Page and Shapiro, p. 32), people are likely to respond to new information using cognitive cues from trusted figures such as parents, friends, interest groups, or those they perceive as experts (Page and Shapiro p. 17). Gilens in his study of the effect of political ignorance on policy preferences wrote that among people who are less politically aware, elite cues seem to be more important in shaping political judgments than are raw policy-relevant facts (Gilens, pp. 391-392). He wrote that the politically unsophisticated lack the knowledge and experience to place facts within a contextual framework in which the facts can be coherently interpreted. But he also found that facts can have a significant influence among people who are more politically knowledgeable (Gilens, p. 392).

Studies of genetics show that human biology also can influence political attitudes. Bouchard in a survey of studies on genetic influence on human psychological traits reported that environment tends to influence conservatism up until around age 19, when genetic influences begin to become apparent (Bouchard, p. 149). He reported that a large study of adults (n=30,000) showed heritabilities of 0.65 for males and 0.45 for females for conservatism. Bouchard and McGue in a paper discussing contemporary behavioral genetic studies wrote that recent studies indicate that social attitudes such as

religiousness, conservatism and authoritarianism are possibly as heritable as are personality traits (Bouchard and McGue, p. 37).

Jennings, Stoker and Bowers in a study comparing data from high school seniors in the 1960s with those in the 1990s found that children tended to adopt their parents' political attitudes under several conditions -- when the parents were politically engaged, when they frequently discussed politics with the children, and when parental attitudes were consistent across time and between parents (Jennings et al., p. 795). They also found that political attitudes formed by children early in life tended to persist into adulthood, while children whose political socialization was weak were slow to develop crystallized opinions and were more susceptible to influences outside the home (p. 796). In addition, Jennings et al. found that children tend to identify with their parents' political party and to vote in accord with their parents' political orientations. However, they also found that a politicized family environment encouraged children to pay attention to outside political forces that might contradict parental views (p. 796). Cesarini et al wrote that studies of twins show that genetic factors explain up to half the variance in political variables, while non-genetic factors explain the remainder (Cesarini et al., p. 71).

But research also shows that genetic and environmental factors are not necessarily determinative for opinions and are subject to individual variation. Hibbing, Alford and Smith wrote that inherited dispositions that are modified by environmental factors influence the structure of attitudes and behaviors, but do not predetermine those opinions or behaviors (Hibbing et al., p. 263).

***Hypothesis Four: Students will tend to hold views similar to those they perceive their parents to hold.***

As to the fifth hypothesis, Zaller wrote that people form mental templates – what he called stereotypes – that fuse information and predispositions (Zaller, p. 7, p. 14). These stereotypes are frames of reference and elite cues that enable people to form conceptions and then opinions about events beyond their personal experience and understanding (Zaller, p. 14). While this is a way for people to synthesize the contextual framework of experience when they themselves have none, those who do have relevant experience will mentally plug that experience into the template as they evaluate the issue. Zaller cited Walter Lippman, who wrote that people rely on others for information to function politically because otherwise most of the world is out of reach, sight and mind (Zaller, p. 6; Lippman, p. 28). Lippman wrote: “It is often very illuminating, therefore, to ask yourself how you got at the facts on which you base your opinion. Who actually saw, heard, felt, counted, named the thing, about which you have an opinion?” (Lippman, p. 28). For those who have had experience doing the hearing, feeling, counting and naming, they themselves become the authoritative source. In research that also applies to Hypothesis Six, Zaller wrote that political predispositions – the individual-level traits that regulate whether a person accepts or rejects political communication -- result at least partially from a distillation of a person’s life experiences including childhood socialization and experiences that cross into policy issue areas (Zaller, pp. 22-23).

***Hypothesis Five: Students will draw on their own experiences in forming opinions; thus, those who are putting themselves through school will give more weight to economic concerns while students supported by their parents will give more weight to humanitarian concerns when deciding whether to support U.S. intervention in a foreign country.***

Finally, my sixth hypothesis draws from political psychology research that shows that people tend to use the heuristics of political orientation and partisanship to interpret facts and give context to issues. Huckfeldt et al. in a study of how citizens make judgments concerning political candidates and issues found that people use heuristic devices, including partisanship and ideology, to sort political information and make decisions – particularly if the associations are highly consistent (Huckfeldt et al. p. 12). Huckfeldt et al. also found that judgments regarding politically consistent objects such as liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans are more accessible for recall than judgments regarding politically anomalous objects (Huckfeldt et al., p. 12). Chong and Druckman in their study of how people process competing messages found that political identification provides cues that help individuals make issue decisions when they otherwise lack detailed information. They found that partisan and ideological values will be more strongly connected to issues that have been regularly debated by elites, because individuals can use partisan and ideological cues to evaluate frames (Chong and Druckman, p. 678). But they wrote that aside from frames, partisan and ideological values can strongly influence how people process political information and induce them to resist information that is not consistent with their existing views (Chong and Druckman, p. 678).

Zaller and Feldman in their study of survey response found that those who are more knowledgeable and aware base their attitudes on ideological principle, making their survey answers consistent; while less-aware people tend to report their attitudes based on feelings, which can vary (Zaller and Feldman, p. 608). Mondak in his paper on survey scales for measuring political knowledge also found that ideology tends to matter for

survey respondents, and that it matters most for those who are most knowledgeable (Mondak, p. 234).

For those who are knowledgeable and strongly partisan, research shows that beliefs can be difficult to change. Taber and Lodge found that strong partisans seek information that confirms their existing opinions and resist or argue against information that contradicts their views (Taber and Lodge, p. 755-756). Kim, Taber and Lodge wrote that partisans with strong prior beliefs tend to be biased processing new information, while nonpartisan reasoners are less biased in responding to new information (Kim, Taber and Lodge p. 26-27). Gaines, Kuklinski et al. wrote that people interpret facts in a range of ways, and interpretation is a prerequisite before factual beliefs can be integrated into policy opinions (Gaines, Kuklinski et al. p. 959). They found that people may update their factual beliefs, but partisan-motivated factual interpretations tend to maintain polarized partisan opinions unless the facts are overwhelming enough to force a revision of preferences (Gaines, Kuklinski et al., pp. 971-972).

***Hypothesis Six: Partisanship and ideology will influence whether students support or oppose U.S. involvement in nation-building after military intervention.***



## Study Design and Measures

The study is based on two surveys conducted one year apart to measure attitudes about nation-building among entry level political science students at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. In both surveys, students were presented with a definition of nation-building to provide a standard for gauging their responses<sup>1</sup>. Other questions were used to assess the students' level of knowledge and awareness of foreign policy issues including nation-building.

The 90 questions on the 2011 survey included 21 questions about personal background, 13 about political attitudes, 10 about personality, 14 about news consumption, 10 about foreign policy opinions, four about nation-building attitudes, two about voting behavior, two about military service and impact on attitudes, 11 about factual knowledge, and three to evaluate the job performance of the president and secretary of state.<sup>2</sup>

The 2011 survey was administered during the week of April 18-22 when international news coverage featured stories about fighting in Libya between dictator Mommar Gadafi's armed forces on one side and rebels under protection from NATO air cover on the other. Whether these international stories may have influenced student responses was not measured. The sample included 126 students, but not all students answered every question. Only 114 students responded when asked if they were male (69, or 61 percent of those responding) or female (45, or 36 percent of those responding). Five students (of 115) reported being married. Most students reported their race as

---

<sup>1</sup> Question 61 on the 2011 survey and Question 64 on the 2012 survey included this wording: "Nation-building has been defined as using military force, after the end of a conflict, to reconstruct society through rapid and major social, economic and political transformation. Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?"

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix One for the complete 2011 survey.

white/Caucasian (102 of 115, or 89 percent). Most students (83 percent, 95 of 114 responding) listed their residence as Nebraska. The age range was 18 to 28, the modal age was 19 and the median age was 19.6. Most students (59 percent, 68 of 115) said they were working in addition to their studies. Most students were Christian (89 percent, 102 of 115).

The 2012 survey included 105 questions and also was distributed online to University of Nebraska-Lincoln entry-level students in political science. The survey was administered on April 19-20, 2012. News stories that were prominent during this period included extensive coverage of fighting in Syria. The 105 survey questions included 22 about personal background, 12 about political attitudes, 10 on personality, 16 about news consumption, 13 about foreign policy attitudes, 14 about nation-building attitudes, two about voting behavior, two about military service and impact on attitudes, 11 knowledge questions, and three to evaluate the job performance of the president and secretary of state.<sup>3</sup> The sample included 169 students, including 103 men (61 percent) and 66 women (39 percent). Two students reported being married, two were divorced, two reported “other” status and two did not respond. Most of the students (154 of 169, or 91 percent) reported their race as white/Caucasian. Of the 169, 167 listed their place of residence and most (143 of 167, or 86 percent) were from Nebraska. All but one listed their age. The age range was 18 to 29, the modal age was 19, and the median age was 19.8. A majority of students (98 of 168, or 58 percent) said they were working in addition to their studies. Most students (138 of 169, or 82 percent) said they were Christian.

The study employed quantitative measures to analyze the survey results, especially crosstabulation and binary logistic regression to look for statistically

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix Two for the complete 2012 survey.

significant associations (at the  $p \leq .05$  level) between various independent variables and the dependent variable of student support for U.S. involvement in nation-building. In addition, factor analysis was used in studying whether political orientation had any influence over student attitudes.

## Results

Majorities of students supported U.S. involvement in nation-building in both the 2012 and 2011 surveys. Of the 159 students who answered the nation-building question on the 2012 survey, 95 supported U.S. involvement in nation-building and 64 opposed it – a ratio of 60 to 40 percent. Results for the 2011 survey were similar. Of the 114 students who responded to the nation-building question, 63 supported U.S. involvement in nation-building and 51 opposed it – a ratio of 55 to 45 percent.

Analysis of 2012 survey results tended to confirm the first hypothesis – that support for humanitarian aid was significantly associated with support for nation-building. Analysis of the 2011 survey results also tended to support it at least partially, despite the fact that results between years were somewhat difficult to compare because not all of the key questions were worded identically.

When asked on the 2012 survey what type of help the U.S. should give to a country in the process of nation-building, analysis of the results showed strong support for humanitarian aid among those who supported nation-building (Table 1).

**Table 1 – 2012: Comparing views about aid and support for nation-building**

### Crosstabulation

DV (Q64): Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?

IV (Q67): What help should the U.S. give to a country that is the process of nation-building?

		Possible help the U.S. might give a country that is nation-building				Total
		No help	Humanitarian aid	Economic aid	Military aid	
Support for nation-building	Yes	3	48	23	21	95
	No	13	34	11	6	64
Total		16	82	34	27	159

Chi-square  $p=0.001$

The question of what help should be provided to a country in the process of building a new government was worded somewhat differently on the 2011 survey, which asked whether the U.S. should provide no help, economic help, advisors, or troops. A statistically significant relationship was detected between student support for nation-building and student support for economic aid to countries building new governments. The statistically significant relationship emerged in both binary logistic regression and cross-tabulation analyses (Table 2, Table 3).

**Table 2 – 2011: Do views on aid influence support for nation-building?**

<b>2011 Binary logistic regression</b>						
DV: (Q61re) Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building						
IV: (Q64cond) What help should the U.S. give a country that is nation-building?						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	.694	.242	8.192	1	.004	2.001
<b>Controlling for gender:</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q64cond	.693	.244	8.065	1	.005	1.999
Gender	.299	.403	.551	1	.458	

**Table 3 – 2011: Do views on aid influence support for nation-building?**

**2011 Crosstabulation**

DV: (Q61re) Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building

IV (Q64cond) Help that the U.S. should give a country that is nation-building

U.S. nation-building	No help	Economic aid	Advisors	Troops	Total
Oppose	8	33	5	5	51
Support	1	38	5	18	62
Total	9	71	10	23	113

Chi-Square  $p=0.007$

The first hypothesis also was supported by analysis of responses to another question on the 2012 survey: when should the U.S. intervene in the affairs of other states? Respondents were presented with five possible answers: never; when people want to bring democracy to their country; when leaders of another country ask for U.S. help; when humanitarian aid is needed; or when our leaders believe it is in the best interests of the U.S. to do so. When the 2012 intervention responses were recoded into a

dichotomous choice between support for humanitarian aid and support for other options, binary regression and crosstab analysis showed a significant association between support for nation-building and support for humanitarian aid (Table 4, Table 5).

**Table 4 – 2012: Intervention and support for U.S. role in nation-building**

<b>2012 Binary logistic regression</b>						
DV: (Q64re) Support for nation-building						
IV (Q86-HumAid12): When should the U.S. intervene in other countries?						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	.717	.352	4.157	1	.041	2.048

**Table 5 – 2012: Intervention and support for U.S. role in nation-building**

**2012 Crosstabulation**

DV: (Q64) Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?

IV : (Q86) When the U.S. should intervene in affairs of other countries?

		When should the U.S. intervene in the affairs of other countries?		
		Other Reasons	Humanitarian Reasons	Total
Should the U.S. take an active role in nation-building?	Yes	Count 55	Count 40	Count 95
		% within HumAid 53.9%	% within HumAid 70.2%	% within HumAid 59.7%
	No	Count 47	Count 17	Count 64
		% within HumAid 46.1%	% within HumAid 29.8%	% within HumAid 40.3%
Total		Count 102	Count 57	Count 159
		% within HumAid 100.0%	% within HumAid 100.0%	% within HumAid 100.0%

Chi-Square p=0.045

The intervention question was worded differently in the 2011 survey.

Respondents were presented with six options for when the U.S. should intervene in the affairs of other countries: never; when our leaders believe it is in our best interests to do so; when we see a moral obligation to intervene even if the long-term goals and costs for the U.S. are unclear; when we see a moral obligation to intervene but first have our leaders determine the long-term goals and costs for the U.S.; or when we see a need but first are able to get other countries to join us so we are not intervening for ourselves. No

significant relationship was apparent in the 2011 data between support for nation-building and answers to the intervention question (Table 6).

**Table 6 – 2011: Intervention and support for U.S. role in nation-building**

<b>2011 Binary logistic regression</b>						
(DVQ61re) Support for nation-building						
(IVQ85): When should U.S. intervene in other countries?						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	.068	.139	.241	1	.624	1.071

While the difference in wording of the intervention questions made some results difficult to compare between years, another set of analyses did compare identical questions. These compared support for nation-building with whether respondents believed principles such as the Golden Rule – treat others as you wish to be treated -- should guide U.S. foreign policy. Answer options for when to use the Golden Rule were: always, when it's practical and doesn't go against U.S. interests, and never. Results were statistically significant for 2012 (Table 7, Table 8) but not for 2011 (Table 9, Table 10).

**Table 7 – 2012: Does Golden Rule influence support for nation-building?**

**2012 Crosstabulation**

**DV: Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?**

**IV: (Q23) How much should the U.S. be guided by the Golden Rule in foreign policy?**

Crosstabulation with 4 "Never" responses to Q23 set to "missing"

		How much should U.S. government be guided by principles such as the Golden Rule in foreign policy?		
		Always	When practical	Total
Should the U.S. take an active role in nation-building?	Yes	43	51	94
	No	18	43	61
Total		61	94	155

Chi-Square p=0.043.

**Table 8 – 2012: Does Golden Rule influence support for nation-building?**

2012 Binary logistic regression						
DV: (Q64re) Support for nation-building						
IV: (Q23) How much should American foreign policy be guided by the Golden Rule?						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q23	-.700	.349	4.029	1	.045	.496
<b>Controlling for gender:</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q23:	-.701	.349	4.036	1	.045	.496
Gender:	-.054	.340	.025	1	.874	.948

**Table 9 – 2011: Does Golden Rule influence support for nation-building?****2011 Crosstabulation**

DV: (Q61): Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?  
 IV: (Q22) How much should the U.S. be guided by the Golden Rule in foreign policy?  
 Crosstabulation with 4 "Never" responses to Q22 set to "missing"

		How much should the U.S. be guided by the Golden Rule in the conduct of foreign policy?		Total
		Always	When it's practical	
Should the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?	Yes	17	31	48
	No	14	48	62
Total		31	79	110

Chi-Square p=0.138.

**Table 10 – 2011: Does Golden Rule influence support for nation-building?**

2011 Binary logistic regression						
DV: (Q61re) Support for nation-building						
IV: (Q22) How much should American foreign policy be guided by the Golden Rule?						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q22	.272	.377	.520	1	.471	1.313
<b>Controlling for gender:</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q22	.262	.379	.476	1	.490	1.299
Gender	.266	.386	.473	1	.491	1.304



Analysis partially supported the second and third hypotheses. As predicted by Hypothesis Two, there were no statistically significant relationships detected in either the 2011 or 2012 responses between how often a student read a newspaper and student views on nation-building. There also were no statistically significant associations detected between attitudes on nation-building and the number of days that a student spent reading news on the Internet, how often students watched news on cable television, which television network they watched, or which Web sites they used (Table 11).

**Table 11 – 2011-2012: Attention to news and support for U.S. nation-building**

<b>Binary logistic regression</b>						
<b>DV Support for nation-building (2012)</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
IV (coded to no=yes attention to news)						
Days spent reading newspapers	-.114	.082	1.912	1	.167	.892
Days spent reading Internet news	.010	.093	.012	1	.914	1.010
Days spent watching network TV news	.014	.092	.022	1	.883	1.014
Days spent watching cable TV news	.019	.098	.037	1	.847	1.019
Days spent listening to NPR news	.010	.093	.012	1	.914	1.010
<b>DV Support for nation-building (2011)</b>						
IV (coded to no=yes attention to news)						
Days spent reading newspapers	-.380	.423	.810	1	.368	.684
Days spent reading Internet news	-.120	.418	.082	1	.774	.887
Days spent watching network TV news	-.115	.388	.088	1	.767	.891
Days spent watching cable TV news	.347	.404	.738	1	.390	1.415
NPR question not included in 2011 survey						

However, when examining the question of whether intentional use of news media had any relationship with support for nation-building, binary regression analysis of the 2011 data did find a statistically significant association at the  $p \leq 0.05$  level between support for nation-building and spending little to no time on news in general (Table 12).

**Table 12 – 2011: Time spent on news and support for U.S. nation-building**

<b>2011 Binary logistic regression</b>						
DV Q61re support for nation-building	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV time/day reading, listening or watching news	-.610	.194	9.860	1	.002	.543

Controlling for time spent on international news made little difference in analysis of the 2011 results, as nearly 70 percent of students reported spending less than 15 minutes per day on international news in any form. The association between time spent on news and support for nation-building remained statistically significant (Table 13).

**Table 13 – 2011: Time spent on news and support for U.S. nation-building**

<b>2011 Binary logistic regression</b>						
DV Q61re support for nation-building	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV time/day reading, listening or watching news	-.640	.230	7.782	1	.005	.527
IV time/day on international news	.020	.304	.004	1	.948	1.020

But a different pattern emerged from the 2012 data. Binary logistic regression analyzing the independent variable of time spent on news for its effect on the dependent variable of support for nation-building found no significant relationship at all between time spent on news and support for nation-building. Crosstab analysis of the 2012 data did suggest a possible relationship in which those who used the Internet for national or international news from zero to five days a week tended to support U.S. involvement in nation-building, while those who spent six or seven days a week reading news on the Internet tended to oppose it, but the relationship was not statistically significant ( $p=0.086$ ).

As to cable television viewing reported by students on the 2012 survey, a crosstab analysis just outside statistical significance ( $p=0.051$ ) found that students who watched cable television news at least one day per week were more likely to support U.S. involvement in nation-building than those who watched zero days per week (Table 14). Several additional crosstab analyses indicated that the strongest support for nation-building came from students who watched cable television news one or two days per week, as opposed to those who watched not at all or those who watched more than three days a week, but the results were not significant at the  $p \leq 0.05$  level.

**Table 14 – 2012: Time on cable TV news and support for U.S. nation-building**

**2012 Crosstabulation**

DV: Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?

IV: How many days in past week did you watch national news on cable TV (CNN, Fox, MSNBC)?

			NewsCable1		Total
			0 days	1-7 days	
Should U.S. take an active role in nation-building?	Yes	Count NewsCable1	30 50.0%	65 65.7%	95 59.7%
	No	Count NewsCable1	30 50.0%	34 34.3%	64 40.3%
Total		Count % within NewsCable1	60 100.0%	99 100.0%	159 100.0%

Chi-Square  $p=0.051$ , just over the  $p \leq 0.05$  limit for statistical significance.

As to the fourth hypothesis, analysis of the survey results for 2012 strongly supported the hypothesis, while analysis of results for 2011 did not support it. Using 2012 data, binary logistic regression incorporating factor analysis found that student perceptions of paternal and maternal ideology, as well as student perceptions of their own ideology, were significant in predicting support for nation-building (Table 15). Factor analysis is a statistical technique to find commonality between underlying elements of similar variables, in this case student attitudes toward their own and their parents'

ideology, and mathematically combine these elements into a single variable for purposes of studying interactions with other variables (Kim and Mueller).

**Table 15 – Perception of ideology and support for U.S. nation-building**

<b>Binary logistic regression analysis</b>				
<b>DV: Student support for nation-building (2012)</b>				
IV	B	S.E.	Sig.	Exp(B)
FAC mother-father ideology	.423	.168	.012	1.527
FAC mother-father-student-ide	.415	.168	.014	1.514
Perception of mother ideology	.261	.109	.017	1.299
Perception of father ideology	.224	.105	.034	1.251
<b>DV: Student support for nation-building (2011)</b>				
IV	B	S.E.	Sig.	Exp(B)
FAC mother-father ideology	.192	.190	.311	1.211
FAC mother-father-student-ide	.215	.190	.259	1.239
Perception of mother ideology	.027	.152	.860	1.027
Perception of father ideology	.244	.150	.104	1.276

Binary logistic regression analysis of the 2012 data showed that the odds of a student supporting nation-building were 1.25 times greater than neutral if the student perceived his or her father to be conservative ( $p=0.034$ ), and 1.3 times greater than neutral if the student perceived his or her mother to be conservative ( $p=0.017$ ). Testing for the combined effect of perceived mother-father ideology on nation-building attitudes showed a moderate effect of 1.5 times greater than neutral ( $p=0.012$ ), with controlling for the student's own ideology making little difference.

**Table 16 – 2012: Perceived conservatism and its effect on support for U.S. nation-building**

**These binary logistic regression analyses are statistically significant at the  $p \leq .05$  level with support for intervention and perception of conservatism being associated with support for a U.S. role in nation-building.**

**2012****DV: (Q64re) Support for nation-building**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV (Q68) Is Afghanistan nation-building in U.S. interest?	-1.073	.362	8.791	1	.003	.342
Fac 1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.402	.175	5.284	1	.022	1.494

Controlling for perceived ideology, support for U.S. nation-building in Afghanistan is significantly associated with support for U.S. involvement in nation-building in general. Conversely, controlling for support for U.S. nation-building in Afghanistan, perceived conservative ideology is significantly associated with support for U.S. involvement in nation-building overall.

IV: (Q70) Use military through UN to bring hum aid?	-.847	.381	4.929	1	.026	.429
Fac1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.467	.174	7.245	1	.007	1.596

Controlling for perceived ideology, support for use of UN forces to supply humanitarian aid is significantly associated with support for U.S. involvement in nation-building. Conversely, controlling for use of UN forces to supply humanitarian aid, perceived conservative ideology is significant associated with support for U.S. involvement in nation-building in general.

IV (Q94) Has Iraq war been a success?	-.684	.347	3.888	1	.049	.505
Fac 1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.346	.174	3.942	1	.047	1.414

Controlling for perceived ideology, perception of the Iraq war as a success is significantly associated with support for U.S. involvement in nation-building in general. Conversely, controlling for perception of the Iraq war, perceived conservative ideology is significantly associated with support for U.S. nation-building.

IV: (Q71) How respond to authoritarian force?	-.577	.197	9.567	1	.002	.561
Fac1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.444	.176	6.386	1	.012	1.559

Controlling for perceived ideology, support for use of military force to respond to authoritarian attempts to squelch citizen protests is significantly associated with support for U.S. involvement in nation-building. Conversely, controlling for attitudes on how to respond to authoritarian attempts to squelch protest, conservative ideology is significantly associated with support for U.S. nation-building.

**These analyses, controlling for various interventions, are significant at the  $p \leq .05$  level for perception of conservative ideology and support for nation-building, but the converse is not statistically significant:**

**DV: (Q64re) Support for nation-building**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV: (Q69) Use military to ensure humanitarian aid?	-.551	.343	2.581	1	.108	.576
Fac1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.431	.171	6.383	1	.012	1.539

IV (Q95) Has Iraq nation-building been a success?	-.536	.341	2.470	1	.116	.585
Fac 1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.389	.171	5.186	1	.023	1.476

IV: (Q104) U.S. help Israel attack Iran to stop nukes?	-.360	.341	1.115	1	.291	.698
Fac1-2 (Mother, Father perceived ideology)	.363	.173	4.417	1	.036	1.438

IV (Q98) Has Afghanistan war been a success?	-.317	.354	.801	1	.371	.728
Fac 1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.374	.176	4.538	1	.033	1.454

IV (Q99) Has Afghanistan nation-building been success?	-.256	.362	.500	1	.479	.774
Fac 1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.401	.171	5.497	1	.019	1.493

Binary logistic regression analysis also found that among those surveyed in 2012, not only was support for nation-building significantly associated with student perception of conservative ideology, it also was significantly associated with a feeling that the U.S. should be active in the world. However, unlike the analysis for 2012, analysis of the 2011 results found that while there was statistically significant support for nation-building among those who said they felt the U.S. should be engaged in the world, there was no statistically significant association with perception of conservatism.

**Table 17 – 2011-2012: U.S. involvement in world, conservatism, and nation-building**

<b>Binary logistic regression</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
<b>DV: (Q61re) Support for nation-building</b>						
IV (Q90) How do you rate U.S. involvement in world?	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Fac1-5 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	-.613	.221	7.657	1	.006	.542
	.198	.200	.975	1	.323	1.219
<b>2012</b>						
<b>DV: (Q64re) Support for nation-building</b>						
IV: (Q105) How do you rate U.S. involvement in world?	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Fac1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	-.535	.261	4.198	1	.040	.585
	.399	.172	5.380	1	.020	1.490

On another question, comparing perception of U.S. influence in the world with support for nation-building, there were statistically significant associations at the  $p \leq .05$  level in both the 2011 and 2012 analyses between nation-building support and a belief that the U.S. is a good influence on the world. As with the engagement question, analysis of 2012 results showed that student perception of their own and their parents' conservatism was significantly associated with a belief that the U.S. is a good influence, but analysis of 2011 results did not show a similar relationship (Table 18).

**Table 18 – 2011-2012: U.S. involvement in world, conservatism, and nation-building**

<b>2011</b>						
<b>DV (Q61re) Support for nation-building</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV (Q59) Is U.S. good, neutral or bad influence in world?	-.866	.336	6.649	1	.010	.421
IV (Q59) Is U.S. a positive or negative influence in world?	-.829	.341	5.904	1	.015	.437
Fac1-5 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.125	.200	.393	1	.531	1.133
<b>2012</b>						
<b>DV(Q64re) Support for nation-building</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV (Q62) Is U.S. good, neutral, or bad influence in world?	-.638	.221	8.352	1	.004	.528
IV (Q62) Is U.S. good, neutral or bad influence in world?	-.523	.228	5.274	1	.022	.592
Fac1-3 (Mother, Father, student perceived ideology)	.336	.174	3.728	1	.054	1.399

Analysis failed to confirm the fifth hypothesis -- that students when asked for the best reason for U.S. intervention in another country would give more weight to economic concerns if they were putting themselves through college, and students would give more weight to humanitarian concerns if their parents were paying for their education. What had suggested a possible relationship was a crosstab analysis of 2012 data (Table 19) that showed that among non-working students, support for humanitarian intervention was significantly higher than it was among working students. But the relationship was outside of statistical significance (Fischer's Exact Test  $p=0.059$ , Chi-square  $p=0.083$ ).

**Table 19 – Support for humanitarian intervention and whether students work****2012 Crosstabulation****DV: Support for humanitarian aid (Q86 recoded to dichotomous)****IV: (Q13): In addition to your studies, are you working?**

		In addition to your studies, are you working?		Total
		Yes	No	
U.S. should intervene when human aid needed	Count	70	41	111
	% within In addition to your studies, are you working?	71.4%	58.6%	66.1%
Other	Count	28	29	57
	% within In addition to your studies, are you working?	28.6%	41.4%	33.9%
Total	Count	98	70	168
	% within In addition to your studies, are you working?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square  $p=0.083$ . Fisher's Exact  $p=0.059$ . Both are outside  $p\leq.05$  statistical significance.

However, binary logistic regression showed no significant relationships between student work and support for nation-building. Controlling for gender also failed to produce any statistically significant relationship (Table 20).

**Table 20 – The effect of student employment on support for U.S. role in nation-building**

<b>2012</b>						
<b>DV: Support for nation-building</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
IV:(Q13) In addition to studies, are you working?	-.261	.328	.637	1	.425	.770
Controlling for gender:						
DV: Support for nation-building	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV: (Q13) In addition to studies, are you working?	-.255	.334	.583	1	.445	.775
Gender	-.032	.338	.009	1	.924	.968
<b>2011</b>						
<b>DV: Support for nation-building</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
IV: (Q14) In addition to studies, are you working?	.534	.390	1.875	1	.171	1.706
Controlling for gender:						
Support for nation-building	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV: (Q14) In addition to studies, are you working?	.504	.394	1.635	1	.201	1.656
Gender	.204	.392	.271	1	.603	1.226
<b>2012</b>						
<b>DV: Support for nation-building</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
IV (Q15) Are you your main financial support?	.142	.370	.148	1	.700	1.153
Controlling for gender:						
DV: Support for nation-building	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV (Q15) Are you your main financial support?	.136	.374	.132	1	.717	1.145
Gender	-.039	.335	.013	1	.909	.962
<b>2011</b>						
<b>DV: Support for nation-building</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
IV (Q16) Are you your main financial support?	.368	.396	.864	1	.353	1.445
Controlling for gender:						
DV: Support for nation-building	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV (Q16) Are you your main financial support?	.344	.398	.744	1	.388	1.410
Gender	.244	.388	.396	1	.529	1.277



As to the sixth hypothesis, there were no statistically significant direct relationships found between support for nation-building and student political party affiliation or political orientation in either the 2012 or 2011 surveys (Table 21, Table 22).

**Table 21 – Analysis of IV party/ideology and DV nation-building support**

Binary logistic regression analysis						
<b>Political orientation</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
<b>DV: (Q61re) Support for nation-building</b>						
IV: (Q23re11) Are you lib, con, or in between?	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	.218	.233	.880	1	.348	1.244
<b>2012</b>						
<b>DV: (Q64re) Support for nation-building</b>						
IV (Q24re) Are you lib, con, or in between?	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	.294	.199	2.187	1	.139	1.341
<b>Political party affiliation</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
<b>DV: (Q61re) Support for nation-building</b>						
IV: (Q24re) Are you Dem, Rep, or Independent?	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	.151	.266	.321	1	.571	1.163
<b>2012</b>						
<b>DV: Support for nation-building</b>						
IV: (Q25re) Are you Dem, Rep, or Independent?	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
	-.161	.248	.418	1	.518	.852

**Table 22 – Influence of political orientation, political party on nation-building support**

**Crosstabulation analysis**

**2012: Q64re: Support for nation-building, Q24re: Political orientation**

Q64re	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Total
No	21	15	28	64
Yes	18	30	47	95
Total	39	45	75	159

Chi-Square p=.125

**2012: Q64re: Support for nation-building, Q25re: Political party**

Q64re	Dem	Ind	Rep	Total
No	12	21	28	61
Yes	15	22	55	92
Total	27	43	83	153

Chi-Square p=.225

**2011: Q61re: Support for nation-building, Q23cond: Political orientation**

Q61re	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Total
No	16	15	20	51
Yes	14	21	28	63
Total	30	36	48	114

Chi-Square p=.544

**2011: Q61re: Support for nation-building, Q24re: Political party**

Q61re	Dem	Ind	Rep	Total
No	18	20	11	49
Yes	17	32	13	62
Total	35	52	24	111

Chi-Square p=.481

Likewise, there were no significant associations found in 2011 or 2012 between student support for U.S. President Barack Obama and support for nation-building. However, some indirect associations between political party/orientation and support for nation-building did emerge. One indirect association emerged in comparing responses for 2011 and 2012 for how students perceived the global role and influence of the United States. The possible choices for student responses were worded somewhat differently between the two years -- including the inclusion in 2012 of a “neutral” category that was not included in the possible 2011 responses, which complicated analysis of the responses between the two years. Crosstab analysis showed that party affiliation and political orientation were statistically significant for 2012 data, but not for 2011, for how students perceived the global role and influence of the United States (Table 23, Table 24). In 2012 students who were conservative tended to more strongly see the U.S. as a positive influence in the world than did liberals or moderates. And perception of positive influence was statistically significant for association with support for nation-building.

**Table 23 – 2012: Comparing perceived global role of U.S. and political ideology/party**

**Crosstab analysis**

**2012: Q62re: Is U.S. a positive, neutral or negative influence? Q24re: Political ideology**

Q62re	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Total
Positive	18	19	49	86
Neutral	14	22	19	55
Negative	8	4	7	19
Total	40	45	75	160

Chi-Square p=.026

**2012: Q62re: Is U.S. a positive, neutral or negative influence? Q25re: Political party**

Q62re	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Total
Positive	14	16	55	85
Neutral	10	15	25	50
Negative	4	12	3	19
Total	28	43	83	154

Chi-Square p=.026

**Table 24 – 2011: Comparing perceived global role of U.S. and political ideology/party****Crosstab analysis****2011: Q59re: Is U.S. a positive or negative influence? Q23cond: Political ideology**

Q59re	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Total
Positive	23	29	39	91
Negative	7	7	9	23
Total	30	36	48	114

Chi-Square p=.879

**2011: Q59re: Is U.S. a positive or negative influence? Q24re: Political party**

Q59re	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Total
Positive	26	22	42	90
Negative	9	2	10	21
Total	35	24	52	111

Chi-Square p=.245

Strength of religious practice was another question in which responses were not statistically significant in their association with nation-building support in 2011, but were significant for 2012 (Table 25, Table 26). In this instance, the questions and responses were worded identically. In 2012 students who answered that they viewed themselves as active in their religion tended to support nation-building more than students who did not perceive themselves as active, and the results were statistically significant; but responses for 2011 showed no statistically significant relationship.

**Table 25 – Religious activity and support for nation-building in 2011 and 2012****Crosstabulation****2012: How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religion?**

Support nation-building	Very active	Somewhat active	Rarely active	Never active	Total
Yes	16	46	23	10	95
No	6	24	17	14	61
Total	22	70	40	24	156

Chi-Square p=.117, Linear-by-linear association 5.583, p=.018

Somers's d -.168, ASE -.2337, p=.019

**2011: How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religion?**

Support nation-building	Very active	Somewhat active	Rarely active	Never active	Total
Yes	9	33	18	3	63
No	8	26	14	3	51
17	17	59	32	6	114

Chi-Square p=.988, Linear-by-Linear Association 0.000, p=.985;

Somers's d .005, ASE .088, p=.955

**Table 26 – Religious activity and support for nation-building in 2011 and 2012****Binary logistic regression****2012: DV: Support for nation-building**

	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV: How active in religion	-.433	.185	5.464	1	.019	.649

**2011: DV: Support for nation-building**

	B	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
IV: How active in religion	-.005	.246	.000	1	.984	.995

Crosstab analysis comparing student ideology with student party identification shows that between 2011 and 2012, there was an 11 percentage point shift of Democratic students from the moderate to liberal categories, and an 11 percentage point net shift of Independents from the moderate and conservative categories into the liberal category, although a plurality of Independents were moderate. Percentages of Republicans in the conservative category stayed about the same (Table 27, Table 28).

In 2011, 69 percent of Democrats identified themselves as liberal, compared with 4 percent of Republicans and 16 percent of Independents. Seventy-five percent of Republicans identified themselves as conservative, compared with zero percent of Democrats and 32 percent of Independents. Thirty-one percent of Democrats identified themselves as moderate, compared with 21 percent of Republicans and 52 percent of Independents (Table 27).

In 2012, 80 percent of Democrats identified themselves as liberal, as did 6 percent of Republicans and 27 percent of Independents. Seventy-four percent of Republicans identified themselves as conservative, as did 7 percent of Democrats and 25 percent of Independents. Thirteen percent of Democrats identified themselves as moderates, compared with 20 percent of Republicans and 48 percent of Independents (Table 28).

**Table 27 – Relationship of party identification and ideological identification in 2011****2011 Crosstab analysis of DV party (Q24re) and IV ideology (Q23cond)**

			Ideology			Total
			Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	
Party	Dem	Count	24	11	0	35
		Expected Count	9.4	10.9	14.7	35.0
		% within Q24re	68.6%	31.4%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Q23cond	80.0%	31.4%	0.0%	31.3%
	Rep	Count	2	11	39	52
		Expected Count	13.9	16.3	21.8	52.0
		% within Q24re	3.8%	21.2%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Q23cond	6.7%	31.4%	83.0%	46.4%
	Ind	Count	4	13	8	25
		Expected Count	6.7	7.8	10.5	25.0
		% within Q24re	16.0%	52.0%	32.0%	100.0%
		% within Q23cond	13.3%	37.1%	17.0%	22.3%
Total	Count	30	35	47	112	
	Expected Count	30.0	35.0	47.0	112.0	
	% within Q24re	26.8%	31.3%	42.0%	100.0%	
	% within Q23cond	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square p=.000.

**Table 28 -- Relationship of party identification and ideological identification in 2012****2012 Crosstab analysis of DV party (PartyCond) and IV ideology (LibCon)**

			Ideology			Total
			Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	
Party	Dem	Count	24	4	2	30
		Expected Count	7.7	7.9	14.3	30.0
		% within PartyCond	80.0%	13.3%	6.7%	100.0%
		% within LibCon	58.5%	9.5%	2.6%	18.9%
	Rep	Count	5	17	63	85
		Expected Count	21.9	22.5	40.6	85.0
		% within PartyCond	5.9%	20.0%	74.1%	100.0%
		% within LibCon	12.2%	40.5%	82.9%	53.5%
	Ind	Count	12	21	11	44
		Expected Count	11.3	11.6	21.0	44.0
		% within PartyCond	27.3%	47.7%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within LibCon	29.3%	50.0%	14.5%	27.7%
Total	Count	41	42	76	159	
	Expected Count	41.0	42.0	76.0	159.0	
	% within PartyCond	25.8%	26.4%	47.8%	100.0%	
	% within LibCon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square p=.000.

In a further attempt to account for the differences in results between 2011 and 2012, personality factors were examined to see if any influence on nation-building attitudes could be detected. Analysis of personality factors in the 2011 data for association with support for nation-building found only one statistically significant relationship (Table 29) – responses to the statement “I see myself as critical, quarrelsome.” Students were asked to rate on a seven-point scale whether they disagreed or agreed with the statement. While the responses were not statistically significant when analyzed directly as an independent variable for effect on support for nation-building, they did become statistically significant when controlling for strength of party affiliation (Table 29). In that case the personality factor did become statistically significant ( $p=.038$ ) and the odds ratio showed that seeing oneself as critical or quarrelsome was inversely related to support for nation-building by a factor of .723.

**Table 29: 2011 Personality, strength of party/orientation, and nation-building support**

<b>Binary logistic regression</b>						
<b>2011 DV: Q61re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building</b>						
<b>IV: Q36: I see myself as critical, quarrelsome</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q36	-.110	.125	.777	1	.378	.896
<b>IV: Q36: I see myself as critical, quarrelsome</b>						
<b>IV: Q25a: Do you consider yourself a strong Dem/Rep or weak Dem/Rep?</b>						
Q36	-.325	.156	4.315	1	.038	.723
Q25aRe	-.258	.241	1.142	1	.285	1.294
<b>IV: Q36: I see myself as critical, quarrelsome</b>						
<b>IV: Q25b: If a weak partisan, which party do you lean toward – Dem, Rep, Ind?</b>						
Q36	.322	.282	1.306	1	.253	1.380
Q25bRe	-.598	.586	1.041	1	.308	.550

In the 2012 data, the critical-quarrelsome personality factor also was statistically significant ( $p=.020$ ) for association with support for nation-building, but only when controlling for independence (Table 30). In that case, seeing oneself as critical or quarrelsome was inversely related to support for nation-building by a factor of .575.

**Table 30 -- 2012 Personality, strength of party/orientation, and nation-building support**  
Binary logistic regression

<b>DV: Q64re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building</b>						
<b>IV: Q37: I see myself as critical, quarrelsome</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q37	-.198	.107	3.419	1	.064	.821
<b>IV: Q37: I see myself as critical, quarrelsome</b>						
<b>IV: Q26a: Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat?</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q37	-.098	.125	.618	1	.432	.906
Q26a	.040	.202	.040	1	.842	1.041
<b>IV: Q37: I see myself as critical, quarrelsome</b>						
<b>IV: Q26b: If an Independent, which party do you lean toward?</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q37	-.553	.237	5.447	1	.020	.575
Q26b	.633	.436	2.110	1	.146	1.883

Analysis of 2012 data also showed that another personality trait, extroversion, was significantly associated with support for nation-building when controlling for strength of party affiliation (Table 31). In that case, extroversion was statistically significant ( $p=.014$ ) for positive association with support for nation-building.

**Table 31: 2012 Personality, strength of party/orientation, and support for nation-building**

<b>2012 Binary logistic regression</b>						
<b>DV: 64re: Support for U.S. nation-building</b>						
<b>IV: Q36: I see myself as extroverted, enthusiastic</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q36	.189	.113	2.771	1	.096	1.207
<b>IV: Q36: I see myself as extroverted, enthusiastic</b>						
<b>IV: Q26a: Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat?</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q36	.365	.148	6.034	1	.014	1.440
Q26aRe	-.108	.215	.252	1	.615	.898
<b>IV: Q36: I see myself as extroverted, enthusiastic</b>						
<b>IV: Q26b: If an independent, which party do you lean toward?</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q36	-.207	.217	.917	1	.338	.813
Q26bRe	.609	.403	2.284	1	.131	1.839

Analysis of 2012 data also showed that the personality factor of creativity was statistically significant ( $p=.019$ ) for association with support for nation-building when controlling for students who identified as Independents or weak partisans. Identifying as a weak partisan or Independent was just outside statistical significance ( $p=.062$ ) for association with support for nation-building (Table 32).

**Table 32: 2012 Personality, strength of party/orientation, and support for nation-building**

<b>Binary logistic regression</b>						
<b>DV: Q64re, Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building</b>						
<b>IV: Q45: I see myself as conventional, uncreative</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q45	-.019	.111	.030	1	.862	.981
<b>IV: Q45: I see myself as conventional, uncreative</b>						
<b>IV: Q26a: Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat?</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q45	.136	.138	.978	1	.323	1.146
Q26aRe	.008	.203	.001	1	.970	1.008
<b>IV: Q45: I see myself as conventional, uncreative</b>						
<b>IV: Q26b: If an independent, which party do you lean toward?</b>						
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q45	-.643	.275	5.467	1	.019	.526
Q26b	.855	.459	3.477	1	.062	2.352



As stated earlier, factor analysis demonstrated that students who perceived themselves and their parents to be conservative tended to support nation-building in 2012. While the personality trait of sympathy and warmth was not itself statistically significant for association with support for nation-building, controlling for sympathy and warmth did slightly increase the positive association of perception of conservatism and support for nation-building (Table 33).

**Table 33 – 2012: Sympathy and warmth, conservatism, and support for nation-building**

<b>Binary logistic regression</b>						
<b>DV: Q64re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building</b>						
<b>IV: Q42: I see myself as sympathetic, warm</b>						
	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
Q42	.199	.128	2.429	1	.119	1.220
FAC 1-3	.415	.168	6.071	1	.014	1.514
<b>IV: Q42: I see myself as sympathetic, warm</b>						
<b>IV: FAC 1-3: Factor for student perception of conservatism for self, mother and father</b>						
	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
Q42	.227	.133	2.894	1	.089	1.254
FAC1-3	.454	.172	6.956	1	.008	1.574

Finally, analysis of 2011 results showed mixed results in looking for associations between strength of party affiliation and support for nation-building (Table 34). Binary logistic regression results were not statistically significant, while a crosstab analysis comparing nation-building support with views of Independents was statistically significant ( $p=.014$ ) at the  $p \leq .05$  level. Results for 2012 showed more equal balance among Independents of all orientations as to support or opposition to U.S. involvement in nation-building, but none of the results was statistically significant (Table 35).

**Table 34: 2011 Strength of partisanship/independence and support for nation-building**

**Binary logistic regression**  
**2011 DV: Q61re -- Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q25aRe	.244	.234	1.088	1	.297	1.276

(Q25aRe: Do you consider yourself a strong or not-so-strong Republican/Democrat?)

Q25bRe	-.656	.534	1.508	1	.219	.519
--------	-------	------	-------	---	------	------

(Q25bRe: If identifying as an Independent, which of the two major parties do you lean toward?)

**2011 Crosstabulation**  
**Q25aRe: Do you consider yourself a strong or not-so-strong Republican/Democrat?**  
**Q61re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building**

Nation-building support	Strong Democrat	Not-so-strong Democrat	Not-so-strong Republican	Strong Republican	Total
No	5	12	12	8	37
Yes	4	13	19	13	49
Total	9	25	31	21	86

Chi-square p=.736

**Q25bRe: If Independent, which party do you lean toward?**  
**Q61re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building**

Nation-building support	Lean Democrat	Neither	Lean Republican	Total
No	0	6	7	13
Yes	5	1	7	13
Total	5	7	14	26

Chi-square p=.014

**Table 35: 2012 Strength of partisanship/independence and support for nation-building**

**2012 Binary logistic regression**  
**DV: Q64re – Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Q26aRe	.033	.202	.027	1	.869	1.034

(Q26aRe: Do you consider yourself a strong or not-so-strong Republican/Democrat?)

Q26bRe	.611	.399	2.341	1	.126	1.841
--------	------	------	-------	---	------	-------

(Q26bRe: If identifying as an Independent, which of the two major parties do you lean toward?)

**2012 Crosstabulation**  
**Q26a: Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat?**  
**Q64re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building**

Nation-building support	Strong Democrat	Not-so-strong Democrat	Not-so-strong Republican	Strong Republican	Total
No	3	10	14	13	40
Yes	10	7	29	24	70
Total	13	17	43	37	110

Chi-square p=.172

**Q26b If Independent, which party do you lean toward?**  
**Q64re: Support for U.S. involvement in nation-building**

Nation-building support	Lean Democrat	Neither	Lean Republican	Total
No	9	11	3	23
Yes	7	9	9	25
Total	16	20	12	48

Chi-square p=.185

## Discussion

The results suggest that students rely on clusters of factors in forming opinions about nation-building, a foreign policy issue about which they appear to have relatively little direct knowledge or information, and that these factor clusters are activated in different ways by different groups at different times. This fits with Zaller's research that people form mental templates fusing information and predispositions (Zaller, p. 7, p. 14), but also suggests that these templates may be triggered and accessed in response to salient stimuli that selectively activate certain characteristics including some that may be latent or dormant.

This selective activation was seen in how perceived conservatism was significantly associated with support for nation-building in 2012 but not in 2011. In 2012, students who perceived themselves and their parents to be conservative tended to support nation-building. In 2011, perceived conservatism was not a statistically significant influence on support for nation-building. In fact, party identification and political ideology were not directly statistically significant for support of nation-building in either the 2012 or 2011 surveys.

One possible explanation for why perceived strength of conservatism was a statistically significant factor in predicting support for U.S. involvement in nation-building in 2012 is that the upcoming presidential election contest may have selectively stimulated conservative students to pay more attention to their political orientation as a lens for thinking about issues such as nation-building. If so that might add a new dimension to Burstein's findings that salience is a key element of democratic responsiveness. But further research including both qualitative interviews and survey

questions more specifically targeted toward discerning the influence of the political climate would be needed before any such associations could be reliably discerned.

The research findings for both 2011 and 2012 tended to support Hypothesis One, that students will support nation-building when humanitarian aid is a justification for the mission and the mission stems from a conflict that is salient. As noted earlier, some 2011 survey questions were worded differently than those of 2012, making comparison difficult. But the finding of an association between support for humanitarian aid and support for nation-building fits with the findings of Boettcher, and Tversky and Kahneman, that the public will tend to support humanitarian intervention at the beginning of an intervention because humanitarian aid is viewed as inherently good, particularly in the absence of framing that would highlight the potential costs in lives and money.

The findings for both 2011 and 2012 partially supported the second hypothesis – that support for nation-building will be independent of the amount of time students intentionally spend consuming international news. The findings did not support the third hypothesis – that students who do spend more time consuming international news will tend to support nation-building more than those who pay minimal attention to foreign news – although there was an association that was just outside of statistical significance at the  $p \leq .05$  level.

No statistically significant association was found for time spent on news and support for nation-building. These findings are consistent with Baum's research that students can become informed about international issues through soft news, but by themselves do not provide support for it. Further analysis including survey questions

requiring sufficiently detailed knowledge answers, as well as qualitative interviews to determine levels of knowledge about nation-building and the connection of knowledge to opinions about nation-building, would be needed to determine whether student opinions indeed were informed or not in light of little to no intentional exposure to news.

Qualitative interview research particularly could be useful to explore the extent, if any, to which students were basing their nation-building opinions on issue-specific information learned indirectly from soft news sources that might not have been measured by the two surveys. These sources might include talk shows, entertainment programs, or similar soft news sources that might have embedded issue information relevant to nation-building as part of the entertainment. While some general knowledge questions were included as part of the 2011 and 2012 surveys, such as “Where on the map would you find Kosovo,” and more specific knowledge-focused questions were included in the 2012 survey such as “What role did the U.S. play in Libya’s recent turmoil,” the surveys did not extensively measure student knowledge about nation-building or related subjects. However, overall responses did seem to suggest a basic level of awareness of major international events despite the lack of attention to news. Because most students answered multiple survey questions indicating that they paid little direct attention to news, it reliably can be concluded that they had little direct knowledge of news events shaping U.S. policy and participation in nation-building. But whether basic student knowledge relevant to nation-building was gained through soft news filtered through entertainment sources, or came from friends and family or other sources, was not measured.

Initial analysis findings seemed to indicate that students who watched cable television news at least one or two days per week were more likely to support nation-building than those who watched not at all or more than three days a week, but results were not statistically significant. The research findings support the research done by the Pew Foundation that the Internet and television are the prime sources of information for young adults as well as Americans overall (Pew 2012). But the findings also indicate that while students use the Internet and television for news more than other sites, they rarely seek out news despite a plethora of information being available about international issues and foreign news. This raises the question of whether young Americans are adequately informed about issues, especially when considering that young adults may be forming media consumption habits that will endure into their mature years. It remains to be seen whether these findings raise alarm and support Converse's decades-old observation that most American voters are somewhat clueless in that they lack the knowledge or interest to form coherent global contextual views about political issues (Converse, pp. 246-247), or whether as Page and Shapiro observed even seemingly clueless Americans are clued in enough to participate in the American political system and vote effectively (Page and Shapiro, p. xi).

As discussed earlier, the research partially supported the fourth hypothesis – that students will tend to hold views similar to those they perceive their parents to hold. On the 2012 survey, students who perceived themselves to be conservative and who perceived their parents to be conservative tended to support nation-building. This fits with Zaller's research that political dispositions can result from a distillation of life experiences including family influences, with Page and Shapiro's findings that people

respond to new information using cognitive cues from trusted figures such as parents. It also fits with Bouchard and McGue's research that social attitudes such as conservatism and authoritarianism may be inherited, and with the findings of Jennings, Stoker and Bowers that political attitudes formed by children early in life tend to persist into adulthood. What is intriguing, however, is that there did not appear to be an association between perception of parental ideology and support or opposition to nation-building among students who identified themselves as moderate or liberal. This might suggest an inherited trait of conservatism, or possibly an inherited tendency to pay attention to authority that manifested as deference to parental opinion. Further research would be needed to help clarify what this association means, including biological research such as eye-blink studies to test for preconscious political predispositions.

What also emerged from the research was a finding that the association of perceived conservatism with support for nation-building did not appear for respondents to the 2011 survey. This would seem to indicate that if there is a biological predisposition or inherited trait, that it can be latent until expressed by some other factor. Because 2012 was a presidential election year, one question that arises is whether an environment of increased attention to politics might have played a role in causing conservative students to be more intentional in expressing their ideology.

Crosstab analysis comparing student ideology with student party identification shows there was an 11 percentage point shift of Democrats from the moderate to liberal categories from 2011 to 2012, and an 11 percentage point net shift of Independents from the moderate and conservative categories into the liberal category, while percentages of Republicans in the conservative category stayed about the same. Along with this seeming

increased polarization on the political left, one wonders whether conservative Republicans either became more polarized in 2012, or were more aware of ideology. Again, qualitative interviews could help sort out this question, as would biological response testing to help determine the existence and influence, if any, of political predispositions, as suggested by Hibbing's research.

The research results did not support Hypothesis Five, that in considering whether to support U.S. involvement in nation-building, students putting themselves through school would give more weight to economic concerns than would students who were supported by their parents. There was no statistically significant support for the hypothesis, but there were weak and statistically non-significant indications that life experience does influence opinions, which would have supported Zaller's observation that people form mental stereotypes that fuse information and predispositions in order to form opinions about events beyond their personal experience and understanding.

The findings indirectly supported Hypothesis Six, that partisanship and ideology would influence whether students support or oppose nation-building after military intervention. Neither the 2011 nor 2012 survey provided any statistically significant direct associations between political party identification and support for nation-building, and nor was there any such association between political ideology and support for nation-building. However, as mentioned earlier, in the 2012 survey perception of conservatism was highly significant among conservative students for support of nation-building.

Another indication of the complexity of the interaction of factors in student opinion formation was the finding of a weak association between those who believed the



U.S. had been successful at nation-building in Iraq and those who gave general support for U.S. efforts at nation-building. This is complex because at the ideology level there was a strong correlation between conservatism and the idea that U.S. nation-building efforts had been successful in Iraq, but there was no direct association between party or ideology and overall support for general U.S. involvement in nation-building. Support for nation-building appeared to be case specific, filtered through partisan-influenced perceptions of the outcome in the particular instance. This fits with research by Huckfeldt et al. that the political environment at a given time can influence party-to-issue correlations (Huckfeldt et al., p. 11). But it also suggests that students may be drawing from a cluster of factors including elite cues, soft news inputs, and psychological traits, as Zaller, Page and Shapiro, Bouchard and others described, but that the factors emerge differently for different groups.

It may be that preconscious psychological predispositions are the gentle nudge that causes conservative students to use perception of conservatism as a lens for weighing support for nation-building while moderate and liberal students do not. As Hibbing et al. wrote, “Political factions are built on the foundation of biologically instantiated predispositions” that are not determinative in themselves but predispose individuals in a conservative or liberal direction (Hibbing et al., p. 258). Further research, particularly qualitative interviews and biological research including eye gaze tracking studies, would be useful in determining why perception of conservatism was statistically significant in 2012 but not 2011, as well as why the relationship between perception of ideology and support for nation-building was not apparent among moderate or liberal students. For example, Dodd, Hibbing and Smith in an eye-gaze study found that liberals tended to be

more influenced by social cues than were conservatives, while conservatives possibly were more influenced by rules (Dodd, Hibbing and Smith, p. 27; Hibbing et al., p. 121).

Strength of religious practice was another question in which responses were not statistically significant in their association with nation-building support in 2011, but were significant for 2012 (Table 25, Table 26). In this instance, the questions and responses were worded identically. In 2012 students who answered that they viewed themselves as active in their religion tended to support nation-building more than students who did not perceive themselves as active, but responses for 2011 showed no statistically significant relationship. This finding, along with the personality measurement that saw perceived conservatism slightly increase in significance when controlling for students who rated themselves as showing empathy, might indicate that conservative students possibly were motivated by political concerns in 2012 in how they perceived nation-building.

Research into the relationship of personality factors and political orientation, such as that of Carney et al., has demonstrated that liberals tend to be more open to new experiences than conservatives, but conservatives tend to be more conscientious; and that conservatives tend to be more conventional and organized while liberals tend to be more open to creativity and diversity (Carney et al., p. 836).

## Conclusion

The research finding that how conservative students perceive the conservatism of themselves and their parents is associated with support for nation-building in 2012 but not 2011 suggests a need for qualitative research – especially interviews with students – to find out why the relationship exists. What is interesting is that ideology by itself does not appear to be always significant – because conservatism was not significantly associated with nation-building support in 2011, and overall political ideology was not significantly associated with support for nation-building in either 2011 or 2012. This suggests that some factor selectively operationalizes ideology at salient times, but not at other times. This could call into question survey studies that are snapshots of attitudes at particular times, rather than time-series studies.

In addition, the research strongly suggests a need for biological studies such as eye-gaze tracking studies to explore how biological factors might influence political attitudes, and how those influences and attitudes might change over time in response to exogenous factors that increase or decrease the salience of factors that overall comprise the mental matrix that appears to determine attitude and opinion formation. The research suggests that students form clusters of factors that interact uniformly under certain conditions, such as conservative students being influenced by the perception of their conservatism and that of their parents, but that the clusters operate differently when salience is lacking and factors such as political ideology are dormant.

Understanding how students and others gain information and form opinions about foreign policy issues such as nation-building is important, because not only does it help

guide teachers, the news media and others in how to effectively provide information, it also helps empower students to get involved. Democratic government requires informed participation in order to function well. As Page and Shapiro wrote, “The chief cure for the ills of American democracy is to be found not in less but in more democracy; not in thwarting the public’s wishes but in providing it with good political information and heeding its wishes” (Page and Shapiro, p. 3).

## Bibliography

- Amundson, Daniel R., Linda S. Lichter and S. Robert Lichter. *The Myopic Neighbor: Local and National Network Television Coverage of the World*. The Center for Media and Public Affairs. Paper Commissioned by the FrameWorks Institute for the Global Independence Initiative of the Aspen Institute. 2001.
- Althaus, Scott L. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics: Opinion Surveys and the Will of the People*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2003.
- Auerbach, Yehudith, and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon. "Media Framing and Foreign Policy: The Elite Press vis-à-vis U.S. Policy in Bosnia, 1992-1995." *Journal of Peace Research*. 41.1 (2005). pp. 83-99.
- Bajraktari, Yll and Peter Roady. "Afghanistan: Changing the Frame, Changing the Game." *Belfer Center Student Paper Series #09-02*. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. Harvard Kennedy School. Cambridge, Mass. March 2009.
- Bartels, Larry M. "Beyond the Running Tally: Partisan Bias in Political Perceptions." *Political Behavior*. 24.2 (2002) pp. 117-150.
- Baum, Matthew A. "How Public Opinion Constrains the Use of Force: The Case of Operation Restore Hope." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 34.2 (2004) pp. 187-226.
- Baum, Matthew A. "Circling the Wagons: Soft News and Isolationism in American Public Opinion." *International Studies Quarterly*. 48.2 (2004) 313-338.
- Baum, Matthew A. "Sex, Lies and War: How Soft News Brings Foreign Policy to the Inattentive Public." *The American Political Science Review*. 96.1 (2002) 91-109.
- Bearden, Milton. "Afghanistan, Graveyard of Empires." *Foreign Affairs*. 80.6 (2001) pp. 17-30.
- Berensky, Adam J. and Donald R. Kinder. "Making Sense of Issues through Media Frames: Understanding the Kosovo Crisis." *The Journal of Politics*. 68.3 (2006) 640-656. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4639887>
- Boettcher, William A. III. "Military Intervention Decisions regarding Humanitarian Crises: Framing Induced Risk Behavior." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 48.3 (2004) pp. 331-355.
- Brody, Richard A. and Catherine R. Shapiro. "Policy Failure and Public Support: The Iran-Contra Affair and Public Assessment of President Reagan." *Political Behavior*. 11.4 (1989) pp. 353-369.

- Burstein, Paul. "The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda." *Political Research Quarterly*. 56.1 (2003) pp. 29-40.
- Barnes, Samuel H. "The Contribution of Democracy to Rebuilding Postconflict Societies." *The American Journal of International Law*. 95.1 (2001) pp. 86-101.
- Baum, Matthew A. "Sex, Lies and War: How Soft News Brings Foreign Policy to the Inattentive Public." *The American Political Science Review*. 96.1 (2002) 91-109.
- Bjereld, Ulf. "Children and the Gender Gap in Foreign Policy Issues." *Gender and Society*. 15.2 (2001) pp. 303-316.
- Bouchard Jr., Thomas J. "Genetic Influence on Human Psychological Traits: A Survey." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 13.4 (2004) pp. 148-151
- Bouchard Jr., Thomas J. and Matt McGue. "Genetic and Environmental Influences on Human Psychological Differences." *Journal of Neurobiology*. 54.1 (2003) pp. 4-45.
- Butler, Michael J. "U.S. Military Intervention in Crisis, 1945-1994: An Empirical Inquiry of Just War Theory." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 47.2 (2003) pp. 226-248.
- Carney, Dana R., John J. Jost, Samuel D. Gosling, and J. Potter. "The Secret Lives of Liberals and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles, and the Things They Leave Behind." *Political Psychology*. 29:807-840. 2008.
- Castano, Emanuele, Simona Sacchi and Peter Hays Gries. "The Perception of the Other in International Relations: Evidence for the Polarizing effect of Entitativity." *Political Psychology* 24.3 (2003) 449-468.
- Cesarini, David, Magnus Johannesson and Sven Oskarsson. "Pre-Birth Factors, Post-Birth Factors, and Voting Evidence from Swedish Adoption Data." *American Political Science Review*. 108.1 (2014) pp. 71-87.
- Chaffee, Steven H., Melissa Nichols Saphir, Joseph Graf, Christian Sandvig, and Kyu Sup Hahn. "Attention to Counter-Attitudinal Messages in a State Election Campaign." *Political Communication* 18 (2001) pp. 247-272.
- Chicago Council on Global Affairs. "Constrained Internationalism: Adapting to New Realities." Results of a 2010 National Survey of American Public Opinion. *The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*. (2010)
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. "Dynamic Public Opinion: Communication Effects Over Time." *American Political Science Review*. 104.4 (2010) pp. 663-680.
- Converse, Philip E. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, Dazvid E. Apter, ed. New York: The Free Press. 1964.

- DellaVigna, Stefano and Ethan Kaplan. "The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122.3 (2007) 1187-1234 <http://0-www.mitpressjournals.org.library.unl.edu/doi/pdf/10.1162/qjec.122.3.1187>
- DelliCarpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why it Matters*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale UP. 1996.
- Dobbins, James, Seth G. Jones, Keith Crane and Beth Cole DeGrasse. *The Beginner's Guide to Nation-Building*. Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand. 2007.
- Dobbins, James and John G. McGinn, Keith Crane, Seth G. Jones, Rollie Lai, Andrew Rathmell, Rachel M. Swanger and Anga R. Timilsina. *America's Role in Nation-Building*. Santa Monica, California: Rand. 2003.
- Dodd, Michael D., John R. Hibbing and Kevin B. Smith. "The Politics of Attention: Gaze Cuing Effects are Moderated by Political Temperament." *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics*. 73:24-29. 2011.
- Druckman, James N. and Arthur Lupia. "Mind, Will and Choice: Lessons from Experiments in Contextual Variation," in Robert E. Goodwin and Charles Tilly, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, pp. 97-113. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2006.
- Druckman, James N. and Michael Parkin. "The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters." *The Journal of Politics*. 67.4 (2005) 1005-1049. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3449894>
- Drury, A. Cooper, Richard Stuart Olson and Douglas A. Van Belle. "The Politics of Humanitarian Aid: U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, 1964-1995." *The Journal of Politics*. 67.2 (2005) pp. 454-473.
- Eichenberg, Richard C. "Gender Differences in Public Attitudes toward the Use of Force by the United States, 1990-2003." *International Security*. 28.1 (2003) pp. 110-141.
- Farrall, Jeremy. "The Future of UN Peacekeeping and the Rule of Law." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)* 101 (2007) pp. 160-163.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Ithaca, N.Y.:Cornell University Press. 2004.
- Gabrielson, Teena. "James Madison's Psychology of Public Opinion." *Political Research Quarterly*. 62.3 (2009) pp 431-444.
- Riffkin, Rebecca. "U.S. Economic Confidence Index Dips to -12." *Gallup*. 21 Oct. 2014. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/178727/economic-confidence-index-dips.aspx> Accessed 21 Oct. 2014.

- Gannon, Kathy. "Afghanistan Unbound." *Foreign Affairs*. 83.3 (2004) pp. 35-46.
- Gerber, Alan and Donald P. Green. "Rational Learning and Partisan Attitudes." *American Journal of Political Science*. 42.3 (1998) pp. 794-818.
- Gilens, Martin. "Political Ignorance and Collective Policy Preferences." *American Political Science Review*. 95.2 (2001) pp. 379-396.
- Goren, Paul. "Party Identification and Core Political Values." *American Journal of Political Science*. 49.4. (2005) p. 881-896.
- Hallin, Daniel C. "The Media, the War in Vietnam, and Political Support: A Critique of the Thesis of an Oppositional Media." *The Journal of Politics*. 46.1 (1984) pp. 2-24.
- Hammond, William M. "The Press in Vietnam as Agent of Defeat: A Critical Examination." *Reviews in American History*. 17.2 (1989) pp. 312-323.
- Harvard 2011. *Survey of Young Americans' Attitudes Toward Politics and Public Service: 19<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Institute of Politics, Harvard University. 2011.
- Harvard 2010. *Survey of Young Americans' Attitudes Toward Politics and Public Service: 19<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Institute of Politics, Harvard University. 2010.
- Herman, Edward S. "The Media's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy." *Journal of International Affairs*. 44.1 (1993)
- Hibbing, John R., Kevin B. Smith and John A. Alford. *Predisposed*. New York: Routledge. 2014.
- Holcomb, Jesse, Amy Michell and Tom Rosenstiel. "Cable: Audience vs. Economics." *The State of the News Media 2011. Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism*. 2011.
- Holsti, Ole R. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly*. 36.4 (1992) pp. 439-466.
- Holsti, Ole R., and James N. Rosenau. "Does Where You Stand Depend on Where You Were Born? The Impact of Polst-Vietnam Foreign Policy Beliefs." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*. 44.1 (1980) pp. 1-22.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Jeffery J. Mondak, Michael Crow and Jeanette Morehouse Mendez. "Making sense of candidates: Partisanship, ideology and issues as guides to judgment." *Cognitive Brain Research*. 23 (2005) pp. 11-23.



- Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, Charles Taber and Gallya Lahav. "Threat, Anxiety, and Support of Antiterrorism Policies." *American Journal of Political Science*. 49.3 (2005) pp. 593-608.
- Huysmans, Jef. "Shape-Shifting NATO: Humanitarian Action and the Kosovo Refugee Crisis." *Review of International Studies*. 28.3 (2002) pp. 599-618.
- Isnermia, Pierangelo, Zoltan Juhasz and Hans Rattinger. "Foreign Policy and the Rational Public in Comparative Perspective." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 46.2 (2002) 201-224. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3176172>
- Iyengar, Shanto and Kyu S. Hahn. "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use." *Journal of Communication*. 59.1 (2009) pp. 19-39.
- Jennings, M. Kent, Laura Stoker and Jake Bowers. "Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined." *The Journal of Politics*. 71.3 (2009) pp. 782-799.
- Jerit, Jennifer, Jason Barabas and Toby Bolsen. "Citizens, Knowledge, and the Information Environment." *American Journal of Political Science*. 50.2 (2006) 266-282.
- Jones, Frank L. "Rolling the Dice of War: Military Necessity and Nation Building." *International Journal* 61.4. (2006) pp. 945-958.
- Jones, Jeffrey M. and Frank Newport. "Slightly Fewer Back ISIS Military Action vs. Past Actions." Gallup. 23 Sept. 2014. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/177263/slightly-fewer-back-isis-military-action-past-actions.aspx> Accessed 22 Oct. 2014
- Keeter, Scott. "The Aging of the Boomers and the Rise of the Millennials." *The Future of Red, Blue and Purple America, a joint project of The Brookings Institution and American Enterprise Institute*. (2008)
- Kim, Jae-On and Charles W. Mueller. "Introduction to Factor Analysis." *Sage Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications. 1978.
- Kim, Sung-youn, Charles S. Taber and Milton Lodge. "A Computational Model of the Citizen as Motivated Reasoner: Modeling of the Dynamics of the 2000 Presidential Election." *Political Behavior*. 32 (2010) pp. 1-28.
- Kuklinski, James H., Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schwieder and Robert F. Rich. "Misinformation and the Currency of Democratic Citizenship." *The Journal of Politics*. 62.3 (2000) p. 790-816.
- Kuklinski, James H. and Buddy Peyton. "Belief Systems and Political Decision-Making." In Russell Dalton and Hans Klingemann, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2009.

Kull, Steven, Clay Ramsay, Evan Lewis and Phil Warf. "Misperceptions, the Media and the Iraq War." *The Program on International Policy Attitudes/Knowledge Works Poll*. October 2, 2003.

Lippman, Walter. *Public Opinion*. New York: MacMillan. 1922/1961.

Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenberg and Shawn Bru. "The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation." *The American Political Science Review*. 89.2 (1995) pp. 309-326.

Logan, Joseph. "Last U.S. Troops Leave Iraq, Ending War." Reuters dispatch published in *The Washington Post*. 18 Dec. 2011. Web.

Madland, David and Ruy Teixeira. "New Progressive America: The Millennial Generation." *Center for American Progress*. 2009.

Marcus, George E. "The Psychology of Emotion and Politics." In Sears, Huddy & Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2003) pp. 182-221.

Marcus, George E., John L. Sullivan, Elizabeth Theiss-Morse and Daniel Stevens. "The Emotional Foundation of Political Cognition: The Impact of Extrinsic Anxiety on the Formation of Political Tolerance Judgments." *Political Psychology*. 26.6 (2005) pp. 949-963.

Marcus, George E. and Michael B. Mackuen. "Anxiety, Enthusiasm and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns." *The American Political Science Review*. 87.3 (1993) pp. 672-685.

Marcus, George. *The Sentimental Citizen: Emotion in Democratic Politics*. (2002)

Michelson, Melissa R. "How Americans Think About Foreign Military Involvement: The Case of Bosnia." *International Studies Notes*. 23.2 (1998) pp. 1-9.

McMahon, Patrice C. and Jon Western, eds. *The International Community and Statebuilding*. New York: Routledge. 2012.

Mingst, Karen A. "Inter-Organizational Politics: The World Bank and the African Development Bank." *Review of International Studies*. 13.4 (1987) pp. 281-293.

Mingst, Karen and Michael G. Schechter. "Assessing Intergovernmental Impact: Problems and Prospects." *Review of International Studies*. 11.3 (1985) pp. 199-206.

Mingst, Karen A. and Margaret P. Karns. *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers. 2004.

Mingst, Karen A. *Politics and the African American Development Bank*. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky. 1990.

Mingst, Karen A. and Margaret P. Karns. *The United Nations in the Post-Cold War Era*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press. 1995, 2000.

Mondak, Jeffery. "Developing Valid Knowledge Scales." *American Journal of Political Science*. 45 (2001) p. 224-238.

Mondak, Jeffery. *Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior*. New York: Cambridge UP. 2010.

Mondak, Jeffery, and Edward G. Carmines, Robert Huckfeldt, Dona-Gene Mitchell and Scot Schraufnagel. "Does Familiarity Breed Contempt? The Impact of Information on Mass Attitudes toward Congress." *American Journal of Political Science*. 51.1 (2007) pp. 34-48.

Mueller, John. *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*. 1973.

The Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy. "2014 Survey of America's College Students." *Survey Conducted on Behalf of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy by Peter D. Hart Research Associates Inc.* (2014)  
<http://www.panettainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2014-hart.pdf>

The Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy. "2011 Survey of America's College Students." *Survey Conducted on Behalf of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy by Peter D. Hart Research Associates Inc.* (2011)  
<http://www.panettainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/survey-2011.pdf>

The Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy. "2010 Survey of America's College Students." *Survey Conducted on Behalf of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy by Peter D. Hart Research Associates Inc.* (2010)  
<http://www.panettainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/survey-2010.pdf>

The Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy. "2009 Survey of America's College Students." *Survey Conducted on Behalf of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy by Peter D. Hart Research Associates Inc.* (2009)  
<http://www.panettainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/survey-2009.pdf>

The Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy. "2008 Survey of America's College Students." *Survey Conducted on Behalf of the Leon & Sylvia Panetta Institute for Public Policy by Peter D. Hart Research Associates Inc.* (2008)  
<http://www.panettainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/survey-2008.pdf>

Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1992.

Pew. "State of the News Media 2010 Executive Summary." *The Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism*. 1 March 2010.

Pew. "Where Americans Get News." *Pew Research Journalism Project*. 27 Sept. 2012. <http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/where-americans-get-news/>

Prior, Markus. "News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science*. 49.3 (2005) 577-592. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3647733>

Redlawsk, David P., Andrew J.W. Civettini, and Karen M. Emmerson. "The Affective Tipping Point: Do Motivated Reasoners Ever 'Get It'?" *Political Psychology*. 31.4 (2010) pp. 563-593.

Robinson, Piers. "The Policy-Media Model: Measuring Media Power during Humanitarian Crisis." *Journal of Peace Research*. 37.5 (2000) pp. 613-633.

Rosenblatt, Alan J. "Aggressive Foreign Policy Marketing: Public Response to Reagan's 1983 Address on Lebanon and Grenada." *Political Behavior*. 20.3 (1998) pp 225-240.

Rosenstiel, Tom and Amy Mitchell. "State of the News Media 2011." *The Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism*. (2011)

Samuels, Kirsti. "Sustainability and Peace Building: A Key Challenge." *Development in Practice*. 15.6 (2005) pp. 728-736.

Samuels, Kirsti. "State-Building and the Political Transition After Conflict." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)* 99 (2005) pp. 171-174.

Shani, Danielle. "Knowing Your Colors: Can Knowledge Correct for Partisan Bias in Political Perceptions?"

Shahrani, Nazif M. "War, Factionalism and the State in Afghanistan." *American Anthropologist*. 104.3 (2002) pp. 715-722.

Sobel, Richard. "Trends: United States Intervention in Bosnia." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*. 62.2 (1998) pp. 250-278.

Sobel, Richard. "A Report: Public Opinion About United States Intervention in El Salvador and Nicaragua." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*. 53.1. (1989) pp. 114-128.

Storbeck, Justin and Gerald L. Clore. "On the Interdependence of Cognition and Emotion." *Cognition and Emotion*. 21.6 (2007) pp. 1212-1237.

Taber, Charles S., and Milton Lodge. "Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs." *American Journal of Political Science*. 50.3 (2006) pp. 755-769.

Taylor, Paul and Scott Keeter, eds. "Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next." *Pew Research Center*. 2010.

U.S. Army. "The U.S. Army in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *Army in Europe Pamphlet 525-100*. Headquarters United States Army, Europe, and Seventh Army. 7 Oct. 2003.

Verba, Sidney, Richard A. Brody, Edwin B. Parker, Norman H. Nie, Nelson W. Polsby, Paul Ekman, and Gordon S. Black. "Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam." *The American Political Science Review*. 61.2 (1967) pp. 317-333.

Wedgwood, Ruth and Harold K. Jacobson. "Syposium: State Reconstruction after Civil Conflict; Foreword." *The American Journal of International Law*. 95.1 (2001) pp. 1-6.

Western, Jon. "Sources of Humanitarian Intervention: Beliefs, Information, and Advocacy in the U.S. Decisions on Somalia and Bosnia." *International Security*. 26.4 (2002) 112-141. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3092104>

Wilson, Jeremy M. "Law and Order in an Emerging Democracy: Lessons from the Reconstruction of Kosovo's Police and Justice Systems." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 605. (2006) pp. 152-177.

Yankelovich, Daniel. *Toward Wiser Public Judgment*.

Zaller, John and Stanley Feldman. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science*. 36.3 (1992) 579-617.

Zaller, John R. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1992.

## Appendix One – Nation-Building Attitudes Survey 2011

April 2011

*First, we'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself.*

### Question 1

What is your PSEPP number?

N	Valid	126
	Missing	0

### Question 2

What is your age?

\_\_\_\_\_ years old.

N	Valid	126
	Missing	0

What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_ years old.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	12	9.5	9.5	9.5
18	17	13.5	13.5	23.0
19	53	42.1	42.1	65.1
20	26	20.6	20.6	85.7
21	11	8.7	8.7	94.4
22	3	2.4	2.4	96.8
23	1	.8	.8	97.6
25	1	.8	.8	98.4
28	2	1.6	1.6	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 3

#### Are you male or female?

		Are you male or female?-male	Are you male or female?-Female
N	Valid	114	46
	Missing	12	80

#### Are you male or female?-male

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	45	35.7	39.5	39.5
	1	69	54.8	60.5	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

#### Are you male or female?-Female

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	46	36.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	80	63.5		
Total		126	100.0		

## Question 4

Do you have any brothers or sisters?

### Statistics

		Do you have any brothers or sisters? Please list how many of each. Write 0 if none.-Brothers	Do you have any brothers or sisters? Please list how many of each. Write 0 if none.- Sisters
N	Valid	126	126
	Missing	0	0

Do you have any brothers or sisters? Please list how many of each. Write 0 if none.-Brothers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
0	18	14.3	14.3	14.3
1	21	16.7	16.7	31.0
2	52	41.3	41.3	72.2
3	21	16.7	16.7	88.9
4	9	7.1	7.1	96.0
9	4	3.2	3.2	99.2
	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

Do you have any brothers or sisters? Please list how many of each. Write 0 if none.-Sisters

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
0	28	22.2	22.2	22.2
1	33	26.2	26.2	48.4
2	31	24.6	24.6	73.0
3	20	15.9	15.9	88.9
4	6	4.8	4.8	93.7
5	5	4.0	4.0	97.6
One	2	1.6	1.6	99.2
	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	



### Question 5

Are your parents living?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, both are living	110	87.3	95.7	95.7
	Father has died	3	2.4	2.6	98.3
	Mother has died	2	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 6

What is your marital status?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	108	85.7	93.9	93.9
	Married	5	4.0	4.3	98.3
	Widowed	1	.8	.9	99.1
	Other	1	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 7

Do you have children?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	3	2.4	2.6	2.6
	No	112	88.9	97.4	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

## Question 8

What race or races do you consider yourself?

	What race or races do you consider yourself?- American Indian/Native American	What race or races do you consider yourself? Asian/Pacific Islander	What race or races do you consider yourself? African American/Black	What race or races do you consider yourself? Hispanic/Latino /Latina/Chicano / Chicana	What race or races do you consider yourself? White/Caucasian	What race or races do you consider yourself? Other
11 Valid	1	6	2	6	115	1
Missing	125	120	124	120	11	125

What race or races do you consider yourself?-American Indian/Native

American

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	1	.8	100.0	100.0
Missing System	125	99.2		
Total	126	100.0		

What race or races do you consider yourself?-Asian/Pacific Islander

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	6	4.8	100.0	100.0
Missing System	120	95.2		
Total	126	100.0		

What race or races do you consider yourself?-African American/Black

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	2	1.6	100.0	100.0
Missing System	124	98.4		
Total	126	100.0		

**What race or races do you consider yourself? -Hispanic/Latino/Latina/****Chicano/Chicana**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	6	4.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	120	95.2		
Total		126	100.0		

**What race or races do you consider yourself?-White/Caucasian**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	13	10.3	11.3	11.3
	1	102	81.0	88.7	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

**What race or races do you consider yourself?-Other**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	125	99.2		
Total		126	100.0		

**What race or races do you consider yourself?-Other-TEXT**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		125	99.2	99.2	99.2
	African	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total		126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 9

Were you born in the United States?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	107	84.9	93.9	93.9
	No	7	5.6	6.1	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 10

Where do you consider to be your home? (city, state, nation)

N	Valid	126
	Missing	0

Where do you consider to be your home? (city, state, nation) TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	12	9.5	9.5	9.5
Adams, NE, United States	1	.8	.8	10.3
Ainsworth, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	11.1
Albion, Nebraska USA	1	.8	.8	11.9
Bennington, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	12.7
Bogota, Cundinamarca, Colombia	1	.8	.8	13.5
Brainard, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	14.3
California	1	.8	.8	15.1
Chaska, Minnesota, United States	1	.8	.8	15.9
Chicago, Illinois, USA	1	.8	.8	16.7
Clarks, Nebraska, USA	1	.8	.8	17.5

Columbus, Nebraska, United States	2	1.6	1.6	19.0
Creighton nebraska usa	1	.8	.8	19.8
Eagan, MN, US	1	.8	.8	20.6
Eustis, Nebraska, USA	1	.8	.8	21.4
Firth, NE, USA	1	.8	.8	22.2
franklin, tn, usa	1	.8	.8	23.0
Fremont, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	23.8
Grand Forks, North Dakota, USA	1	.8	.8	24.6
Grand Island, NE USA	1	.8	.8	25.4
Grand Island, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	26.2
Holdrege Nebraska USA	1	.8	.8	27.0
Joplin, mO 64804	1	.8	.8	27.8
Joplin,MO 68508	1	.8	.8	28.6
kearney, ne	1	.8	.8	29.4
Kearney, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	30.2
Kenesaw, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	31.0
Lee's Summit, MO, USA	1	.8	.8	31.7
Lexington, Nebraska	1	.8	.8	32.5
Lexington, Nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	33.3
Lincoln, NE	4	3.2	3.2	36.5
Lincoln, NE U.S.A.	1	.8	.8	37.3
Lincoln, NE U.S.A.	1	.8	.8	38.1
Lincoln, NE USA	2	1.6	1.6	39.7
Lincoln, NE, United States	2	1.6	1.6	41.3
Lincoln, Ne, USA	1	.8	.8	42.1
Lincoln, NE, USA	6	4.8	4.8	46.8
lincoln, nebraska	1	.8	.8	47.6
Lincoln, Nebraska, America	2	1.6	1.6	49.2

lincoln, nebraska, united states	1	.8	.8	50.0
Lincoln, Nebraska, United States	7	5.6	5.6	55.6
Lincoln, Nebraska, USA	2	1.6	1.6	57.1
Littleton, CO, USA	1	.8	.8	57.9
Minden, Nebraska, United States of America	1	.8	.8	58.7
Nebraska	3	2.4	2.4	61.1
North Platte Nebraska United States	1	.8	.8	61.9
Olathe, KS, USA	1	.8	.8	62.7
Omaha	1	.8	.8	63.5
Omaha Nebraska	1	.8	.8	64.3
Omaha, Ne	1	.8	.8	65.1
Omaha, NE	1	.8	.8	65.9
Omaha, NE United States	1	.8	.8	66.7
omaha, NE US	1	.8	.8	67.5
omaha, NE USA	1	.8	.8	68.3
Omaha, NE USA	1	.8	.8	69.0
Omaha, NE, U.S.A	1	.8	.8	69.8
Omaha, NE, United States	1	.8	.8	70.6
Omaha, NE, US	1	.8	.8	71.4
omaha, ne, USA	1	.8	.8	72.2
omaha, NE, USA	1	.8	.8	73.0
Omaha, Ne, USA	1	.8	.8	73.8
Omaha, NE, USA	3	2.4	2.4	76.2
Omaha, Nebraska	1	.8	.8	77.0
Omaha, Nebraska USA	1	.8	.8	77.8
omaha, nebraska, United States	1	.8	.8	78.6
Omaha, Nebraska, United States	4	3.2	3.2	81.7
Omaha, Nebraska, United States of America	2	1.6	1.6	83.3
Omaha, Nebraska, US	1	.8	.8	84.1

omaha, nebraska, USA	1	.8	.8	84.9
Omaha, Nebraska, USA	6	4.8	4.8	89.7
overland Park, Kansas	1	.8	.8	90.5
Paradise Valley, AZ, USA	1	.8	.8	91.3
Plattsmouth Nebraska United States	1	.8	.8	92.1
Rancho Santa Margarita, California, United States of America	1	.8	.8	92.9
Ravenna, NE, USA	1	.8	.8	93.7
Raymond, NE, US	1	.8	.8	94.4
Salem, South Dakota, U.S.	1	.8	.8	95.2
Sioux City, IA, United States	1	.8	.8	96.0
Taipei, Taiwan	1	.8	.8	96.8
Valpariso, NE	1	.8	.8	97.6
Vietnam	1	.8	.8	98.4
Wakefield, NE United States	1	.8	.8	99.2
West Bloomfield, Michigan, United States	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

## Question 11

What is the highest level of school you have completed?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid High school graduate	17	13.5	14.8	14.8
Technical school graduate	1	.8	.9	15.7
Some college	95	75.4	82.6	98.3
College graduate	2	1.6	1.7	100.0
Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing System	11	8.7		
Total	126	100.0		

### Question 12

Are you currently a student?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	114	90.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 13

If you are a student, please specify your level:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Full-time college undergraduate	114	90.5	99.1	99.1
	Full-time doctoral student	1	.8	.9	100.0
Total		115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 14

In addition to your studies, are you working?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	68	54.0	59.1	59.1
	No	47	37.3	40.9	100.0
Total		115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		



### Question 15

If you are working, please indicate the level:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Part-time	63	50.0	90.0	90.0
	Full-time	7	5.6	10.0	100.0
	Total	70	55.6	100.0	
Missing	System	56	44.4		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 16

Are you the main source for your own financial support, or do your parents/family or someone else provide your main source of support?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I support myself	32	25.4	27.8	27.8
	Family is my main source of financial support	83	65.9	72.2	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 16-Text

Are you the main source for your own financial support, or do your parents/family or someone else provide your main source of support? TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		123	97.6	97.6	97.6
	combination of wife and I	1	.8	.8	98.4
	financial aid	1	.8	.8	99.2
	My boyfriend & I support our family	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total		126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 17

Please indicate the annual income category for your primary means of financial support.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below \$20,000	33	26.2	28.7	28.7
	\$20,000 to \$40,000	13	10.3	11.3	40.0
	\$40,001 to \$60,000	9	7.1	7.8	47.8
	\$60,001 to \$80,000	18	14.3	15.7	63.5
	\$80,001 to \$100,000	17	13.5	14.8	78.3
	Above \$100,000	25	19.8	21.7	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 18

If you are a college student, how are you paying for school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I am paying for it myself by working	6	4.8	5.2	5.2
	I am paying for it through a mix of work, family support and scholarships and/or financial aid	47	37.3	40.9	46.1
	I am paying for it through scholarships and/or financial aid	21	16.7	18.3	64.3
	My family is paying for it	39	31.0	33.9	98.3
	Other	2	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 18-Text

If you are a college student, how are you paying for school?-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	124	98.4	98.4	98.4
National Guard	1	.8	.8	99.2
Post 9/11 GI bill	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 19

If you are working, please indicate the type of work you are doing:

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Clerical	3	2.4	4.3	4.3
Professional	2	1.6	2.9	7.2
Business, self-employed	3	2.4	4.3	11.6
Business/corporation	10	7.9	14.5	26.1
Other white collar	6	4.8	8.7	34.8
Service industry	22	17.5	31.9	66.7
Custodial/factory worker	1	.8	1.4	68.1
Construction	4	3.2	5.8	73.9
Other blue collar	4	3.2	5.8	79.7
Other	14	11.1	20.3	100.0
Total	69	54.8	100.0	
Missing				
System	57	45.2		
Total	126	100.0		

### Question 19-Text

If you are working, please indicate the type of work you are doing:-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	114	90.5	90.5	90.5
desk aid	1	.8	.8	91.3
Lifeguard	1	.8	.8	92.1
mailman	1	.8	.8	92.9
Military	3	2.4	2.4	95.2
nanny	1	.8	.8	96.0
Research	1	.8	.8	96.8
Resident Assistant	1	.8	.8	97.6
retail	1	.8	.8	98.4
Retail and vet clinic	1	.8	.8	99.2
Sales	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 20

What is your religion?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Christianity	102	81.0	88.7	88.7
Islam	2	1.6	1.7	90.4
Judaism	2	1.6	1.7	92.2
Other	9	7.1	7.8	100.0
Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing System	11	8.7		
Total	126	100.0		

### Question 20-Text

What is your religion?-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	117	92.9	92.9	92.9
Agnostic	2	1.6	1.6	94.4
AGNOSTIC	1	.8	.8	95.2
Agnostic	1	.8	.8	96.0
Atheist	1	.8	.8	96.8
athiest	1	.8	.8	97.6
Dont Practice	1	.8	.8	98.4
Lutheran	1	.8	.8	99.2
Roman-Catholic	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 21

How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religion?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Very active	17	13.5	14.8	14.8
Somewhat active	60	47.6	52.2	67.0
Rarely active	32	25.4	27.8	94.8
Never active	6	4.8	5.2	100.0
Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing				
System	11	8.7		
Total	126	100.0		

## Question 22

How much do you think that the American government should be guided by principles such as the Golden Rule in the conduct of foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	31	24.6	27.0	27.0
	When it's practical -- as long as it doesn't go against U.S. interests	80	63.5	69.6	96.5
	Never	4	3.2	3.5	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

*Now, we'd like to ask you some questions about your views on politics.*

## Question 23

Do you consider yourself liberal, conservative or somewhere in between?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Liberal	10	7.9	8.7	8.7
	Moderate leaning liberal	20	15.9	17.4	26.1
	Moderate	36	28.6	31.3	57.4
	Moderate leaning conservative	30	23.8	26.1	83.5
	Conservative	19	15.1	16.5	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 24

Do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or something else?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democrat	35	27.8	31.3	31.3
	Republican	52	41.3	46.4	77.7
	Independent	25	19.8	22.3	100.0
	Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing	Something else	2	1.6		
	System	12	9.5		
	Total	14	11.1		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 25a

Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat or a not so strong

Republican/Democrat?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strong Republican	21	16.7	24.4	24.4
	Strong Democrat	9	7.1	10.5	34.9
	Not-so-strong Republican	31	24.6	36.0	70.9
	Not-so-strong Democrat	25	19.8	29.1	100.0
	Total	86	68.3	100.0	
Missing	System	40	31.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 25b (If responses to 25a = 3 or 4)

Which of the two major parties do you lean toward?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democrat	5	4.0	18.5	18.5
	Republican	15	11.9	55.6	74.1
	Neither	7	5.6	25.9	100.0
	Total	27	21.4	100.0	
Missing	System	99	78.6		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 26**

Would you consider your mother to be liberal, moderate leaning liberal, moderate, moderate leaning conservative, or conservative?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Liberal	8	6.3	7.0	7.0
	Moderate liberal	19	15.1	16.5	23.5
	Moderate	28	22.2	24.3	47.8
	Moderate conservative	30	23.8	26.1	73.9
	Conservative	30	23.8	26.1	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 27**

Would you consider your father to be liberal, moderate leaning liberal, moderate, moderate leaning conservative, or conservative?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Liberal	8	6.3	7.0	7.0
	Moderate liberal	16	12.7	13.9	20.9
	Moderate	25	19.8	21.7	42.6
	Moderate conservative	26	20.6	22.6	65.2
	Conservative	40	31.7	34.8	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		



### Question 28

How often were politics discussed in your home?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	4.0	4.3	4.3
	Rarely	39	31.0	33.9	38.3
	Sometimes	56	44.4	48.7	87.0
	Often	15	11.9	13.0	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 29

How often these days do you discuss your views about the world with your parents?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	9	7.1	7.8	7.8
	Once every couple of months	27	21.4	23.5	31.3
	About once a month	31	24.6	27.0	58.3
	About once every couple of weeks	19	15.1	16.5	74.8
	About once a week	15	11.9	13.0	87.8
	More than once a week	10	7.9	8.7	96.5
	More than once a day	2	1.6	1.7	98.3
	Not applicable	2	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 30

How often these days do you discuss your views about the world with your siblings?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	26	20.6	22.6	22.6
	Once every couple of months	40	31.7	34.8	57.4
	About once a month	13	10.3	11.3	68.7
	About once every couple of weeks	16	12.7	13.9	82.6
	About once a week	7	5.6	6.1	88.7
	More than once a week	5	4.0	4.3	93.0
	More than once a day	2	1.6	1.7	94.8
	Not applicable	6	4.8	5.2	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 31

How often do you discuss your views about the world with your friends?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	8	6.3	7.0	7.0
	Once every couple of months	22	17.5	19.1	26.1
	About once a month	16	12.7	13.9	40.0
	About once every couple of weeks	21	16.7	18.3	58.3
	About once a week	26	20.6	22.6	80.9
	More than once a week	18	14.3	15.7	96.5
	More than once a day	4	3.2	3.5	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 32

If you are married, how often do you discuss your views about the world with your spouse?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	4.0	4.9	4.9
	Once every couple of months	3	2.4	2.9	7.8
	About once a month	2	1.6	2.0	9.8
	About once every couple of weeks	4	3.2	3.9	13.7
	About once a week	3	2.4	2.9	16.7
	More than once a week	2	1.6	2.0	18.6
	Not applicable	83	65.9	81.4	100.0
	Total	102	81.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	19.0		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 33

Of the people listed, who has had the most influence on your views about the world?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	My parents	65	51.6	57.0	57.0
	My siblings	5	4.0	4.4	61.4
	My friends	24	19.0	21.1	82.5
	My spouse	2	1.6	1.8	84.2
	None of them	18	14.3	15.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 34

Of all the people listed, whose viewpoint do you trust the most?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	My parents	81	64.3	70.4	70.4
	My siblings	6	4.8	5.2	75.7
	My friends	17	13.5	14.8	90.4
	My spouse	3	2.4	2.6	93.0
	None of them	8	6.3	7.0	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

*We would now like to ask you some questions about how you see yourself.*

### Question 35

I see myself as: Extroverted, enthusiastic.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	2	1.6	1.8	1.8
	Disagree	1	.8	.9	2.6
	Mildly disagree	12	9.5	10.5	13.2
	Neither agree nor disagree	9	7.1	7.9	21.1
	Mildly agree	30	23.8	26.3	47.4
	Agree	37	29.4	32.5	79.8
	Strongly agree	23	18.3	20.2	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 36

I see myself as: Critical, quarrelsome.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	9	7.1	7.9	7.9
	Disagree	25	19.8	21.9	29.8
	Mildly disagree	21	16.7	18.4	48.2
	Neither agree nor disagree	23	18.3	20.2	68.4
	Mildly agree	24	19.0	21.1	89.5
	Agree	10	7.9	8.8	98.2
	Strongly agree	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 37

I see myself as: Dependable, self-disciplined.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	.8	.9	.9
	Disagree	3	2.4	2.6	3.5
	Mildly disagree	4	3.2	3.5	7.0
	Neither agree nor disagree	12	9.5	10.4	17.4
	Mildly agree	22	17.5	19.1	36.5
	Agree	52	41.3	45.2	81.7
	Strongly agree	21	16.7	18.3	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 38

I see myself as: Anxious, easily upset.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	9	7.1	8.0	8.0
	Disagree	34	27.0	30.1	38.1
	Mildly disagree	21	16.7	18.6	56.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	23	18.3	20.4	77.0
	Mildly agree	17	13.5	15.0	92.0
	Agree	6	4.8	5.3	97.3
	Strongly agree	3	2.4	2.7	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 39

I see myself as: Open to new experiences, complex.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	.8	.9	.9
	Disagree	3	2.4	2.7	3.5
	Mildly disagree	2	1.6	1.8	5.3
	Neither agree nor disagree	16	12.7	14.2	19.5
	Mildly agree	39	31.0	34.5	54.0
	Agree	38	30.2	33.6	87.6
	Strongly agree	14	11.1	12.4	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 40****I see myself as: Reserved, quiet.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	15	11.9	13.0	13.0
	Disagree	29	23.0	25.2	38.3
	Mildly disagree	22	17.5	19.1	57.4
	Neither agree nor disagree	18	14.3	15.7	73.0
	Mildly agree	17	13.5	14.8	87.8
	Agree	13	10.3	11.3	99.1
	Strongly agree	1	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 41****I see myself as: Sympathetic, warm.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	4	3.2	3.5	3.5
	Mildly disagree	7	5.6	6.1	9.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	11	8.7	9.6	19.3
	Mildly agree	36	28.6	31.6	50.9
	Agree	38	30.2	33.3	84.2
	Strongly agree	18	14.3	15.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 42****I see myself as: Disorganized, careless.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	14	11.1	12.3	12.3
	Disagree	39	31.0	34.2	46.5
	Mildly disagree	15	11.9	13.2	59.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	15	11.9	13.2	72.8
	Mildly agree	25	19.8	21.9	94.7
	Agree	4	3.2	3.5	98.2
	Strongly agree	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 43****I see myself as: Calm, emotionally stable.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	2.4	2.6	2.6
	Mildly disagree	7	5.6	6.1	8.8
	Neither agree nor disagree	17	13.5	14.9	23.7
	Mildly agree	30	23.8	26.3	50.0
	Agree	44	34.9	38.6	88.6
	Strongly agree	13	10.3	11.4	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		



**Question 44****I see myself as: Conventional, uncreative.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	9	7.1	7.8	7.8
	Disagree	38	30.2	33.0	40.9
	Mildly disagree	26	20.6	22.6	63.5
	Neither agree nor disagree	21	16.7	18.3	81.7
	Agree	13	10.3	11.3	93.0
	Mildly agree	7	5.6	6.1	99.1
	Strongly agree	1	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	115	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	11	8.7		
Total		126	100.0		

*Now we'd like to ask you some questions about how you get information about what's going on in the world.*

**Question 45****How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	31	24.6	27.2	27.2
	One day	23	18.3	20.2	47.4
	Two days	22	17.5	19.3	66.7
	Three days	12	9.5	10.5	77.2
	Four days	10	7.9	8.8	86.0
	Five days	4	3.2	3.5	89.5
	Six days	5	4.0	4.4	93.9
	Seven days	7	5.6	6.1	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 46**

If you read a newspaper, did you read it online or did you read a physical paper?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Online	31	24.6	27.7	27.7
	Physical paper	53	42.1	47.3	75.0
	Not applicable	28	22.2	25.0	100.0
	Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	11.1		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 47**

How many days in the past week did you watch the national news on network TV?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	43	34.1	37.7	37.7
	One day	31	24.6	27.2	64.9
	Two days	19	15.1	16.7	81.6
	Three days	10	7.9	8.8	90.4
	Four days	2	1.6	1.8	92.1
	Five days	3	2.4	2.6	94.7
	Six days	2	1.6	1.8	96.5
	Seven days	4	3.2	3.5	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 48**

How many days in the past week did you watch the national news on cable television?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	38	30.2	33.6	33.6
	One day	32	25.4	28.3	61.9
	Two days	17	13.5	15.0	77.0
	Three days	8	6.3	7.1	84.1
	Four days	6	4.8	5.3	89.4
	Five days	4	3.2	3.5	92.9
	Six days	4	3.2	3.5	96.5
	Seven days	4	3.2	3.5	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 49**

How many days in the past week did you go to the Internet for national or international news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	32	25.4	28.1	28.1
	One day	23	18.3	20.2	48.2
	Two days	19	15.1	16.7	64.9
	Three days	11	8.7	9.6	74.6
	Four days	5	4.0	4.4	78.9
	Five days	6	4.8	5.3	84.2
	Six days	5	4.0	4.4	88.6
	Seven days	13	10.3	11.4	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 50

#### Statistics

	What Web sites do you use for international news? Newspaper sites	What Web sites do you use for international news? CNN	What Web sites do you use for international news? Fox News	What Web sites do you use for international news? MSNBC	What Web sites do you use for international news? National Public Radio
N Valid	16	59	28	33	15
Missing	110	67	98	93	111

#### Statistics

	What Web sites do you use for international news? BBC	What Web sites do you use for international news? Other	What Web sites do you use for international news? Other TEXT
N Valid	11	13	126
Missing	115	113	0

### Question 50-1

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-

#### Newspaper sites (please indicate the sites)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	16	12.7	100.0	100.0
Missing System	110	87.3		
Total	126	100.0		

**Question 50-2**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-CNN

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	59	46.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	67	53.2		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 50-3**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Fox

News

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	28	22.2	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	98	77.8		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 50-4**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-MSNBC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	33	26.2	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	93	73.8		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 50-5**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-

National Public Radio

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	15	11.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	111	88.1		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 50-6**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-BBC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	11	8.7	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	115	91.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 50-7**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Other

(please indicate)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	10.3	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	113	89.7		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 50-8**

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Other (please indicate)-TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		113	89.7	89.7	89.7
	Democracy Now	1	.8	.8	90.5
	drudgereport.com	1	.8	.8	91.3
	Google	1	.8	.8	92.1
	none	2	1.6	1.6	93.7
	Reddit	1	.8	.8	94.4
	StratFor	1	.8	.8	95.2
	the wallstreet journal	1	.8	.8	96.0
	Twitter	1	.8	.8	96.8
	yahoo	3	2.4	2.4	99.2
	Yahoo	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total		126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 51

How much time per day do you spend reading, listening to, or watching news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15 minutes or less	55	43.7	48.2	48.2
	15-30 minutes	33	26.2	28.9	77.2
	30-45 minutes	13	10.3	11.4	88.6
	45-60 minutes	8	6.3	7.0	95.6
	60 minutes or more	5	4.0	4.4	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 52

Of that time, how much would you estimate you spend on international news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15 minutes or less	88	69.8	77.9	77.9
	15-30 minutes	13	10.3	11.5	89.4
	30-45 minutes	7	5.6	6.2	95.6
	45-60 minutes	5	4.0	4.4	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 53

How well informed do you consider yourself on international news and issues?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I'm regularly well informed on the major international news and global issues.	13	10.3	11.4	11.4
	I'm regularly well informed only on a select topic or issue that interests me	16	12.7	14.0	25.4

	I'm well informed only once in awhile if there's a story or issue that interests me.	33	26.2	28.9	54.4
	I give casual attention to international news but don't consider myself well informed.	42	33.3	36.8	91.2
	I seldom if ever pay attention to international news or issues and don't consider myself well-informed.	10	7.9	8.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

## Question 54

What is the source of international news you use most frequently?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Print newspapers (please indicate)	24	19.0	21.6	21.6
	Internet newspaper sites (please indicate)	14	11.1	12.6	34.2
	Other Internet news sites (please indicate)	11	8.7	9.9	44.1
	Cable television broadcasts such as Fox News, CNN, MSNBC or Comedy Central (please indicate)	22	17.5	19.8	64.0
	Network news broadcasts such as ABC, CBS, or NBC (please indicate)	7	5.6	6.3	70.3
	Public Television	12	9.5	10.8	81.1
	Commercial radio news broadcasts (please indicate)	2	1.6	1.8	82.9
	National Public Radio news broadcasts	5	4.0	4.5	87.4



National Public Radio	1	.8	.9	88.3
Internet news site				
Online magazine news sites (please indicate)	2	1.6	1.8	90.1
Internet blogs (please indicate)	1	.8	.9	91.0
Talking with others	5	4.0	4.5	95.5
Internet social media Web sites (please indicate)	3	2.4	2.7	98.2
Internet government Web sites (please indicate)	1	.8	.9	99.1
Other (please list)	1	.8	.9	100.0
Total	111	88.1	100.0	
Missing System	15	11.9		
Total	126	100.0		

### Question 54-TEXT

What is the source of international news you use most frequently?-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	45	35.7	35.7	35.7
abc	2	1.6	1.6	37.3
ABC	3	2.4	2.4	39.7
BBC	3	2.4	2.4	42.1
CBS	1	.8	.8	42.9
cnn	2	1.6	1.6	44.4
CNN	17	13.5	13.5	57.9
CNN, Fox News	2	1.6	1.6	59.5
CNN, Washington Post, Huffington Post, NY Times	1	.8	.8	60.3
cnn.com	1	.8	.8	61.1
CNN.com	1	.8	.8	61.9
Colbert	1	.8	.8	62.7
Comedy Central	1	.8	.8	63.5
drudgereport.com	1	.8	.8	64.3
Facebook	2	1.6	1.6	65.9

Fox News	4	3.2	3.2	69.0
Fox News, CNN	1	.8	.8	69.8
journal star	2	1.6	1.6	71.4
kearney hub	1	.8	.8	72.2
Lincoln journal star	1	.8	.8	73.0
Lincoln Journal Star	2	1.6	1.6	74.6
MSN	1	.8	.8	75.4
MSNBC	1	.8	.8	76.2
MSNBC, CNN, and Fox News	1	.8	.8	77.0
msnbc.com	1	.8	.8	77.8
New York Times	5	4.0	4.0	81.7
nytimes.com	1	.8	.8	82.5
omaha world hearold	1	.8	.8	83.3
omaha world herald	1	.8	.8	84.1
Omaha world Herald	1	.8	.8	84.9
Omaha World Herald	3	2.4	2.4	87.3
reddit	2	1.6	1.6	88.9
SPORTS	1	.8	.8	89.7
StratFor	1	.8	.8	90.5
the wallstreet journal	1	.8	.8	91.3
Twitter	1	.8	.8	92.1
usa today	1	.8	.8	92.9
USA Today	1	.8	.8	93.7
USAToday	1	.8	.8	94.4
USATODAY	1	.8	.8	95.2
whatever talk radio is on when I tune in	1	.8	.8	96.0
world herald	1	.8	.8	96.8
World Herald	1	.8	.8	97.6
yahoo	3	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

## Question 55

Please list your most important source for international news.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	23	18.3	18.3	18.3
ABC news	1	.8	.8	19.0
abc tv	1	.8	.8	19.8
BBC	2	1.6	1.6	21.4
BBC.com	1	.8	.8	22.2
Cable Television	1	.8	.8	23.0
CBS	1	.8	.8	23.8
cnn	3	2.4	2.4	26.2
CNN	26	20.6	20.6	46.8
CNN, Newspaper	1	.8	.8	47.6
CNN, TV	1	.8	.8	48.4
CNN.com	3	2.4	2.4	50.8
CNN.com, New York Times.	1	.8	.8	51.6
Democracy Now	1	.8	.8	52.4
Don't know	1	.8	.8	53.2
Drudgereport.com	1	.8	.8	54.0
Facebook	1	.8	.8	54.8
fox	1	.8	.8	55.6
Fox News	3	2.4	2.4	57.9
Friends	1	.8	.8	58.7
Google News	1	.8	.8	59.5
internet	2	1.6	1.6	61.1
Internet	4	3.2	3.2	64.3
Lincoln Journal Star	2	1.6	1.6	65.9
local paper	1	.8	.8	66.7
MSNBC	2	1.6	1.6	68.3
Na	1	.8	.8	69.0
Network Broadcasts	1	.8	.8	69.8
Network news broadcasts	1	.8	.8	70.6
New York Times	1	.8	.8	71.4
newspaper	1	.8	.8	72.2
Newspaper	4	3.2	3.2	75.4

none	1	.8	.8	76.2
not applicable	1	.8	.8	77.0
NPR	1	.8	.8	77.8
Ny times	1	.8	.8	78.6
Omaha World Herald	1	.8	.8	79.4
online	1	.8	.8	80.2
radio	2	1.6	1.6	81.7
Reddit	1	.8	.8	82.5
StratFor	1	.8	.8	83.3
talking with others	1	.8	.8	84.1
television	1	.8	.8	84.9
Television	6	4.8	4.8	89.7
television-CNN	1	.8	.8	90.5
The Colbert Report	1	.8	.8	91.3
the new york times	1	.8	.8	92.1
the wallstreet journal	1	.8	.8	92.9
TV	4	3.2	3.2	96.0
TV - CNN, Comedy Central	1	.8	.8	96.8
TV ABC	1	.8	.8	97.6
Twitter or talking with others	1	.8	.8	98.4
world herald	1	.8	.8	99.2
Yahoo	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

## Question 56

What is it about that source that makes it important to you?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	28	22.2	22.2	22.2
All news is biased and made to sell a story, CNN is no different. It's just the channel I chose	1	.8	.8	23.0
conveint	1	.8	.8	23.8
convenient	1	.8	.8	24.6

Convenient	1	.8	.8	25.4
Convenient - can watch and do other things at the same time	1	.8	.8	26.2
convenient	1	.8	.8	27.0
Convenient	1	.8	.8	27.8
Covers both national and international topics broadly and quickly. If I am interested in getting more information, I am likely to go elsewhere.	1	.8	.8	28.6
credible, widely available	1	.8	.8	29.4
Easily accessible	2	1.6	1.6	31.0
Easily accessible, balanced	1	.8	.8	31.7
easily accessible, well known	1	.8	.8	32.5
Easy	1	.8	.8	33.3
easy access	4	3.2	3.2	36.5
Easy access	1	.8	.8	37.3
Easy access since I have a Yahoo account	1	.8	.8	38.1
easy to access	3	2.4	2.4	40.5
Easy to access	1	.8	.8	41.3
Easy to access and read	1	.8	.8	42.1
Easy to follow	1	.8	.8	42.9
easy to get	1	.8	.8	43.7
Easy to obtain	1	.8	.8	44.4
easy to retrieve information	1	.8	.8	45.2
easy to understand. makes it funny.	1	.8	.8	46.0
easy to watch	1	.8	.8	46.8
Fairly trusted	1	.8	.8	47.6
Gives unbiased perspectives	1	.8	.8	48.4
Good at covering major global issues	1	.8	.8	49.2
good information	1	.8	.8	50.0
Highly Critical, In depth	1	.8	.8	50.8

I am a finance major	1	.8	.8	51.6
I feel that there not as slated as other news networks.	1	.8	.8	52.4
I just think it is reliable	1	.8	.8	53.2
I trust it	1	.8	.8	54.0
I watch it the most	1	.8	.8	54.8
In depth and relatively credible	1	.8	.8	55.6
Informed writers	1	.8	.8	56.3
It helps me understand the news in my viewpoint	1	.8	.8	57.1
It is accessible for almost everyone	1	.8	.8	57.9
It is easily accessible and accurate	1	.8	.8	58.7
It is easy to access.	1	.8	.8	59.5
It is incredibly up to date with very diverse and extensive stories all over the net.	1	.8	.8	60.3
It is mainstream	1	.8	.8	61.1
it is not influenced by US ratings and gives an outside perspective as to what the US is doing	1	.8	.8	61.9
It is simple to use and I can read what I want quickly.	1	.8	.8	62.7
It is what I use the most, and is the easiest for me to gather information quickly.	1	.8	.8	63.5
It just covers a wide variety of topics. I have no doubt that it's biased, but I don't care much.	1	.8	.8	64.3
It's funny, but it has some intrinsic value	1	.8	.8	65.1
It's just what I have always watched. It's not important to me for any other reason.	1	.8	.8	65.9

It's not really important to me, its just the one I usually watch.	1	.8	.8	66.7
It's reliable	1	.8	.8	67.5
it's well informed and is generally unbiased	1	.8	.8	68.3
Its accuracy	1	.8	.8	69.0
Its easy to access	1	.8	.8	69.8
its in the car	1	.8	.8	70.6
Its reliable and I dont have to pay for it	1	.8	.8	71.4
Its the easiest to read and get all of my information from	1	.8	.8	72.2
Major news company	1	.8	.8	73.0
MILITARY	1	.8	.8	73.8
Moderate	1	.8	.8	74.6
NA	2	1.6	1.6	76.2
none	2	1.6	1.6	77.8
not applicable	1	.8	.8	78.6
nothing	1	.8	.8	79.4
quickly and regularly updated	1	.8	.8	80.2
Relevance	1	.8	.8	81.0
reliability	1	.8	.8	81.7
Reliability	2	1.6	1.6	83.3
reliable	3	2.4	2.4	85.7
Reliable and balanced	1	.8	.8	86.5
Reliable Information	1	.8	.8	87.3
Same views	1	.8	.8	88.1
Seems reliable	1	.8	.8	88.9
seems well researched	1	.8	.8	89.7
Simple and reliable	1	.8	.8	90.5
Stats	1	.8	.8	91.3
Tells me whats going on	1	.8	.8	92.1

The BBC focuses on issues everyday that have global importance that on a slow news day ABC/CBS/FOX would focus on a surfing cat.	1	.8	.8	92.9
The New York ti	1	.8	.8	93.7
They are unbiased and share opinions on matters	1	.8	.8	94.4
They cover a lot of news, good or bad, that happens worldwide.	1	.8	.8	95.2
They have the most news.	1	.8	.8	96.0
they know more about politics than I do so I can learn from them	1	.8	.8	96.8
trustworthy	1	.8	.8	97.6
Usually know the facts, the breaking news	1	.8	.8	98.4
well-organized and lots of categories	1	.8	.8	99.2
You can watch it and not have to be jumbled up with words in the paper.	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

## Question 57

How much would you say you trust that news source?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly trust it	22	17.5	19.5	19.5
	Trust it	86	68.3	76.1	95.6
	Distrust it	5	4.0	4.4	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		



*We'd like to ask you a few questions about what you think the role of the United States should be in dealing with other nations and people around the world.*

### Question 58

**Do you think it will be best for the future of the United States if we take an active part in world affairs, or if we stay out of world affairs?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Take an active part	81	64.3	71.1	71.1
	Stay out	33	26.2	28.9	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 59

**In general, do you think the U.S. is a positive or negative influence on world affairs?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly positive	20	15.9	17.5	17.5
	Somewhat positive	71	56.3	62.3	79.8
	Somewhat negative	23	18.3	20.2	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 60

What do you think should be the chief consideration for people who determine U.S. foreign policy?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0	3	2.4	2.6	2.6
What they believe to be the nation's best interest for security.	46	36.5	40.4	43.0
What they believe to be the nation's best interest economically.	27	21.4	23.7	66.7
What they believe to be morally correct.	34	27.0	29.8	96.5
The concerns expressed by voters	4	3.2	3.5	100.0
Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing System	12	9.5		
Total	126	100.0		

### Question 60-Text

What do you think should be the chief consideration for people who determine U.S. foreign policy?-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	123	97.6	97.6	97.6
A mixture of the first three choices, no one choice is more important to me than the other.	1	.8	.8	98.4
Other countries lack of political and individual freedoms	1	.8	.8	99.2
What they believe to be the nation's best interest for security along with regards to being somewhat morally correct	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 61

Over the past 20 years the United States has gotten involved in helping various countries such as Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq build new democratic governments after periods of conflict. Nation-building has been defined as using military force, after the end of a conflict, to reconstruct society through rapid and major social, economic and political transformation. Do you think the U.S. should take an active role in nation-building?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	63	50.0	55.3	55.3
	No	51	40.5	44.7	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 62

In helping a country build a new government, should the U.S. insist that the country's new government be democratic?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	61	48.4	53.5	53.5
	No	53	42.1	46.5	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 63

In helping a country rebuild after a war, should the U.S. insist that the country establish a capitalist market economy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	52	41.3	46.0	46.0
	No	61	48.4	54.0	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 64**

Here is a list of possible help the U.S. might give a country that is in the process of building a new government. Check the item you most agree should be done.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No help -- the U.S. should stay out of another country's business.	9	7.1	8.0	8.0
	The U.S. should provide only limited economic aid.	9	7.1	8.0	15.9
	The U.S. should provide economic aid to support the new government until it is stable.	22	17.5	19.5	35.4
	The U.S. should provide economic aid to support the new government until it is stable only if other countries help too, such as through the United Nations or other organizations.	23	18.3	20.4	55.8
	The U.S. should provide advisors to help organize the police and army but should not send U.S. troops	10	7.9	8.8	64.6
	The U.S. should provide U.S. troops to help keep peace until the new government is stable.	15	11.9	13.3	77.9
	The U.S. should provide U.S. troops to help keep peace until the new government is stable only if other countries help too, such as through the United Nations or other organizations.	8	6.3	7.1	85.0
	The U.S. should provide enough economic aid to rebuild key parts of the country's infrastructure.	8	6.3	7.1	92.0
	The U.S. should give enough economic aid to rebuild key parts of the country's infrastructure only if other countries help too, such as through the United Nations or other organizations.	9	7.1	8.0	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 65

Which continent do you think will be most important to the United States to deal with over the next decade?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Africa	23	18.3	20.4	20.4
	Asia	54	42.9	47.8	68.1
	Europe	18	14.3	15.9	84.1
	North America	15	11.9	13.3	97.3
	South America	3	2.4	2.7	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 66

Why? Please explain briefly:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		22	17.5	17.5	17.5
	Advancements	1	.8	.8	18.3
	Africa has largely destitute areas, and Darfur needs attention. Also, rates of crimes against women and HIV infection are enormous and need intervention.	1	.8	.8	19.0
	After we are done dealing with the war in Iraq our attention will turn to the conflicts in Africa.	1	.8	.8	19.8
	All of the current social conflict is happening in countries here.	1	.8	.8	20.6
	Always have been	1	.8	.8	21.4
	amount of people	1	.8	.8	22.2

asia a key component of the future and would be a good resource for us as a nation	1	.8	.8	23.0
Asia has a huge population and they are rising in power and money. It would behoove us to be on their good side.	1	.8	.8	23.8
Asia has most of the countries that have the technology and money to be a threat to the United States.	1	.8	.8	24.6
Asia is booming fast.	1	.8	.8	25.4
Becasue they are an important asset to us through demands	1	.8	.8	26.2
Because	1	.8	.8	27.0
Because I think that we have increasing conflict with china. I believe that they have an infostructure that is currently strong, however they are turning a blind e eye to neccessary resources.	1	.8	.8	27.8
Because of all the fighting, and wars going on	1	.8	.8	28.6
because of their academic success and there way of educating their citizens. And the fact that our academic success and knowledge has been decreasing.	1	.8	.8	29.4
because so many people can and will get hurt if resolutions aren't reached quickly	1	.8	.8	30.2
Because the most damage is in that country for the time being	1	.8	.8	31.0

Because they are don't get along with us very well.	1	.8	.8	31.7
Because we can stay within ourselves	1	.8	.8	32.5
Because we live there	1	.8	.8	33.3
Because we're still at war	1	.8	.8	34.1
china	1	.8	.8	34.9
China and India along with the rest of the Middle East	1	.8	.8	35.7
China is becoming very powerful	1	.8	.8	36.5
China is on the rise	1	.8	.8	37.3
China is the country that has helped us by lending a great deal of money which is why the U.S. has such a great debt.	1	.8	.8	38.1
China plays a major role in the world and will continue to	1	.8	.8	38.9
China will be important to have a relationship with.	1	.8	.8	39.7
China's growing economic and military power	1	.8	.8	40.5
China's is expanding, and we are educationally falling behind many European countries	1	.8	.8	41.3
Competition	1	.8	.8	42.1
competitor and have terrible civil equality issues	1	.8	.8	42.9
distance	1	.8	.8	43.7
Don't know.	1	.8	.8	44.4
Due to the north/south Korean conflict we can't afford for the North to start a war against the south and must focus on solving their issues democratically.	1	.8	.8	45.2

Economic Value	1	.8	.8	46.0
economy	1	.8	.8	46.8
focus on issues close to home	1	.8	.8	47.6
Genocide	1	.8	.8	48.4
growing population	1	.8	.8	49.2
Hot spots, population	1	.8	.8	50.0
Huge competition	1	.8	.8	50.8
I LIKE IT	1	.8	.8	51.6
I think they need the most help.	1	.8	.8	52.4
I think we should help other continents yes, but America is in financial trouble and for now, if possible our focus should remain here.	1	.8	.8	53.2
Increased population	1	.8	.8	54.0
increasing power and influence	1	.8	.8	54.8
It has the most countries that need our help, such as ones in the Middle East.	1	.8	.8	55.6
It is socially and economically behind many other countries.	1	.8	.8	56.3
It's a mess	1	.8	.8	57.1
Its becoming more unsettling and is closer to the home front, causing more potential tension between the two.	1	.8	.8	57.9
its closests to us	1	.8	.8	58.7
Largest most sufficient economy	1	.8	.8	59.5
Largest, fastest growing economy and population	1	.8	.8	60.3
Major source for oil	1	.8	.8	61.1
Mexico needs help	1	.8	.8	61.9
middle east terrorism and oil	1	.8	.8	62.7



Most impoverished	1	.8	.8	63.5
National Debt, Israel	1	.8	.8	64.3
needs it	1	.8	.8	65.1
No idea. Because were not at war with them?	1	.8	.8	65.9
North Korea	1	.8	.8	66.7
not sure	1	.8	.8	67.5
Not Sure	1	.8	.8	68.3
nuclear weapons	1	.8	.8	69.0
Obviously Asis's burgeoning economy and population. In the span of a very short time, China and many other countries in Asia, such as India, have become economic and political world powers.	1	.8	.8	69.8
People starve there every day	1	.8	.8	70.6
population, financial ties	1	.8	.8	71.4
power house	1	.8	.8	72.2
Rapid growth	1	.8	.8	73.0
Rise of China, threat of North Korea	1	.8	.8	73.8
so much going on there - they need our help	1	.8	.8	74.6
Tackling the debt crisis.	1	.8	.8	75.4
Take care of domestic issues first	1	.8	.8	76.2
the conflicts in the Middle East need to be resolved and the economies in Europe need to be helped so that our economy will not plummet again.	1	.8	.8	77.0

The current conflicts in Europe and particularly the middle east pose the greatest threats to the United States' infrastructure itself in regards to national security and its monetary burden on our already cumbersome national deficit.	1	.8	.8	77.8
The Middle East and China	1	.8	.8	78.6
The Middle East oil supply is important to the American economy.	1	.8	.8	79.4
The population growth	1	.8	.8	80.2
the rampant poverty that exists in africa	1	.8	.8	81.0
The U.S. doesn't need to be the police force for the world; we should be our number one priority.	1	.8	.8	81.7
The U.S. interacts with China and other Asian countries quite frequently incomparison with the past.	1	.8	.8	82.5
The war on Iraq.	1	.8	.8	83.3
The wars	1	.8	.8	84.1
There are a lot of problems there.	1	.8	.8	84.9
There are a ton of people their, and a lot of them are communists so they are probly the biggest threat	1	.8	.8	85.7
There are important aspects that we need that are in Africa.	1	.8	.8	86.5
There is a lot of build-up that is going on there, especially in parts of China	1	.8	.8	87.3

they are our biggest threat	1	.8	.8	88.1
They need economic support the most	1	.8	.8	88.9
They own all the money	1	.8	.8	89.7
Though places in Europe such as Ireland are an issue as well as our ongoing issues in the Middle East, we should bolster our own side of the world first.	1	.8	.8	90.5
To much poverty there	1	.8	.8	91.3
Too many civil wars. Lack of resources to provide enough food for it's people. High disease rate/ lack of medicine. Lack of education.	1	.8	.8	92.1
U.S. has huge agricultural markets in Asia. In addition to exporting, we import many products from the continent.	1	.8	.8	92.9
Underdeveloped	1	.8	.8	93.7
Very advanced	1	.8	.8	94.4
very poor	1	.8	.8	95.2
war	1	.8	.8	96.0
we are closely tied to Europe	1	.8	.8	96.8
We are the United States	1	.8	.8	97.6
we need to deal mostly with the united states personal problems	1	.8	.8	98.4
we should worry about ourselves	1	.8	.8	99.2
Weak overall government, starvation, small forms of genocide	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

**Question 67****What factor should mainly determine U.S. policies toward other countries?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	What U.S. policymakers believe is best for Americans.	40	31.7	35.4	35.4
	What Americans believe is the best thing for the U.S.	33	26.2	29.2	64.6
	What Americans think is the right thing to do	30	23.8	26.5	91.2
	What U.S. policymakers think is the right thing to do	7	5.6	6.2	97.3
	Other	3	2.4	2.7	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 67-Text****What factor should mainly determine U.S. policies toward other countries?-TEXT**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		123	97.6	97.6	97.6
	Opinions Should be influenced by International Experts, scholars, United Nations	1	.8	.8	98.4
	treat others like you want to be treated	1	.8	.8	99.2
	What is the best for Americans, not necessarily what U.S. policymakers and Americans 'think' though.	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	126	100.0	100.0	

**Question 68**

Did you vote for a congressional candidate or candidates in the most recent national election?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	38	30.2	33.3	33.3
	No	76	60.3	66.7	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 69a (if Question 68 responses = 1)**

Did you have a preference for a particular party in the last national election?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes -- Democrat	8	6.3	21.1	21.1
	Yes -- Republican	27	21.4	71.1	92.1
	No party preference -- voted for the individual rather than the party	3	2.4	7.9	100.0
	Total	38	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	88	69.8		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 69b (if Question 68 responses = 1)**

In voting for a congressional candidate in the most recent national election, how much consideration did you give to the candidates' positions on foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extensive -- I based my decision on their foreign policy platforms and experience	1	.8	2.6	2.6
	Moderate -- I based my decision largely on foreign policy positions but considered other factors	17	13.5	44.7	47.4

	A little -- I thought about their foreign policy positions but mostly used other factors	19	15.1	50.0	97.4
	Not at all -- I did not consider the candidates' foreign policy positions when I voted	1	.8	2.6	100.0
	Total	38	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	88	69.8		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 70

Do you have a close relative serving in the U.S. military?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes (If so, please specify the relationship, such as brother, cousin, etc.)	39	31.0	34.2	34.2
	No	75	59.5	65.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 70-Text

Do you have a close relative serving in the U.S. military?-TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		87	69.0	69.0	69.0
	Best friend	1	.8	.8	69.8
	Best Friend	1	.8	.8	70.6
	Boyfriend	2	1.6	1.6	72.2
	Boyfriend, and friends, and uncles	1	.8	.8	73.0
	brother	2	1.6	1.6	74.6
	Brother	1	.8	.8	75.4
	cousin	12	9.5	9.5	84.9
	Cousin	5	4.0	4.0	88.9
	Cousin and Uncle	1	.8	.8	89.7
	Cousin-in-law	1	.8	.8	90.5
	cousins	1	.8	.8	91.3
	Cousins	1	.8	.8	92.1
	Father	1	.8	.8	92.9
	Serving	1	.8	.8	93.7
	sister and brother-in-law	1	.8	.8	94.4
	step brother	1	.8	.8	95.2
	Uncle	4	3.2	3.2	98.4
	Uncle and cousins	1	.8	.8	99.2
	UNCLES	1	.8	.8	100.0

**Do you have a close relative serving in the U.S. military?-TEXT**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	87	69.0	69.0	69.0
Best friend	1	.8	.8	69.8
Best Friend	1	.8	.8	70.6
Boyfriend	2	1.6	1.6	72.2
Boyfriend, and friends, and uncles	1	.8	.8	73.0
brother	2	1.6	1.6	74.6
Brother	1	.8	.8	75.4
cousin	12	9.5	9.5	84.9
Cousin	5	4.0	4.0	88.9
Cousin and Uncle	1	.8	.8	89.7
Cousin-in-law	1	.8	.8	90.5
cousins	1	.8	.8	91.3
Cousins	1	.8	.8	92.1
Father	1	.8	.8	92.9
Serving	1	.8	.8	93.7
sister and brother-in-law	1	.8	.8	94.4
step brother	1	.8	.8	95.2
Uncle	4	3.2	3.2	98.4
Uncle and cousins	1	.8	.8	99.2
UNCLES	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

**Question 71a (if Question 70 responses = 1)**

Do you think that relative's service has influenced how you think about U.S. foreign policy?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Yes	13	10.3	34.2	34.2
No	25	19.8	65.8	100.0
Total	38	30.2	100.0	
Missing				
System	88	69.8		
Total	126	100.0		

**Question 71b (If Question 70 responses = 1)**

How has your relative's service influenced your thinking about U.S. foreign policy?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	96	76.2	76.2	76.2
5	1	.8	.8	77.0
Angry	1	.8	.8	77.8
Has not	1	.8	.8	78.6
Hasn't	1	.8	.8	79.4
Hates terrorists	2	1.6	1.6	81.0

He is serving his country to help protect it and I will continue to support the armed forces	1	.8	.8	81.7
I am more skeptical about it.	1	.8	.8	82.5
I don't think there should be that many troops in Afghanistan	1	.8	.8	83.3
I fully support it	1	.8	.8	84.1
I have more pride and trust in the service and in the duties they perform overseas.	1	.8	.8	84.9
I have the same opinoins now that I did then.	1	.8	.8	85.7
i like to agree with them most of the time, especially when they explain their reasoning.	1	.8	.8	86.5
I think it is dangerous and a wasted effort, despite it being a "security" measure.	1	.8	.8	87.3
I think too many troops have been deployed in Iraq and it has caused pointless deaths to american citizens	1	.8	.8	88.1
increasingly anti-war	1	.8	.8	88.9
It has not made me change the way I think.	1	.8	.8	89.7
It hasn't	1	.8	.8	90.5
It hasnt had any influence	1	.8	.8	91.3
It's informed me more about it	1	.8	.8	92.1
made it better	1	.8	.8	92.9
N/A	4	3.2	3.2	96.0
no	1	.8	.8	96.8
not applicable	1	.8	.8	97.6
Not happy with the decisions our government is making, I think we should get out of the Middle East.	1	.8	.8	98.4
Not Sure	1	.8	.8	99.2
They tell me what's right and wrong.	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	



## Question 72

What do you see as the biggest foreign policy challenge for the United States over the next five years?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Keeping the nation secure from attack by terrorists.	14	11.1	12.3	12.3
	Ensuring reliable and affordable sources of energy.	28	22.2	24.6	36.8
	Building democracy.	3	2.4	2.6	39.5
	Ensuring global financial stability.	26	20.6	22.8	62.3
	Making sure U.S. companies compete strongly in foreign markets.	17	13.5	14.9	77.2
	Making sure other countries compete fairly in U.S. markets.	2	1.6	1.8	78.9
	Maintaining a safe and healthy environment.	3	2.4	2.6	81.6
	Promoting peace.	15	11.9	13.2	94.7
	Keeping the nation secure from nations that are hostile to us	4	3.2	3.5	98.2
	Other:	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 72-Text

What do you see as the biggest foreign policy challenge for the United States over the next five years? -TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	125	99.2	99.2	99.2
promting peave and educational achievements through out other countries	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 73

Who is the Cabinet official designated to implement U.S. foreign policy?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Secretary of the Interior	3	2.4	2.7	2.7
Secretary of State	76	60.3	67.9	70.5
U.S. Trade Representative	10	7.9	8.9	79.5
Secretary of Defense	23	18.3	20.5	100.0
Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing System	14	11.1		
Total	126	100.0		

### Question 74

Which entity is responsible for approving treaties with foreign governments?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid The President	47	37.3	41.6	41.6
The Secretary of State	12	9.5	10.6	52.2
The House of Representatives	15	11.9	13.3	65.5
The Senate	39	31.0	34.5	100.0
Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing System	13	10.3		
Total	126	100.0		

**Question 75****How long do members of the House of Representatives serve in office?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 years	24	19.0	21.4	21.4
	3 years	8	6.3	7.1	28.6
	2 years	78	61.9	69.6	98.2
	1 year	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	11.1		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 76****How long do members of the Senate serve in office?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	8 years	17	13.5	15.0	15.0
	2 years	9	7.1	8.0	23.0
	6 years	63	50.0	55.8	78.8
	4 years	24	19.0	21.2	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 77****Who is the Secretary of State?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Michele Bachmann	8	6.3	7.1	7.1
	Eric Cantor	14	11.1	12.4	19.5
	Hillary Clinton	85	67.5	75.2	94.7
	Kent Conrad	6	4.8	5.3	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 78

Who is the President of the United States?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Barack Obama	110	87.3	97.3	97.3
	Jon Kyl	2	1.6	1.8	99.1
	Rahm Emanuel	1	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 79

Who is the current Speaker of the House of Representatives?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Jeannette Rankin	14	11.1	12.5	12.5
	Thomas Petri	12	9.5	10.7	23.2
	John Boehner	84	66.7	75.0	98.2
	Lynn Woolsey	2	1.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	11.1		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 80

On a map of the world, where would you find Bosnia and Herzegovina?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asia	7	5.6	6.3	6.3
	Europe	80	63.5	71.4	77.7
	South America	9	7.1	8.0	85.7
	North America	1	.8	.9	86.6
	Middle East	15	11.9	13.4	100.0
	Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	11.1		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 81****On a map of the world, where would you find Iraq?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	South America	2	1.6	1.8	1.8
	North America	1	.8	.9	2.7
	Europe	4	3.2	3.5	6.2
	Middle East	103	81.7	91.2	97.3
	Asia	3	2.4	2.7	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 82****On a map of the world, where would you find Kosovo?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Middle East	22	17.5	19.5	19.5
	North America	4	3.2	3.5	23.0
	Europe	60	47.6	53.1	76.1
	Asia	18	14.3	15.9	92.0
	South America	9	7.1	8.0	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 83****On a map of the world, where would you find Afghanistan?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asia	14	11.1	12.4	12.4
	Europe	2	1.6	1.8	14.2
	Middle East	97	77.0	85.8	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 84

How active should the United States be within the United Nations?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always active -- we should always be the world's leader in solving problems.	27	21.4	23.7	23.7
	Active only in global problems -- we should be active in solving problems that concern us and everyone else, but should stay out of other nations' problems if they don't concern us.	57	45.2	50.0	73.7
	Active only in dealing with our own problems -- we should be active when it helps us.	24	19.0	21.1	94.7
	Inactive -- unless there is a good reason to cooperate in fixing a problem that affects us.	3	2.4	2.6	97.4
	Always inactive -- we should stay out of the UN and take care of any problems ourselves.	3	2.4	2.6	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

## Question 85

When do you think the U.S. should intervene in the affairs of other countries?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	3	2.4	2.6	2.6
	When other countries ask for our help	21	16.7	18.4	21.1
	When our leaders believe it is in our best interests to do so	41	32.5	36.0	57.0
	When we see a moral obligation to intervene even if the long-term goals and costs for the U.S. are unclear	18	14.3	15.8	72.8
	When we see a moral obligation to intervene but first have our leaders determine the long-term goals and costs for the U.S.	23	18.3	20.2	93.0
	When we see a need but first are able to get other countries to join us so we are not intervening by ourselves	8	6.3	7.0	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 85-Text

When do you think the U.S. should intervene in the affairs of other countries?-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	123	97.6	97.6	97.6
Only when the countries ask for help but it depends on who the one who is asking for help.	1	.8	.8	98.4
When any US interests are at stake	1	.8	.8	99.2
When asked and/or in our best interests	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	126	100.0	100.0	

### Question 86

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that the president is handling foreign affairs?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly approve	9	7.1	8.0	8.0
Somewhat approve	65	51.6	58.0	66.1
Somewhat disapprove	33	26.2	29.5	95.5
Strongly disapprove	5	4.0	4.5	100.0
Total	112	88.9	100.0	
Missing				
System	14	11.1		
Total	126	100.0		



**Question 87****Do you approve or disapprove of the job performance of the president?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly approve	9	7.1	7.9	7.9
	Somewhat approve	53	42.1	46.5	54.4
	Somewhat disapprove	41	32.5	36.0	90.4
	Strongly disapprove	11	8.7	9.6	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 88****Do you approve or disapprove of the job performance of the secretary of state?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly approve	9	7.1	7.9	7.9
	Somewhat approve	75	59.5	65.8	73.7
	Somewhat disapprove	26	20.6	22.8	96.5
	Strongly disapprove	4	3.2	3.5	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

### Question 89

Which answer best describes how informed and knowledgeable you consider yourself about U.S. and world events?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I feel well-informed and very knowledgeable about what's happening in the U.S. and around the world.	9	7.1	7.9	7.9
	I feel like I know the basic important things that are happening in the U.S. and around the world.	37	29.4	32.5	40.4
	I feel well-informed about what's happening in the U.S. but I don't know what's going on around the rest of the world.	19	15.1	16.7	57.0
	I feel like I know the basic important things happening in the U.S. but not what's going on around the rest of the world.	29	23.0	25.4	82.5
	I feel well-informed about what's happening around the world but I don't know what's going on in the U.S.	4	3.2	3.5	86.0
	I feel like I know the basic important things happening around the world but not what's going on in the U.S.	9	7.1	7.9	93.9
	I feel like I don't really know what's going on in the U.S. or what's happening around the world	7	5.6	6.1	100.0
	Total	114	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	9.5		
Total		126	100.0		

**Question 90**

How would you rate the current level of U.S. involvement in the world?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	About right	47	37.3	41.6	41.6
	We need to be more active internationally	21	16.7	18.6	60.2
	We need to be less active internationally	45	35.7	39.8	100.0
	Total	113	89.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	10.3		
Total		126	100.0		

## Appendix Two – Nation-Building Attitudes Survey 2012

April 2012

*First, we'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself.*

### Question 1

What is your PSEPP number?

Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 2

What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_ years old.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	.6	.6	.6
18	18	10.7	10.7	11.2
19	68	40.2	40.2	51.5
19 years old	1	.6	.6	52.1
20	43	25.4	25.4	77.5
20 years old	1	.6	.6	78.1
21	22	13.0	13.0	91.1
22	7	4.1	4.1	95.3
23	5	3.0	3.0	98.2
25	2	1.2	1.2	99.4
29	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

**Question 3-m****Are you male or female?-male**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	103	60.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	66	39.1		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 3-f****Are you male or female?-Female**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	65	38.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	104	61.5		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 4-b**

Do you have any brothers or sisters? Please list how many of each. Write 0 if

**none.-Brothers**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		10	5.9	5.9	5.9
	0	55	32.5	32.5	38.5
	1	65	38.5	38.5	76.9
	2	32	18.9	18.9	95.9
	3	4	2.4	2.4	98.2
	4	3	1.8	1.8	100.0
Total		169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 4-s

Do you have any brothers or sisters? Please list how many of each. Write 0 if

none.-Sisters

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
0	12	7.1	7.1	7.1
1	42	24.9	24.9	32.0
11	72	42.6	42.6	74.6
2	1	.6	.6	75.1
3	32	18.9	18.9	94.1
4	8	4.7	4.7	98.8
5	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 5

Are your parents living?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, both are living	161	95.3	96.4	96.4
	Father has died	5	3.0	3.0	99.4
	Mother has died	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	167	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 6****What is your marital status?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	161	95.3	96.4	96.4
	Married	2	1.2	1.2	97.6
	Divorced	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
	Other	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	167	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 7****Do you have children?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	1	.6	.6	.6
	No	166	98.2	99.4	100.0
	Total	167	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 8-American Indian/Native American****Question 8****What race or races do you consider yourself?-American Indian/Native American**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.2	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	167	98.8		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 8-Asian/Pacific Islander

What race or races do you consider yourself?-Asian/Pacific Islander

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	9	5.3	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	160	94.7		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 8-African American/Black

What race or races do you consider yourself?-African American/Black

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	1.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	166	98.2		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 8-Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Chicano/Chicana

What race or races do you consider yourself?-Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Chicano/Chicana

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.2	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	167	98.8		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 8-White/Caucasian

What race or races do you consider yourself?-White/Caucasian

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	154	91.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	15	8.9		
Total		169	100.0		



### Question 8-Other

What race or races do you consider yourself?-Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	168	99.4		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 8-Other/Text

What race or races do you consider yourself?-Other-TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		169	100.0	100.0	100.0

### Question 9

Were you born in the United States?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	158	93.5	94.6	94.6
	No	9	5.3	5.4	100.0
	Total	167	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 10

Where do you consider to be your home? (city, state, nation)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Atlanta Georgia USA	1	.6	.6	1.8
	Bellevue, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	2.4
	Bellevue, Nebraska, USA	1	.6	.6	3.0
	Blair, NE, U.S.A.	1	.6	.6	3.6
	Bloomfield, NE, United States of America	1	.6	.6	4.1

Boise, Idaho, USA	1	.6	.6	4.7
Bonner Springs, KS, USA	1	.6	.6	5.3
Chadron, NE, US	1	.6	.6	5.9
China	2	1.2	1.2	7.1
city	1	.6	.6	7.7
Cozad, NE, USA	1	.6	.6	8.3
Crab Orchard, NE United States	1	.6	.6	8.9
Crete, Nebraska, US	1	.6	.6	9.5
Culbertson, NE, US	1	.6	.6	10.1
Dodge, Nebraska, US	1	.6	.6	10.7
Eagan, MN, USA	2	1.2	1.2	11.8
Eagle River, Alaska, USA	1	.6	.6	12.4
Elk Point, SD	1	.6	.6	13.0
elkhorn ne	1	.6	.6	13.6
Elkhorn, Nebraska, united states	1	.6	.6	14.2
Elkhorn, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	14.8
Elkhorn,NE,USA	1	.6	.6	15.4
Elm Creek, NE U.S	1	.6	.6	16.0
Elwood, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	16.6
Eustis, Nebraska, United States	2	1.2	1.2	17.8
Falls City,NE,US	1	.6	.6	18.3
Farnam, NE	1	.6	.6	18.9
Fremont, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	19.5
Fremont, Nebraska, United States of America	1	.6	.6	20.1
Gothenburg, NE, USA	1	.6	.6	20.7
Grand Island Nebraska	1	.6	.6	21.3
Grand Island, Nebraska, United States of America	1	.6	.6	21.9
Gretna Nebraska United States	1	.6	.6	22.5
Gretna, Nebraska, USA	1	.6	.6	23.1
Hastings, Nebraska	1	.6	.6	23.7
hastings, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	24.3

Hastings, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	24.9
Herman, Nebraska United States	1	.6	.6	25.4
Holdrege, Ne, US	1	.6	.6	26.0
Humphrey, NE USA	1	.6	.6	26.6
Italy	1	.6	.6	27.2
Kearney	1	.6	.6	27.8
Kearney, Nebraska, USA	3	1.8	1.8	29.6
Laurel, Nebraska, United States of America	1	.6	.6	30.2
Leigh, NE, US	1	.6	.6	30.8
Lewisville, Texas, US	1	.6	.6	31.4
Lexington, Ne US	1	.6	.6	32.0
Lincoln	1	.6	.6	32.5
Lincoln NE	1	.6	.6	33.1
Lincoln Nebraska USA	1	.6	.6	33.7
Lincoln, NE	5	3.0	3.0	36.7
Lincoln, NE United States	1	.6	.6	37.3
Lincoln, NE USA	3	1.8	1.8	39.1
lincoln, ne, united states	1	.6	.6	39.6
Lincoln, NE, United States	2	1.2	1.2	40.8
Lincoln, NE, USA	2	1.2	1.2	42.0
Lincoln, Nebraska	2	1.2	1.2	43.2
Lincoln, Nebraska, U.S.A.	1	.6	.6	43.8
Lincoln, Nebraska, United States	6	3.6	3.6	47.3
Lincoln, Nebraska, United States of America	1	.6	.6	47.9
Lincoln, Nebraska, US	1	.6	.6	48.5
lincoln, nebraska, usa	1	.6	.6	49.1
Lincoln, Nebraska, USA	3	1.8	1.8	50.9
lincoln, nebrasksa, united states	1	.6	.6	51.5
lincoln,nebraska, united states	1	.6	.6	52.1
Loomis, Nebraska, USA	1	.6	.6	52.7
Loup City, Nebraska, US	1	.6	.6	53.3
McCook, Nebraska, United States of America	1	.6	.6	53.8

Minot, ND USA	1	.6	.6	54.4
Mission Viejo, CA, United States of America	1	.6	.6	55.0
Murrieta, California, USA	1	.6	.6	55.6
Nebraska	3	1.8	1.8	57.4
Nebraska City, NE	1	.6	.6	58.0
norfolk nebraska united states	1	.6	.6	58.6
Norfolk, Nebraska	1	.6	.6	59.2
Norfolk, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	59.8
O'Neill, NE, USA	1	.6	.6	60.4
O'Neill, Nebraska	1	.6	.6	60.9
O'Neill, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	61.5
omaha ne usa	1	.6	.6	62.1
Omaha Nebraska	1	.6	.6	62.7
Omaha Nebraska United States of America	1	.6	.6	63.3
Omaha, Ne	1	.6	.6	63.9
Omaha, NE	5	3.0	3.0	66.9
Omaha, NE USA	1	.6	.6	67.5
omaha, ne, united states	1	.6	.6	68.0
Omaha, NE, United States	2	1.2	1.2	69.2
Omaha, NE, United States of America	1	.6	.6	69.8
omaha, ne, us	1	.6	.6	70.4
omaha, ne, usa	1	.6	.6	71.0
Omaha, Ne, USA	1	.6	.6	71.6
Omaha, NE, USA	5	3.0	3.0	74.6
Omaha, Nebraska	2	1.2	1.2	75.7
Omaha, Nebraska, The United States	1	.6	.6	76.3
Omaha, Nebraska, U.S.	1	.6	.6	76.9
Omaha, Nebraska, U.S.A.	1	.6	.6	77.5
omaha, nebraska, united states	1	.6	.6	78.1
Omaha, Nebraska, united states	1	.6	.6	78.7
Omaha, Nebraska, United States	2	1.2	1.2	79.9

Omaha, Nebraska, United States of America	2	1.2	1.2	81.1
omaha, nebraska, usa	1	.6	.6	81.7
Omaha, Nebraska, USA	6	3.6	3.6	85.2
omaha,ne	1	.6	.6	85.8
Omaha,Nebraska,USA	1	.6	.6	86.4
Omana, Ne. USA	1	.6	.6	87.0
Oxford Nebraska	1	.6	.6	87.6
Palatine, IL USA	1	.6	.6	88.2
Pickrell,Nebraska,USA	1	.6	.6	88.8
Plano, Texas	1	.6	.6	89.3
Ravenna, NE, U.S.	1	.6	.6	89.9
Richmond, Texas	1	.6	.6	90.5
Salix, IA, United States	1	.6	.6	91.1
Scribner, Nebraska United States	1	.6	.6	91.7
South Sioux City	1	.6	.6	92.3
South Sioux City, NE , USA	1	.6	.6	92.9
South Sioux City, NE, U.S.A	1	.6	.6	93.5
st.louis missouri	1	.6	.6	94.1
Stanton, NE, USA	1	.6	.6	94.7
Taipei, Taiwan	1	.6	.6	95.3
Unadilla, NE, United States	1	.6	.6	95.9
wayne, ne, merica	1	.6	.6	96.4
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China	1	.6	.6	97.0
York, NE, United States	1	.6	.6	97.6
yorktown, VA USA	1	.6	.6	98.2
yorktown, virginia, united states	1	.6	.6	98.8
Yutan, Nebraska, United States	1	.6	.6	99.4
zhenjiang jiangsu china	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

## Question 11

What is the highest level of school you have completed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High school graduate	28	16.6	16.7	16.7
	Technical school graduate	1	.6	.6	17.3
	Some college	133	78.7	79.2	96.4
	College graduate	5	3.0	3.0	99.4
	Some graduate school	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	168	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 11 - Text

What is the highest level of school you have completed?-TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		169	100.0	100.0	100.0

## Question 12

If you are a student, please specify your level:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Part-time college undergraduate	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Full-time college undergraduate	166	98.2	98.8	100.0
	Total	168	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 13

In addition to your studies, are you working?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	98	58.0	58.3	58.3
	No	70	41.4	41.7	100.0
	Total	168	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 14

If you are working, please indicate the level:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Part-time	96	56.8	93.2	93.2
	Full-time	7	4.1	6.8	100.0
	Total	103	60.9	100.0	
Missing	System	66	39.1		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 15

Are you the main source for your own financial support, or do your parents/family or someone else provide your main source of support?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I support myself	33	19.5	19.8	19.8
	Family is my main source of financial support	130	76.9	77.8	97.6
	Other	4	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	167	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 15-Text

Are you the main source for your own financial support, or do your parents/family or someone else provide your main source of support? -- TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	165	97.6	97.6	97.6
Both	1	.6	.6	98.2
combination of both	1	.6	.6	98.8
Scholarship	1	.6	.6	99.4
Student loans	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 16

Please indicate the annual income category for your primary means of financial support.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below \$20,000	61	36.1	36.3	36.3
	\$20,000 to \$40,000	20	11.8	11.9	48.2
	\$40,001 to \$60,000	7	4.1	4.2	52.4
	\$60,001 to \$80,000	14	8.3	8.3	60.7
	\$80,001 to \$100,000	29	17.2	17.3	78.0
	Above \$100,000	37	21.9	22.0	100.0
	Total	168	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		169	100.0		



## Question 17

If you are a college student, how are you paying for school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I am paying for it myself by working	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
	I am paying for it through a mix of work, family support and scholarships and/or financial aid	82	48.5	49.1	50.9
	I am paying for it through scholarships and/or financial aid	28	16.6	16.8	67.7
	My family is paying for it	51	30.2	30.5	98.2
	Other	3	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	167	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 17-Text

If you are a college student, how are you paying for school?-TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		167	98.8	98.8	98.8
	Both Scholarships and Family Savings	1	.6	.6	99.4
	Working, scholarships and financial aid	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	169	100.0	100.0	

## Question 18

If you are working, please indicate the type of work you are doing:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clerical	10	5.9	8.8	8.8
	Professional	10	5.9	8.8	17.5
	Business, self-employed	6	3.6	5.3	22.8
	Business/corporation	20	11.8	17.5	40.4
	Other white collar	7	4.1	6.1	46.5
	Service industry	15	8.9	13.2	59.6
	Custodial/factory worker	4	2.4	3.5	63.2
	Construction	4	2.4	3.5	66.7
	Other blue collar	14	8.3	12.3	78.9
	Other	24	14.2	21.1	100.0
	Total	114	67.5	100.0	
Missing	System	55	32.5		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 18-Text

If you are working, please indicate the type of work you are doing:-TEXT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		149	88.2	88.2	88.2
	caregiver	1	.6	.6	88.8
	Childcare	1	.6	.6	89.3
	coach	1	.6	.6	89.9
	Courier	1	.6	.6	90.5
	data assistant	1	.6	.6	91.1
	Day Care	1	.6	.6	91.7
	Daycare	1	.6	.6	92.3
	farm/ ranch	1	.6	.6	92.9
	landscaping	1	.6	.6	93.5
	Landscaping	1	.6	.6	94.1
	Nanny	3	1.8	1.8	95.9
	Not working	1	.6	.6	96.4

Nurse Aide	1	.6	.6	97.0
Office Administration	1	.6	.6	97.6
referee	1	.6	.6	98.2
Research assistant	1	.6	.6	98.8
Retail	1	.6	.6	99.4
UNL Research	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

## Question 19

### What is your religion?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Buddhism	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
	Christianity	138	81.7	82.1	83.9
	Hinduism	1	.6	.6	84.5
	Other	26	15.4	15.5	100.0
	Total	168	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 20

### If Christian, are you

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Baptist	6	3.6	4.0	4.0
	Episcopalian	1	.6	.7	4.7
	Church of Christ	7	4.1	4.7	9.4
	Congregationalist	2	1.2	1.3	10.7
	Lutheran	31	18.3	20.8	31.5
	Methodist	21	12.4	14.1	45.6
	Presbyterian	5	3.0	3.4	49.0
	Roman Catholic	62	36.7	41.6	90.6
	Other	14	8.3	9.4	100.0
	Total	149	88.2	100.0	
Missing	System	20	11.8		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 20-Text

If Christian, are you-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	163	96.4	96.4	96.4
Atheist	1	.6	.6	97.0
Catholic	1	.6	.6	97.6
Christian	1	.6	.6	98.2
Evangelical Covenant	1	.6	.6	98.8
nondenominational	1	.6	.6	99.4
Nondenominational	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

## Question 21

Do you consider yourself an evangelical Christian?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	53	31.4	31.9	31.9
No	113	66.9	68.1	100.0
Total	166	98.2	100.0	
Missing System	3	1.8		
Total	169	100.0		

## Question 22

How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religion?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Very active	23	13.6	13.9	13.9
Somewhat active	76	45.0	46.1	60.0
Rarely active	41	24.3	24.8	84.8
Never active	25	14.8	15.2	100.0
Total	165	97.6	100.0	
Missing System	4	2.4		
Total	169	100.0		

### Question 23

How much do you think that the American government should be guided by principles such as the Golden Rule – treating others as you wish them to treat you – in the conduct of foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	62	36.7	36.9	36.9
	When it's practical -- as long as it doesn't go against U.S. interests	102	60.4	60.7	97.6
	Never	4	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	168	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		169	100.0		

*Now, we'd like to ask you some questions about your views on politics.*

### Question 24

On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is extremely liberal, 7 is extremely conservative and 4 is in the middle, where do you see yourself regarding your political views?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely liberal	4	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Liberal	18	10.7	10.9	13.3
	Slightly liberal	20	11.8	12.1	25.5
	Moderate -- in the middle	45	26.6	27.3	52.7
	Slightly conservative	25	14.8	15.2	67.9
	Conservative	43	25.4	26.1	93.9
	Extremely conservative	10	5.9	6.1	100.0
	Total	165	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.4		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 25

Do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or something else?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democrat	30	17.8	18.2	18.2
	Republican	85	50.3	51.5	69.7
	Independent	44	26.0	26.7	96.4
	Something else	6	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	165	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.4		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 26a (if #25 = Democrat or Republican)

Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat or a not so strong Republican/Democrat?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strong Republican	37	21.9	33.0	33.0
	Strong Democrat	13	7.7	11.6	44.6
	Not-so-strong Republican	44	26.0	39.3	83.9
	Not-so-strong Democrat	18	10.7	16.1	100.0
	Total	112	66.3	100.0	
Missing	System	57	33.7		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 26b (if #25 = Independent)

Which of the two major parties do you lean toward?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democrat	16	9.5	32.7	32.7
	Republican	13	7.7	26.5	59.2
	Neither	20	11.8	40.8	100.0
	Total	49	29.0	100.0	
Missing	System	120	71.0		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 27

Where would you consider your mother's views on politics to be on a scale where 1 is extremely liberal, 7 is extremely conservative, and 4 is in the middle?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely liberal	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Liberal	21	12.4	13.0	14.3
	Slightly liberal	13	7.7	8.1	22.4
	Moderate -- in the middle	51	30.2	31.7	54.0
	Slightly conservative	15	8.9	9.3	63.4
	Conservative	49	29.0	30.4	93.8
	Extremely conservative	10	5.9	6.2	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 28

Where would you consider your father's views on politics to be on a scale where 1 is extremely liberal, 7 is extremely conservative, and 4 is in the middle?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely liberal	3	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Liberal	15	8.9	9.3	11.1
	Slightly liberal	11	6.5	6.8	17.9
	Moderate -- in the middle	40	23.7	24.7	42.6
	Slightly conservative	18	10.7	11.1	53.7
	Conservative	58	34.3	35.8	89.5
	Extremely conservative	17	10.1	10.5	100.0
	Total	162	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 29****How often were politics discussed in your home?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	9	5.3	5.6	5.6
	Rarely	63	37.3	38.9	44.4
	Sometimes	62	36.7	38.3	82.7
	Often	28	16.6	17.3	100.0
	Total	162	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 30****How often these days do you discuss your views about the world with your parents?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	11	6.5	6.8	6.8
	Once every couple of months	44	26.0	27.2	34.0
	About once a month	25	14.8	15.4	49.4
	About once every couple of weeks	42	24.9	25.9	75.3
	About once a week	24	14.2	14.8	90.1
	More than once a week	14	8.3	8.6	98.8
	More than once a day	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	162	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	4.1		
Total		169	100.0		



### Question 31

How often these days do you discuss your views about the world with your siblings?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	34	20.1	21.1	21.1
	Once every couple of months	45	26.6	28.0	49.1
	About once a month	25	14.8	15.5	64.6
	About once every couple of weeks	27	16.0	16.8	81.4
	About once a week	15	8.9	9.3	90.7
	More than once a week	7	4.1	4.3	95.0
	More than once a day	1	.6	.6	95.7
	Not applicable	7	4.1	4.3	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 32

How often do you discuss your views about the world with your friends?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	16	9.5	9.9	9.9
	Once every couple of months	24	14.2	14.9	24.8
	About once a month	21	12.4	13.0	37.9
	About once every couple of weeks	31	18.3	19.3	57.1
	About once a week	34	20.1	21.1	78.3
	More than once a week	30	17.8	18.6	96.9
	More than once a day	5	3.0	3.1	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 33

If you are married, how often do you discuss your views about the world with your spouse?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	72	42.6	64.9	64.9
	Once every couple of months	5	3.0	4.5	69.4
	About once a month	8	4.7	7.2	76.6
	About once every couple of weeks	8	4.7	7.2	83.8
	About once a week	9	5.3	8.1	91.9
	More than once a week	6	3.6	5.4	97.3
	More than once a day	3	1.8	2.7	100.0
	Total	111	65.7	100.0	
Missing	System	58	34.3		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 34

Of the people listed, who has had the most influence on your views about the world?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	My parents	98	58.0	60.9	60.9
	My siblings	10	5.9	6.2	67.1
	My friends	34	20.1	21.1	88.2
	My spouse	1	.6	.6	88.8
	None of them	18	10.7	11.2	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 35

Of all the people listed, whose viewpoint do you trust the most?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	My parents	123	72.8	76.4	76.4
	My siblings	12	7.1	7.5	83.9
	My friends	14	8.3	8.7	92.5
	My spouse	3	1.8	1.9	94.4
	None of them	9	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

*We would now like to ask you some questions about how you see yourself.*

### Question 36

I see myself as: Extroverted, enthusiastic.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	5	3.0	3.1	3.1
	Disagree	6	3.6	3.7	6.8
	Mildly disagree	15	8.9	9.3	16.1
	Neither agree nor disagree	27	16.0	16.8	32.9
	Mildly agree	42	24.9	26.1	59.0
	Agree	50	29.6	31.1	90.1
	Strongly agree	16	9.5	9.9	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 37****I see myself as: Critical, quarrelsome.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	18	10.7	11.2	11.2
	Disagree	37	21.9	23.0	34.2
	Mildly disagree	23	13.6	14.3	48.4
	Neither agree nor disagree	36	21.3	22.4	70.8
	Mildly agree	34	20.1	21.1	91.9
	Agree	10	5.9	6.2	98.1
	Strongly agree	3	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 38****I see myself as: Dependable, self-disciplined.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Disagree	3	1.8	1.9	3.1
	Mildly disagree	8	4.7	5.0	8.1
	Neither agree nor disagree	15	8.9	9.3	17.4
	Mildly agree	29	17.2	18.0	35.4
	Agree	70	41.4	43.5	78.9
	Strongly agree	34	20.1	21.1	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 39****I see myself as: Anxious, easily upset.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	20	11.8	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	46	27.2	28.8	41.3
	Mildly disagree	24	14.2	15.0	56.3
	Neither agree nor disagree	26	15.4	16.3	72.5
	Mildly agree	32	18.9	20.0	92.5
	Agree	11	6.5	6.9	99.4
	Strongly agree	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 40****I see myself as: Open to new experiences, complex.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Disagree	5	3.0	3.1	4.3
	Mildly disagree	6	3.6	3.7	8.1
	Neither agree nor disagree	20	11.8	12.4	20.5
	Mildly agree	48	28.4	29.8	50.3
	Agree	56	33.1	34.8	85.1
	Strongly agree	24	14.2	14.9	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 41****I see myself as: Reserved, quiet.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	19	11.2	11.8	11.8
	Disagree	37	21.9	23.0	34.8
	Mildly disagree	22	13.0	13.7	48.4
	Neither agree nor disagree	24	14.2	14.9	63.4
	Mildly agree	32	18.9	19.9	83.2
	Agree	20	11.8	12.4	95.7
	Strongly agree	7	4.1	4.3	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 42****I see myself as: Sympathetic, warm.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	.6	.6	.6
	Disagree	3	1.8	1.9	2.5
	Mildly disagree	14	8.3	8.7	11.2
	Neither agree nor disagree	11	6.5	6.8	18.0
	Mildly agree	40	23.7	24.8	42.9
	Agree	61	36.1	37.9	80.7
	Strongly agree	31	18.3	19.3	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 43****I see myself as: Disorganized, careless.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	37	21.9	23.0	23.0
	Disagree	41	24.3	25.5	48.4
	Mildly disagree	26	15.4	16.1	64.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	27	16.0	16.8	81.4
	Mildly agree	18	10.7	11.2	92.5
	Agree	10	5.9	6.2	98.8
	Strongly agree	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 44****I see myself as: Calm, emotionally stable.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Disagree	3	1.8	1.9	3.1
	Mildly disagree	13	7.7	8.1	11.2
	Neither agree nor disagree	21	12.4	13.0	24.2
	Mildly agree	28	16.6	17.4	41.6
	Agree	63	37.3	39.1	80.7
	Strongly agree	31	18.3	19.3	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 45****I see myself as: Conventional, uncreative.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	23	13.6	14.3	14.3
	Disagree	44	26.0	27.3	41.6
	Mildly disagree	32	18.9	19.9	61.5
	Neither agree nor disagree	28	16.6	17.4	78.9
	Agree	27	16.0	16.8	95.7
	Mildly agree	4	2.4	2.5	98.1
	Strongly agree	3	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	161	95.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.7		
Total		169	100.0		

*Now, we'd like to ask you some questions about how you get information about what's going on in the world.*

**Question 46****How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	49	29.0	30.6	30.6
	One day	39	23.1	24.4	55.0
	Two days	23	13.6	14.4	69.4
	Three days	21	12.4	13.1	82.5
	Four days	9	5.3	5.6	88.1
	Five days	8	4.7	5.0	93.1
	Six days	3	1.8	1.9	95.0
	Seven days	8	4.7	5.0	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		



**Question 47**

If you read a newspaper, did you read it online or did you read a physical paper?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Online	63	37.3	45.3	45.3
	Physical paper	76	45.0	54.7	100.0
	Total	139	82.2	100.0	
Missing	System	30	17.8		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 48**

How many days in the past week did you watch national-international news on network TV?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	66	39.1	41.3	41.3
	One day	31	18.3	19.4	60.6
	Two days	24	14.2	15.0	75.6
	Three days	16	9.5	10.0	85.6
	Four days	11	6.5	6.9	92.5
	Five days	7	4.1	4.4	96.9
	Six days	1	.6	.6	97.5
	Seven days	4	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 49**

How many days in the past week did you watch the national news on cable television  
(CNN, Fox, MSNBC)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	61	36.1	38.6	38.6
	One day	35	20.7	22.2	60.8
	Two days	25	14.8	15.8	76.6
	Three days	17	10.1	10.8	87.3
	Four days	10	5.9	6.3	93.7
	Five days	6	3.6	3.8	97.5
	Six days	1	.6	.6	98.1
	Seven days	3	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 50**

How many days in the past week did you listen to national-international news on National  
Public Radio?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	112	66.3	70.0	70.0
	One day	15	8.9	9.4	79.4
	Two days	9	5.3	5.6	85.0
	Three days	9	5.3	5.6	90.6
	Four days	6	3.6	3.8	94.4
	Five days	2	1.2	1.3	95.6
	Six days	1	.6	.6	96.3
	Seven days	6	3.6	3.8	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 51

Which television network do you watch most frequently for national and international news?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21	12.4	12.4	12.4
0	1	.6	.6	13.0
abc	2	1.2	1.2	14.2
Abc	1	.6	.6	14.8
ABC	7	4.1	4.1	18.9
abc 40	1	.6	.6	19.5
abc family	1	.6	.6	20.1
ABC News	2	1.2	1.2	21.3
ABC/NBC	1	.6	.6	21.9
Al Jazeera English Online Programming	1	.6	.6	22.5
BBC News	1	.6	.6	23.1
brazzers	1	.6	.6	23.7
CBS	3	1.8	1.8	25.4
cctv	1	.6	.6	26.0
Channel 7	1	.6	.6	26.6
cnn	4	2.4	2.4	29.0
Cnn	2	1.2	1.2	30.2
CNN	49	29.0	29.0	59.2
CNN, News channels	1	.6	.6	59.8
Comedy central	1	.6	.6	60.4
Comedy Central	3	1.8	1.8	62.1
don't at all	1	.6	.6	62.7
espn	1	.6	.6	63.3
ESPN	2	1.2	1.2	64.5
fox	3	1.8	1.8	66.3
Fox	12	7.1	7.1	73.4
FOX	6	3.6	3.6	76.9
Fox and Comedy Central	1	.6	.6	77.5
fox news	1	.6	.6	78.1
Fox News	6	3.6	3.6	81.7
i don't really watch news on TV	1	.6	.6	82.2
local news stations	1	.6	.6	82.8

msnbc	2	1.2	1.2	84.0
MSNBC	2	1.2	1.2	85.2
n/a	1	.6	.6	85.8
N/A	1	.6	.6	86.4
nbc	2	1.2	1.2	87.6
NBC	7	4.1	4.1	91.7
none	7	4.1	4.1	95.9
None	2	1.2	1.2	97.0
switch between different ones for weather	1	.6	.6	97.6
The Colbert Reprt	1	.6	.6	98.2
WOWT	1	.6	.6	98.8
yahoo	1	.6	.6	99.4
youtube	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

## Question 52

Which television program in particular is your favorite program for being informed about national-  
international news?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	22	13.0	13.0	13.0
0	1	.6	.6	13.6
abc	1	.6	.6	14.2
ABC	4	2.4	2.4	16.6
ABC News	3	1.8	1.8	18.3
AC 360	1	.6	.6	18.9
Anderson Cooper	1	.6	.6	19.5
Anderson Cooper 360	1	.6	.6	20.1
Any	1	.6	.6	20.7
Bill Mahr	1	.6	.6	21.3
Bill O'reilly	1	.6	.6	21.9
Bill O'Reilly	1	.6	.6	22.5
cctv	1	.6	.6	23.1
cnn	4	2.4	2.4	25.4
Cnn	1	.6	.6	26.0
CNN	27	16.0	16.0	42.0
CNN, Fox	1	.6	.6	42.6
Colbert Report	2	1.2	1.2	43.8
comedy central	1	.6	.6	44.4
Daily show	1	.6	.6	45.0
Daily Show	2	1.2	1.2	46.2
Daily Show and Colbert Report	1	.6	.6	46.7
Daily Show with Jon Stewart	1	.6	.6	47.3
Don't have a favorite	1	.6	.6	47.9
Don't have one	1	.6	.6	48.5
EPSN	1	.6	.6	49.1
Fareed Zakaria	1	.6	.6	49.7
fox	3	1.8	1.8	51.5
Fox	6	3.6	3.6	55.0
FOX	5	3.0	3.0	58.0
Fox News	1	.6	.6	58.6
fox news or abc	1	.6	.6	59.2

foxnews	1	.6	.6	59.8
Frontline	1	.6	.6	60.4
Frost Over the World (AJE)	1	.6	.6	60.9
I don't know	1	.6	.6	61.5
John King, USA	1	.6	.6	62.1
John Stewart Show	1	.6	.6	62.7
larry king	1	.6	.6	63.3
Late night political comedy	1	.6	.6	63.9
local news stations	1	.6	.6	64.5
Local news stations.	1	.6	.6	65.1
Morning News	1	.6	.6	65.7
msnbc	1	.6	.6	66.3
MSNBC	2	1.2	1.2	67.5
N.A.	1	.6	.6	68.0
n/a	3	1.8	1.8	69.8
N/A	4	2.4	2.4	72.2
NA	1	.6	.6	72.8
National Watch	1	.6	.6	73.4
nbc	1	.6	.6	74.0
Nbc	1	.6	.6	74.6
NBC	2	1.2	1.2	75.7
nbc nightly news	1	.6	.6	76.3
NBC Nightly News	1	.6	.6	76.9
NBC Nightly News with Brian Williams	1	.6	.6	77.5
News at 10	1	.6	.6	78.1
nightly news	1	.6	.6	78.7
no favorite	1	.6	.6	79.3
none	9	5.3	5.3	84.6
None	1	.6	.6	85.2
not sure	1	.6	.6	85.8
O Reily	1	.6	.6	86.4
O'Reily Factor	1	.6	.6	87.0
Piers Morgan Tonight	1	.6	.6	87.6
Saturday Night Live or Conan	1	.6	.6	88.2
Sean Hannity	1	.6	.6	88.8

sports center	1	.6	.6	89.3
sportscenter	1	.6	.6	89.9
sqwuak box	1	.6	.6	90.5
Steve Colbert	1	.6	.6	91.1
The Colbert Report	2	1.2	1.2	92.3
The Daily Show	3	1.8	1.8	94.1
The Daily Show with John Stewart	1	.6	.6	94.7
The Daily Show with Jon Stewart	1	.6	.6	95.3
The Daily Show, The Colbert Report	1	.6	.6	95.9
the local news	1	.6	.6	96.4
The O'reilly Factor	1	.6	.6	97.0
Today show	2	1.2	1.2	98.2
World News	1	.6	.6	98.8
World News Tonight	1	.6	.6	99.4
WOWT	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 53

How many days in the past week did you go to the Internet for national or international news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zero days	36	21.3	22.5	22.5
	One day	40	23.7	25.0	47.5
	Two days	24	14.2	15.0	62.5
	Three days	29	17.2	18.1	80.6
	Four days	6	3.6	3.8	84.4
	Five days	7	4.1	4.4	88.8
	Six days	4	2.4	2.5	91.3
	Seven days	14	8.3	8.8	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 54-Newspaper sites

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Newspaper sites

(please indicate the sites)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	18	10.7	100.0	100.0
Missing System	151	89.3		
Total	169	100.0		

### Question 54—Newspaper sites-Text

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Newspaper sites (please indicate the

sites)-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	154	91.1	91.1	91.1
brownagfieldnews	1	.6	.6	91.7
Huffington Post	2	1.2	1.2	92.9
journal star	1	.6	.6	93.5
Lincoln Journal Star	2	1.2	1.2	94.7
New York Times	4	2.4	2.4	97.0
nyt.com, omaha.com, journalstar.com	1	.6	.6	97.6
nytimes.com	1	.6	.6	98.2
Omaha.com	1	.6	.6	98.8
USA today.	1	.6	.6	99.4
Wall Street Journal	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 54-CNN

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-CNN

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	86	50.9	100.0	100.0
Missing System	83	49.1		
Total	169	100.0		



### Question 54-Fox

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Fox News

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	59	34.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	110	65.1		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 54-MSNBC

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-MSNBC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	37	21.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	132	78.1		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 54-NPR

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-National Public

Radio

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	5.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	159	94.1		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 54-BBC

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-BBC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	7.7	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	156	92.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 54-Other

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Other (please indicate)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	21	12.4	100.0	100.0
Missing System	148	87.6		
Total	169	100.0		

## Question 54-Other-Text

What Web sites do you use for international news? Check all that apply:-Other (please indicate)-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	149	88.2	88.2	88.2
Al Jazeera	2	1.2	1.2	89.3
Comedy Central	1	.6	.6	89.9
drudge report	1	.6	.6	90.5
drudgereport	1	.6	.6	91.1
google news	2	1.2	1.2	92.3
Huffingtonpost, Jezebel.com, reddit.com	1	.6	.6	92.9
Hulu accessing Daily Show	1	.6	.6	93.5
MSN	1	.6	.6	94.1
news.google.com (aggregate)	1	.6	.6	94.7
none	1	.6	.6	95.3
Reddit	1	.6	.6	95.9
Repubblica.it	1	.6	.6	96.4
XXL, YAHOO	1	.6	.6	97.0
yahoo	3	1.8	1.8	98.8
Yahoo	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 55

How much time per day do you spend reading, listening to, or watching news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15 minutes or less	85	50.3	53.5	53.5
	15-30 minutes	32	18.9	20.1	73.6
	30-45 minutes	27	16.0	17.0	90.6
	45-60 minutes	6	3.6	3.8	94.3
	60 minutes or more	9	5.3	5.7	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 56

Of that time, how much would you estimate you spend on international news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15 minutes or less	122	72.2	76.3	76.3
	15-30 minutes	18	10.7	11.3	87.5
	30-45 minutes	18	10.7	11.3	98.8
	45-60 minutes	2	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 57

How well informed do you consider yourself on international news and issues?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I'm regularly well informed on the major international news and global issues.	13	7.7	8.1	8.1
	I stay well-informed on a few topics or issues.	44	26.0	27.5	35.6
	I'm well-informed only once in awhile if there's a story or issue that interests me.	28	16.6	17.5	53.1
	I give casual attention to international news but am not well-informed.	54	32.0	33.8	86.9
	I seldom if ever pay attention to international news or issues.	21	12.4	13.1	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 58

What is your most important source of international news? Please check or fill-in ONE category only.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Print newspapers (please indicate)	29	17.2	18.1	18.1
	Internet newspaper sites (please indicate)	20	11.8	12.5	30.6
	Other Internet news sites (please indicate)	20	11.8	12.5	43.1
	Cable television broadcasts such as Fox News, CNN, MSNBC or Comedy Central (please indicate)	38	22.5	23.8	66.9

	Network news broadcasts such as ABC, CBS, or NBC (please indicate)	8	4.7	5.0	71.9
	Public Television	11	6.5	6.9	78.8
	Commercial radio news broadcasts (please indicate)	1	.6	.6	79.4
	National Public Radio news broadcasts	8	4.7	5.0	84.4
	National Public Radio Internet news site	4	2.4	2.5	86.9
	Online magazine news sites (please indicate)	2	1.2	1.3	88.1
	Internet blogs (please indicate)	2	1.2	1.3	89.4
	Talking with others	10	5.9	6.3	95.6
	Internet social media Web sites (please indicate)	4	2.4	2.5	98.1
	Other (please list)	3	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 58-Text

What is your most important source of international news? Please check or fill-in ONE category

only.-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	64	37.9	37.9	37.9
2312	1	.6	.6	38.5
abc	2	1.2	1.2	39.6
Abc	1	.6	.6	40.2
ABC	3	1.8	1.8	42.0
ABC, NBC	1	.6	.6	42.6
Al Jazeera	1	.6	.6	43.2
BBC	1	.6	.6	43.8
cnn	3	1.8	1.8	45.6
CNN	18	10.7	10.7	56.2

CNN or FOX	1	.6	.6	56.8
CNN, Al Jazeera, BBC	1	.6	.6	57.4
comedy central	1	.6	.6	58.0
Comedy Central	5	3.0	3.0	60.9
crop commodity reports on a national level	1	.6	.6	61.5
Daily Nebraskan	1	.6	.6	62.1
Daily Show with Jon Stewart	1	.6	.6	62.7
DN	1	.6	.6	63.3
drudgereport	1	.6	.6	63.9
Facebook	1	.6	.6	64.5
facebook twitter	1	.6	.6	65.1
fox	1	.6	.6	65.7
Fox	3	1.8	1.8	67.5
FOX	1	.6	.6	68.0
fox news	1	.6	.6	68.6
Fox News	4	2.4	2.4	71.0
FOX News	1	.6	.6	71.6
Google News	1	.6	.6	72.2
HIGH TIMES	1	.6	.6	72.8
Huffington Post, Jezebel, reddit.com	1	.6	.6	73.4
journal star	1	.6	.6	74.0
Lincoln	1	.6	.6	74.6
Lincoln Journal Star	5	3.0	3.0	77.5
Local	1	.6	.6	78.1
msn	1	.6	.6	78.7
MSN	1	.6	.6	79.3
MSNBC	3	1.8	1.8	81.1
msnbc.com	2	1.2	1.2	82.2
New York Times	3	1.8	1.8	84.0
New York Times, Omaha World Herald	1	.6	.6	84.6
news.google.com	1	.6	.6	85.2
NY times	1	.6	.6	85.8
NYT	1	.6	.6	86.4

nytimes.com	1	.6	.6	87.0
Omaha world heard	1	.6	.6	87.6
Omaha World Herald	5	3.0	3.0	90.5
Reddit	1	.6	.6	91.1
sohu	1	.6	.6	91.7
The Colbert Report	1	.6	.6	92.3
The Daily Show, The Colbert Report	1	.6	.6	92.9
USA today	1	.6	.6	93.5
USA Today	2	1.2	1.2	94.7
USATODAY	1	.6	.6	95.3
Wall street journal	1	.6	.6	95.9
wallstreet	1	.6	.6	96.4
world herald	1	.6	.6	97.0
yahoo	2	1.2	1.2	98.2
Yahoo	2	1.2	1.2	99.4
yahoo.com	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 59 - Text

#### What is it about that news source that makes it important to you? - Text

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21	12.4	12.4	12.4
Accessibility	1	.6	.6	13.0
accuracy	1	.6	.6	13.6
Accuracy, unbiased articles, interest	1	.6	.6	14.2
Aggregate of a wide range of reporting from different sources on topics from many areas	1	.6	.6	14.8
Always news station	1	.6	.6	15.4
Comical	1	.6	.6	16.0
commodity market	1	.6	.6	16.6
Conservative news	1	.6	.6	17.2
conservative views	1	.6	.6	17.8

Convenient	1	.6	.6	18.3
Convenience	1	.6	.6	18.9
Credibility and objectivity	1	.6	.6	19.5
credible	1	.6	.6	20.1
Details and clarity	1	.6	.6	20.7
Different opinions	1	.6	.6	21.3
easiest	1	.6	.6	21.9
easily accessible	1	.6	.6	22.5
Easily accessible	1	.6	.6	23.1
Easy to access	1	.6	.6	23.7
easy to access on phone	1	.6	.6	24.3
Easy to access, gets to the point	1	.6	.6	24.9
easy to read	1	.6	.6	25.4
Easy to understand	1	.6	.6	26.0
Easy when i need to read it	1	.6	.6	26.6
Entertaining	1	.6	.6	27.2
Every hour on the radio	1	.6	.6	27.8
fact	1	.6	.6	28.4
Filtering for relevant topics easily.	1	.6	.6	29.0
friends views on different things	1	.6	.6	29.6
Good	1	.6	.6	30.2
Has a wide variety of topics	1	.6	.6	30.8
home page	1	.6	.6	31.4
humor	1	.6	.6	32.0
i can get information quickly	1	.6	.6	32.5
I have always watched fox news	1	.6	.6	33.1
I have it with me at all times	1	.6	.6	33.7
I like the reporters. They don't seem to force their opinions on me.	1	.6	.6	34.3
I like the short articles online that get to the point, and the broadcasters on t.v.	1	.6	.6	34.9



I listen to it while I commute. Also, the stories are in depth and unbiased.	1	.6	.6	35.5
I love good morning america	1	.6	.6	36.1
I only care if they are accurate most of the time.	1	.6	.6	36.7
I prefer CNN over FOX news because it is less biased than FOX news.	1	.6	.6	37.3
I trust CNN very much to get the best story and most reliable.	1	.6	.6	37.9
I trust my friend's and family's judgements.	1	.6	.6	38.5
I trust them, and they are very interested in politics.	1	.6	.6	39.1
If it is relevant to me	1	.6	.6	39.6
If its interesting.	1	.6	.6	40.2
Information	1	.6	.6	40.8
INTERSTING	1	.6	.6	41.4
It affects me	1	.6	.6	42.0
It doesn't bore me out of my witts. It's entertaining and for the most part unbiased.	1	.6	.6	42.6
It gives a lot of information	1	.6	.6	43.2
It has many different stories available.	1	.6	.6	43.8
It is conservative.	1	.6	.6	44.4
it is current and important	1	.6	.6	45.0
it is easy to follow	1	.6	.6	45.6
It is informative	1	.6	.6	46.2
It is more traditional	1	.6	.6	46.7
it is my homepage	1	.6	.6	47.3
It is my homepage I just read the hot topics.	1	.6	.6	47.9
It is relatively moderate ideologically.	1	.6	.6	48.5

it is simple	1	.6	.6	49.1
It is the local newspaper	1	.6	.6	49.7
It is well known and my parents recommend it	1	.6	.6	50.3
It is what my parents watched growing up	1	.6	.6	50.9
it lets me know whats going on in the world	1	.6	.6	51.5
It pops up on my home page	1	.6	.6	52.1
It shows both liberal and conservative which I like.	1	.6	.6	52.7
It's easiest to check	1	.6	.6	53.3
It's easily accessible	1	.6	.6	53.8
It's easy to see what the most important topics in the world are	1	.6	.6	54.4
It's entertaining	1	.6	.6	55.0
It's fluid, always changing.	1	.6	.6	55.6
It's funny. Not as biased	1	.6	.6	56.2
It's interesting and fun to look at political matters going on in the way they portay it, even though it takes sense to realize what they are actually trying to say and whether or not they are telling the truth.	1	.6	.6	56.8
It's interesting.	1	.6	.6	57.4
It's not about the news source to be honest, the only thing important is the news itself.	1	.6	.6	58.0
It's not too bias	1	.6	.6	58.6
It's truthful	1	.6	.6	59.2
It's what my parents watch.	1	.6	.6	59.8
Its available on campus.	1	.6	.6	60.4
Its easy access for me to learn about what is going on around the world.	1	.6	.6	60.9

Its easy and enjoyable to read.	1	.6	.6	61.5
Its entertaining	1	.6	.6	62.1
its good information	1	.6	.6	62.7
its interesting to me !	1	.6	.6	63.3
its local	1	.6	.6	63.9
Its my home page	1	.6	.6	64.5
its not important to me	1	.6	.6	65.1
Its usually correct and always acesable	1	.6	.6	65.7
Knowing what is going on in the world.	1	.6	.6	66.3
knowing what is happening around the nation and the world! With the war and other issues.	1	.6	.6	66.9
knowing what is happening in different parts of the world and how those things are affecting me.	1	.6	.6	67.5
Learning out society	1	.6	.6	68.0
less biased, covers pertinent stories	1	.6	.6	68.6
Lets you know whats going on in the world around you.	1	.6	.6	69.2
life	1	.6	.6	69.8
local	1	.6	.6	70.4
Local	1	.6	.6	71.0
lots of info and easy to navigate	1	.6	.6	71.6
Neutrality and unbiased opinions	1	.6	.6	72.2
newspaper	1	.6	.6	72.8
Non bias	1	.6	.6	73.4
Not sure	1	.6	.6	74.0
nothing	1	.6	.6	74.6
Objectivity	1	.6	.6	75.1
online source	1	.6	.6	75.7

personal discussion	1	.6	.6	76.3
President Obama	1	.6	.6	76.9
professionalism	1	.6	.6	77.5
provides multiple articles from multiple sources	1	.6	.6	78.1
related to my country	1	.6	.6	78.7
relates to me	1	.6	.6	79.3
Relatively local yet covers issues from around the world.	1	.6	.6	79.9
Relevance to me	1	.6	.6	80.5
Reliability	1	.6	.6	81.1
Reliability and impartiality; unbiased.	1	.6	.6	81.7
Reliable source	1	.6	.6	82.2
Republican	1	.6	.6	82.8
Satyr is not influenced by politics. It's just funny for the sake of being funny, and thereby honest. All other news sources have become to heavily politicized to make them reliable in any sense. I trust printed media news sources such as newspapers over nline or broadcast, but even those have slants.	1	.6	.6	83.4
Seems reliable for the most part.	1	.6	.6	84.0
seems trustworthy	1	.6	.6	84.6
social security	1	.6	.6	85.2
sports	1	.6	.6	85.8
Sports	1	.6	.6	86.4
The spin stops here.	1	.6	.6	87.0
Their sources	1	.6	.6	87.6
Their views are similar to mine, more so than others.	1	.6	.6	88.2

They always give a fair point of view.	1	.6	.6	88.8
They are both Liberal and Conservative	1	.6	.6	89.3
They are updated often	1	.6	.6	89.9
They seem to cover what is really important going on that day.	1	.6	.6	90.5
They way the news is given	1	.6	.6	91.1
things i know	1	.6	.6	91.7
To be well informed.	1	.6	.6	92.3
To keep informed	1	.6	.6	92.9
to know the news are correct and not bias.	1	.6	.6	93.5
Trustworthy	1	.6	.6	94.1
Unbiased reporting, liberal-leaning editorials, fun and creative use of social media, relevancy.	1	.6	.6	94.7
unbiased, focused on markets	1	.6	.6	95.3
Unbiased, good reporting	1	.6	.6	95.9
Understandability	1	.6	.6	96.4
Up to date always	1	.6	.6	97.0
Variety of news	1	.6	.6	97.6
very informative	1	.6	.6	98.2
Viloence	1	.6	.6	98.8
Weather	1	.6	.6	99.4
Wide range of topics and good reporting	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 60

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is strongly trusting, 3 is neutral and 5 is strongly skeptical, how much do you trust your most important source for news?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly trust it	20	11.8	12.5	12.5
	Trust it	90	53.3	56.3	68.8
	Neutral -- neither trusting nor skeptical	41	24.3	25.6	94.4
	Skeptical	8	4.7	5.0	99.4
	Strongly skeptical	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

*We'd like to ask you a few questions about what you think the role of the United States should be in dealing with other nations and people around the world.*

### Question 61

Do you think it will be best for the future of the United States if we take an active part in world affairs, or if we stay out of world affairs?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Take an active part	100	59.2	62.5	62.5
	Stay out	60	35.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 62

In general, do you think the U.S. is a positive, neutral or negative influence on world affairs?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly positive	9	5.3	5.6	5.6
	Positive	77	45.6	48.1	53.8
	Neutral	55	32.5	34.4	88.1
	Negative	19	11.2	11.9	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 63

What do you think should be the chief consideration for people who determine U.S. foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	What they believe to be the nation's best interest for security.	61	36.1	38.1	38.1
	What they believe to be the nation's best interest economically.	49	29.0	30.6	68.8
	What they believe to be morally correct.	37	21.9	23.1	91.9
	What they believe voters want them to do	7	4.1	4.4	96.3
	Other	6	3.6	3.8	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 63 -- Text

What do you think should be the chief consideration for people who determine U.S. foreign policy?-

#### TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	164	97.0	97.0	97.0
All the Above	1	.6	.6	97.6
combination of above	1	.6	.6	98.2
Combination of national interest and concern for other people around the world	1	.6	.6	98.8
We should do whats is best for the rest of the world	1	.6	.6	99.4
Whatever strengthens the livelihood, security, and success of as many people as possible, while disadvantaging as few as possible.	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 64

Over the past 20 years the United States has gotten involved in helping various countries such as Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq build new democratic governments after periods of conflict. Nation-building has been defined as using military force, after the end of a conflict, to reconstruct society through rapid and major social, economic and political transformation. Do you think the U.S. should take an active

role in nation-building?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	95	56.2	59.7	59.7
	No	64	37.9	40.3	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		



### Question 65

In helping a country build a new government, should the U.S. insist that the country's new government be democratic?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	85	50.3	53.1	53.1
	No	75	44.4	46.9	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 66

In helping a country rebuild after a war, should the U.S. insist that the country establish a capitalist market economy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	83	49.1	51.9	51.9
	No	77	45.6	48.1	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 67

Here is a list of possible help the U.S. might give a country that is in the process of building a new nation. Which item do you most agree with?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No help -- the U.S. should stay out of another country's business.	16	9.5	10.0	10.0
	Humanitarian aid -- The U.S. should provide humanitarian aid such as food, medicine, clothing and shelter to people who need the help.	82	48.5	51.3	61.3
	Economic aid -- The U.S. should provide economic aid to build or rebuild key parts of the country's infrastructure such as roads, bridges, schools and hospitals.	35	20.7	21.9	83.1
	Military aid -- The U.S. should provide U.S. troops to keep the peace and to train the country's police and army until the new government is stable.	27	16.0	16.9	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 68

Are U.S. nation-building efforts in Afghanistan in the best interest of the United States?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	65	38.5	40.9	40.9
	No	94	55.6	59.1	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 69

If hostile forces prevent humanitarian aid from being safely delivered to those who need it in a particular country or region of the world, should the U.S. use its military to ensure the humanitarian aid can be supplied?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	101	59.8	63.1	63.1
	No	59	34.9	36.9	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 70

If hostile forces prevent humanitarian aid from being safely delivered to those who need it in a particular country or region, should the U.S. work through the United Nations or another multinational agency to use military force to ensure the humanitarian aid can be supplied?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	118	69.8	73.8	73.8
	No	42	24.9	26.3	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 71

When an authoritarian government somewhere in the world uses military force against its own citizens who are trying to protest against that government, how should the U.S. respond?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	We should use our military to protect the other country's civilians.	21	12.4	13.2	13.2
	We should work with a multi-national organization such as NATO or the United Nations to use military force to stop the attacks on civilians.	86	50.9	54.1	67.3
	We should use economic sanctions to force the authoritarian government to end the fighting.	22	13.0	13.8	81.1
	We should stay out of it, it's not our problem.	30	17.8	18.9	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 72

Did you vote for a congressional candidate or candidates in the most recent national election?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	52	30.8	32.9	32.9
	No	106	62.7	67.1	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 73a (if #72 = yes)

Did you have a preference for a particular party in the last national election?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes -- Democrat	14	8.3	26.9	26.9
	Yes -- Republican	24	14.2	46.2	73.1
	No party preference -- voted for the individual rather than the party	14	8.3	26.9	100.0
	Total	52	30.8	100.0	
Missing	System	117	69.2		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 73b (if #72 = yes)

In voting for a congressional candidate in the most recent national election, how much consideration how much consideration did you give to the candidates' positions on foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extensive -- I based my decision on their foreign policy platforms and experience	3	1.8	5.8	5.8
	Moderate -- I based my decision largely on foreign policy positions but considered other factors	30	17.8	57.7	63.5
	A little -- I thought about their foreign policy positions but mostly used other factors	15	8.9	28.8	92.3
	Not at all -- I did not consider the candidates' foreign policy positions when I voted	4	2.4	7.7	100.0
	Total	52	30.8	100.0	
Missing	System	117	69.2		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 74****Do you have a close relative serving in the U.S. military?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes (If so, please specify the relationship, such as brother, cousin, etc.)	46	27.2	28.8	28.8
	No	114	67.5	71.3	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 74-Text

Do you have a close relative serving in the U.S. military?-TEXT

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	125	74.0	74.0	74.0
brother	1	.6	.6	74.6
Brother	1	.6	.6	75.1
Brother and cousin	1	.6	.6	75.7
Brother-in-law	1	.6	.6	76.3
cousin	12	7.1	7.1	83.4
Cousin	7	4.1	4.1	87.6
cousin and brother-in-law	1	.6	.6	88.2
Cousin, uncle	1	.6	.6	88.8
Cousin(s)	1	.6	.6	89.3
cousins	1	.6	.6	89.9
dad	1	.6	.6	90.5
Dad	1	.6	.6	91.1
Father	1	.6	.6	91.7
Grandfather	1	.6	.6	92.3
my uncles	1	.6	.6	92.9
Step father, not currently serving	1	.6	.6	93.5
uncle	2	1.2	1.2	94.7
Uncle	6	3.6	3.6	98.2
uncle, cousin	1	.6	.6	98.8
Uncle, Cousin	1	.6	.6	99.4
uncle,cousins	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

### Question 75a (if #74 = yes)

Do you think that relative's service has influenced how you think about U.S. foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	28	16.6	60.9	60.9
	No	18	10.7	39.1	100.0
	Total	46	27.2	100.0	
Missing	System	123	72.8		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 75b (if #74 = yes)

How has your relative's service influenced your thinking about U.S. foreign policy?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		131	77.5	77.5	77.5
	dont know	1	.6	.6	78.1
	Felt the USA is more secure than the news reports	1	.6	.6	78.7
	greatly	1	.6	.6	79.3
	hasn't	1	.6	.6	79.9
	He doesn't talk about it much so its not very influential. I just have more respect for soldiers	1	.6	.6	80.5
	he talks about it	1	.6	.6	81.1
	He's been in Afganistan	1	.6	.6	81.7
	How the government decides who they go to war with and why! Also, where they send troops for military interference	1	.6	.6	82.2
	I believe what he believes	1	.6	.6	82.8
	I don't want them to be in danger.	1	.6	.6	83.4
	I have more respect for it.	1	.6	.6	84.0
	I love it	1	.6	.6	84.6



I stand behind the military one hundred percent.	1	.6	.6	85.2
I think he's helping society	1	.6	.6	85.8
I think our country needs to work on our own economic problems before we go and try to fix other countries problems.	1	.6	.6	86.4
I want him to be safe	1	.6	.6	87.0
I'm not sure	1	.6	.6	87.6
it hasn't	1	.6	.6	88.2
It hasn't	2	1.2	1.2	89.3
It just makes me realize there commitment for us.	1	.6	.6	89.9
Made me appreciate everything the military does	1	.6	.6	90.5
made me more open minded	1	.6	.6	91.1
Made me trust the us	1	.6	.6	91.7
My relative's service has not influenced my thoughts of U.S. foreigh policy	1	.6	.6	92.3
N/A	2	1.2	1.2	93.5
needs relooked at	1	.6	.6	94.1
none	1	.6	.6	94.7
not at all	1	.6	.6	95.3
Obviously I'm worried about the safety of those individuals, but I believe if anything they have pushed me to think that there are some flaws with our current foreign policy, but changes could be made fairly easily.	1	.6	.6	95.9
something really good	1	.6	.6	96.4
that they should help with foreign policy as much as they can with out using military force first then if need be use military aid	1	.6	.6	97.0

The value of the lives of our service men and women must be valued; thus, their time ought to be used in its most effective way.	1	.6	.6	97.6
They are overseas risking their lives for another country's civilians.	1	.6	.6	98.2
we need to do everything possible to protect the well being of our country	1	.6	.6	98.8
We spend way too much money on it	1	.6	.6	99.4
Yes	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	169	100.0	100.0	

## Question 76

What topic area do you see as presenting the most important foreign policy challenge for the United States over the next five years?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Peace and security	31	18.3	19.4	19.4
	Energy	19	11.2	11.9	31.3
	The economy	73	43.2	45.6	76.9
	The environment	16	9.5	10.0	86.9
	Education	10	5.9	6.3	93.1
	Health	5	3.0	3.1	96.3
	Food and water	6	3.6	3.8	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

*Now we have a couple of questions about government in Washington. We want to see how much information about government gets out to the public from the media. Many people don't know the answers to these questions, but even if you're unsure we'd like you to take your best guess.*

### Question 77

How long do members of the House of Representatives serve in office?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 years	44	26.0	27.7	27.7
	3 years	9	5.3	5.7	33.3
	2 years	104	61.5	65.4	98.7
	1 year	2	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 78

How long do members of the Senate serve in office?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	8 years	16	9.5	10.0	10.0
	2 years	19	11.2	11.9	21.9
	6 years	104	61.5	65.0	86.9
	4 years	21	12.4	13.1	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 79****Who is the Secretary of State?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Michele Bachmann	18	10.7	11.3	11.3
	Eric Cantor	19	11.2	11.9	23.1
	Hillary Clinton	119	70.4	74.4	97.5
	Kent Conrad	4	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 80****Who is the current Speaker of the House of Representatives?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Jeannette Rankin	8	4.7	5.0	5.0
	Thomas Petri	23	13.6	14.4	19.4
	John Boehner	121	71.6	75.6	95.0
	Lynn Woolsey	8	4.7	5.0	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 81

On a map of the world, where would you find Bosnia and Herzegovina?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asia	19	11.2	11.9	11.9
	Europe	87	51.5	54.7	66.7
	South America	16	9.5	10.1	76.7
	North America	3	1.8	1.9	78.6
	Middle East	34	20.1	21.4	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 82

On a map of the world, where would you find Iraq?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	South America	1	.6	.6	.6
	North America	6	3.6	3.8	4.4
	Europe	5	3.0	3.1	7.5
	Middle East	142	84.0	88.8	96.3
	Asia	6	3.6	3.8	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 83****On a map of the world, where would you find Kosovo?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Middle East	36	21.3	22.6	22.6
	North America	4	2.4	2.5	25.2
	Europe	63	37.3	39.6	64.8
	Asia	39	23.1	24.5	89.3
	South America	17	10.1	10.7	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 84****On a map of the world, where would you find Afghanistan?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	North America	3	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Asia	7	4.1	4.4	6.3
	Europe	5	3.0	3.1	9.4
	Middle East	141	83.4	88.1	97.5
	South America	4	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	160	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	5.3		
Total		169	100.0		

*We'd like to ask you a few questions about how you see the role of the United States in the world.*

### Question 85

What is the best response to this question: how active should the United States be within the United Nations?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always active -- we are the world's leader in solving problems.	38	22.5	24.2	24.2
	Active only when we can help others -- we should act if we have expertise that can help other countries	74	43.8	47.1	71.3
	Active if it helps us -- we should be active in solving problems that concern us, but we should stay out of other countries' problems if they don't concern us.	42	24.9	26.8	98.1
	Inactive -- we should stay out of the UN and take care of our own problems ourselves, and leave other countries to take care of their own problems.	3	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	157	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	12	7.1		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 86

Which response best describes when the U.S. should intervene in the affairs of other countries?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	10	5.9	6.3	6.3
	When people want to bring democracy to their country	15	8.9	9.4	15.7
	When the leaders of another country ask for U.S. help	49	29.0	30.8	46.5
	When humanitarian aid is needed	57	33.7	35.8	82.4
	When our leaders believe it is in the best interests of the U.S. to do so	28	16.6	17.6	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 87

Do you approve or disapprove of the way that the president is handling foreign affairs?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly approve	11	6.5	7.0	7.0
	Somewhat approve	78	46.2	49.4	56.3
	Somewhat disapprove	57	33.7	36.1	92.4
	Strongly disapprove	12	7.1	7.6	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		



**Question 88**

Do you approve or disapprove of the job performance of the president?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly approve	15	8.9	9.5	9.5
	Somewhat approve	68	40.2	43.0	52.5
	Somewhat disapprove	45	26.6	28.5	81.0
	Strongly disapprove	30	17.8	19.0	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 89**

Do you approve or disapprove of the job performance of the secretary of state?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly approve	11	6.5	6.9	6.9
	Somewhat approve	86	50.9	54.1	61.0
	Somewhat disapprove	53	31.4	33.3	94.3
	Strongly disapprove	9	5.3	5.7	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 90

Which answer best describes how well you are able to inform yourself about what's going on around the world?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I'm always well-informed -- I regularly pay attention to international news.	12	7.1	7.5	7.5
	I'm often but not always well-informed about major international news topics.	52	30.8	32.7	40.3
	I'm occasionally well-informed, particularly when an international topic interests me.	85	50.3	53.5	93.7
	I never pay attention to international news.	10	5.9	6.3	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 91

The "Arab Spring" has been in the news frequently over the past year. The term "Arab Spring" refers to:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Spring-like climate conditions in Arab countries	8	4.7	5.0	5.0
	Citizen uprisings against authoritarian governments in Arab countries	102	60.4	64.2	69.2
	The discovery of a huge new water source in the Middle East	26	15.4	16.4	85.5
	The economic recovery of Arab countries after the global recession	23	13.6	14.5	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 92

What role did the U.S. play in Libya's recent turmoil?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The U.S. provided ground troops to fight the Libyan army.	21	12.4	13.3	13.3
	The U.S. played no role.	31	18.3	19.6	32.9
	The U.S. provided economic support to the Libyan government of Moamar Qaddafi.	46	27.2	29.1	62.0
	The U.S. cooperated with NATO in air attacks against Qaddafi's forces	60	35.5	38.0	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 93

Which response best answers the question: How long was the U.S. at war in Iraq?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One year	8	4.7	5.0	5.0
	Two years	9	5.3	5.7	10.7
	Five years	30	17.8	18.9	29.6
	Eight years	112	66.3	70.4	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 94**

**Has the war in Iraq been a success?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	76	45.0	47.8	47.8
	No	83	49.1	52.2	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 95**

**Have U.S. efforts at nation-building in Iraq been successful?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	73	43.2	46.2	46.2
	No	85	50.3	53.8	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 96**

**Which response best answers the question: How long has the U.S. been at war in**

**Afghanistan?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Three years	13	7.7	8.2	8.2
	Five years	25	14.8	15.8	24.1
	Seven years	26	15.4	16.5	40.5
	Ten years	94	55.6	59.5	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 97**

**True or False: Pakistan, Afghanistan's neighbor to the east, has a democratically elected government.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	True	62	36.7	39.0	39.0
	False	97	57.4	61.0	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 98**

**Do you think the war in Afghanistan has been a success?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	68	40.2	42.8	42.8
	No	91	53.8	57.2	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

**Question 99**

**Do you think that U.S. efforts at nation-building in Afghanistan have been successful?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	54	32.0	34.0	34.0
	No	105	62.1	66.0	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 100

Which do you agree should be the role of the U.S. in Afghanistan?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The U.S. should provide humanitarian aid only	39	23.1	24.7	24.7
	The U.S. should provide ground troops to ensure security and training until the Afghan government, military and police are strong enough to function on their own.	69	40.8	43.7	68.4
	The U.S. should have no role -- the U.S. should get out completely.	32	18.9	20.3	88.6
	The U.S. should provide economic aid to build the country's infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, roads and bridges.	18	10.7	11.4	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 101

What do you think is the best way for the U.S. to support democracy in other countries?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The U.S. should provide humanitarian aid such as food, clothing, medicine and shelter to those ho need it when citizens attempt to bring democracy to their country.	64	37.9	40.5	40.5
	When citizens of another country demonstrate in favor of democracy, U.S. officials should speak out in their support.	49	29.0	31.0	71.5
	When people protest for democracy and face a hostile response from their government, the U.S. should guarantee their safety through all possible means including military action.	22	13.0	13.9	85.4
	The U.S. should stay out of the business of other countries.	23	13.6	14.6	100.0
	Total	158	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	6.5		
Total		169	100.0		



## Question 102

Video from within Syria has shown the Syrian government using tanks to fire on some residential areas.

The government says it is fighting an armed uprising, while others say the government has fired on unarmed civilians, some of whom protested against the government. What is the best way for the U.S.

to respond to the situation in Syria?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The U.S. should impose economic sanctions against the Syrian government to try to force it to end attacks on civilians	20	11.8	12.6	12.6
	The U.S. should not have a role, that's for the Syrian people to decide.	24	14.2	15.1	27.7
	The U.S. should use its military to stop the Syrian government from any killing of civilians	39	23.1	24.5	52.2
	The U.S. should work with multi-national agencies such as the United Nations to seek a diplomatic solution.	50	29.6	31.4	83.6
	The U.S. should work with multi-national agencies such as the United Nations to use military force to stop the Syrian government from any killing of civilians.	26	15.4	16.4	100.0
	Total	159	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.9		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 103

The U.S. and the United Nations Security Council contend Iran's government may be working to try to develop a capability to produce nuclear weapons. Iran says the program is designed for peaceful purposes. What do you think is the best way for the U.S. to deal with Iran?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The U.S. should use international diplomacy and economic sanctions to pressure Iran to end its nuclear program.	84	49.7	53.5	53.5
	The U.S. military should attack Iran to stop its nuclear program.	33	19.5	21.0	74.5
	The U.S. and the Israeli military should jointly attack Iran.	21	12.4	13.4	87.9
	The U.S. doesn't need to do anything, it's not a U.S. problem.	19	11.2	12.1	100.0
	Total	157	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	12	7.1		
Total		169	100.0		

### Question 104

104. Should the U.S. help Israel attack Iran if Israeli government officials believe an attack is necessary to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	81	47.9	51.6	51.6
	No	76	45.0	48.4	100.0
	Total	157	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	12	7.1		
Total		169	100.0		

## Question 105

105. How would you rate the current level of U.S. involvement in the world?

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
<i>Valid</i>	<i>We need to be more active internationally</i>	23	13.6	14.6	14.6
	<i>Our level of involvement is about right</i>	85	50.3	53.8	68.4
	<i>We need to be less active internationally</i>	50	29.6	31.6	100.0
	<i>Total</i>	158	93.5	100.0	
<i>Missing</i>	<i>System</i>	11	6.5		
<i>Total</i>		169	100.0		

*That's the end of the survey. Thanks for participating!*