

**CONNECTICUT EMERGENCY
BROADCAST SYSTEM SURVEY:**

**PUBLIC REACTION TO THE
ERRONEOUS STATEWIDE BROADCAST
OF FEBRUARY 1ST, 2005**

Full Report

March/April 2005

**Funding for this research was provided by a grant from
the Public Entity Risk Institute.**



Table of Contents

Report

- Study Background and Methodology 4
- Key Findings – Overview 5
- Awareness of the Erroneous Broadcast Message 8
- Reactions to the False Alert 9
- Degree of Public Concern 11
- Future Responses to Emergency Broadcasts 12
- Who To Believe 14
- Home, Family, Preparedness and Evacuation 18
- Project Staff 19

Annotated Questionnaire 20

Report

I. STUDY BACKGROUND & METHODOLOGY

The Public Entity Risk Institute (PERI) commissioned the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut (CSRA) to conduct a scientific survey of Connecticut residents to gauge their reactions to the erroneous Emergency Broadcast System alert that aired statewide on February 1, 2005 (a Tuesday). The broadcast message, which ran on area TV and radio stations for about three minutes starting just after 2 PM, accidentally advised Connecticut residents to evacuate the state. It was a general message that did not specify an affected area (beside the entire state) and did not give any details about the emergency. The full text of the emergency notice was as follows: *“Civil authorities have issued an immediate evacuation order for all of Connecticut, beginning at 2:10 PM and ending at 3:10 PM.”*

The goal of the survey was to leverage the fact that this unplanned event was an activation of the state’s actual emergency alert system and may serve as an opportunity to assess future system performance and requirements in the case of an actual emergency. Among the issues explored by the research team were:

- The percentage of the population that was immediately aware of the alert
- The medium by which this alert was received
- Initial “gut” reactions to the broadcast
- Factors that impact the believability and influence of alert messages

An important caveat to this analysis is the expectation that a deliberate use of the emergency alert system would have involved a more appropriate and informative message. For this reason, issues impacting the context and the method for message transmission were explored and are discussed in this report.

A total of 756 Connecticut residents, ages 18 and older, were interviewed for this study. The interviews were conducted by trained interviewers from the CSRA research facility in Storrs, Connecticut between February 11 and March 12, 2005.

General Population Sample: The general population sample, which consisted of 503 interviews, was generated using Random Digit Dialing (RDD) techniques to ensure that all Connecticut households with a telephone have an equal probability of selection. The data was weighted to the US Census Current Population Survey statistics for age, race, gender and education.

- The sampling error for 503 interviews with Connecticut residents is approximately $\pm 4.5\%$ points at the 95% level of confidence.

Oversample of Those Who Saw/Heard/Experienced The Broadcast: The initial 503 RDD interviews yielded 48 residents who experienced the emergency broadcast when it aired. 253 additional interviews were conducted in order to achieve the desired oversample of 301 for this group (residents who experienced the broadcast when it aired). The additional 253 interviews were generated using Random Digit Dialing sampling.

- The sampling error for 300 interviews with Connecticut residents is approximately $\pm 5.8\%$ points at the 95% level of confidence.

On questionnaire development, data analysis and reporting, CSRA worked in conjunction with Jerome Conley, Senior Research Scientist, The Institute for Crisis, Disaster and Risk Management at the George Washington University

II. KEY FINDINGS – OVERVIEW

The following are highlights of the survey findings:

- The survey finds that about 9% of Connecticut residents saw or heard the emergency alert broadcast live – via the media – when it was broadcast on February 1st. An additional 2 % were contacted by a friend or relative as the emergency alert was being broadcast. In total, roughly 11% of Connecticut residents experienced the broadcast in real time.
 - An additional 6-in-10 heard about the broadcast after it was known to be a false alert. They heard about it later that day or that week. That leaves about 3 in 10 CT residents who were not aware of the event at all when called for this survey.
- TV served as the main medium for spreading the alert. The vast majority of residents who personally saw or heard the broadcast in real time did so via television (75%), while the rest heard the broadcast on the radio (22%).
 - Likewise, the majority of residents who heard of the broadcast after it was known to be a false alert learned about it via TV news (61%) while others learned of it via radio news (18%) or from another person (13%).
- Residents who experienced the alert in real time had a mix of gut reactions to the emergency broadcast. When asked in an open-ended manner to describe their initial reactions, we heard the following:
 - 28% didn't believe it – they were certain it was a false alarm or some sort of test
 - 20% were concerned, afraid, anxious
 - 16% were confused, not sure what to make of it
 - 11% ignored it completely

- As the emergency broadcast message aired, residents mostly searched for one or more information sources, including turning to other TV or radio stations (39%), looking outside to see if they could see anything (29%), calling their neighbors (14%), calling a friend or relative who did not live close by (14%) or checking the Internet (10%).
 - 13% checked their home for essential supplies
 - 4% headed to the basement or safe area in their house
 - Only 1% of people who experienced the broadcast in real time actually began an evacuation of the state.
 - These results highlight that confirmation-seeking was the primary initial activity that people pursued during the alert, much more so than following the instructions of the warning or even taking basic safety precautions.
- In general, the majority of residents (63%) who experienced the emergency broadcast said they were only a little or not at all concerned by the broadcast (24% said just a little, 39% said not at all concerned). Only 16% said they were “very concerned” by the emergency broadcast, and approximately half of the “very concerned” group thought the emergency was related to terrorism.
- Why were Connecticut residents generally unfazed by the broadcast, and why did so few follow the instructions of the broadcast and not take safety precautions?
 - Connecticut residents who experienced the broadcast but were not that concerned by it attributed their absence of worry to the broadcast’s lack of mention of a specific threat (58%) and lack of mention of a specific area other than the entire state (49%). Simply put, the broadcast seemed too general and nondescript to be taken seriously.
 - Also, the lack of confirmation from other media sources was cited by about 4 in 10 (39%) as a “major” reason for their lack of concern.
- Despite the lack of response to the emergency broadcast, the vast majority of all Connecticut residents (77%) said that the erroneous February 1st alert had no real effect on their faith in the Emergency Broadcast System.
- We also asked all CT residents what they would do in the future if they saw or heard an emergency broadcast message asking them to evacuate their area. Just about everyone would try to confirm the broadcast before evacuating.
 - Nearly all Connecticut residents (90%) say they would be very or somewhat likely to switch to some form of news media – whether radio, TV, or Internet – in order to confirm the emergency
 - 78% would try to confirm the emergency by calling a friend, neighbor, or relative
 - 69% would call local emergency personnel (though interestingly, not many people did this on February 1st – most likely because they did the other actions first and, for most, their anxiety level never rose very high).

- The study also explored who CT residents perceived to be a credible source for delivering an emergency message.
 - Most Credible: CT residents would be most likely to believe the Governor or some other high level state official (74%), or local police or fire department (74%).
 - Second tier credibility: About 6 in 10 residents would believe an automated broadcast message which provides specifics on the emergency (58%), local officials such as town mayor (57%) or national news reporter (50%) as sources in the event of a serious emergency.
 - Third tier credibility: Only about one-third would be very likely to believe a *local* reporter, neighbor, employer or religious leader.
 - Least credible: An automated broadcast message without specifics is the least credible source – only 9% very likely to believe. Clearly, details about the emergency are needed in order to achieve credibility via an automated message.

- There is a strong sense of one's home as the best refuge during an emergency. Most Connecticut residents (75%) would stay in their homes until they had no choice but to evacuate.

- The vast majority of residents with children aged 18 or younger would make sure they had their children with them before they evacuated, even if they were assured that their children were being evacuated (64% of parents said they would only evacuate with their children).
 - However, most residents would evacuate without their spouse or significant other if they are assured that their spouse/significant other were being evacuated as well (61% of married residents said they would do this).

- The overwhelming majority of state residents (83%) do not have a 'go kit' – meaning an already-prepared collection of the essential things that one would need to take with him/her in the case of an evacuation. A plurality say they would rely on the Internet to look for information to find what to put in a 'go kit'. About one-third have no idea where to turn for this type of information.

III. Awareness of the Erroneous Broadcast Message

Incidence of Experiencing The Broadcast Live

Fewer than 1 in 10 Connecticut residents (9%) personally saw or heard the Feb 1st statewide broadcast of the Emergency Broadcast System. An additional 2% were contacted by a friend or relative right when the emergency alert was broadcast.

Of the remaining 89%, 6-in-10 (60%) heard about the broadcast after it was known to be a false alert later on that day or that week.

Residents who were likely to be home during the day and watching TV were much more likely to see or hear the broadcast, with the demographics of this group skewed towards lower income and older residents. Interestingly, rural residents were more likely to witness the broadcast than suburban or urban residents. Also, women with children at home were more likely to have experienced the broadcast.

- Lower income residents with household income under \$20,000 or between \$20,000 and \$40,000 were significantly more likely to have personally seen or heard the broadcast as it aired (16% and 15%, respectively) than were higher income residents making \$75,000 or more a year (only 5%).
- Residents living in rural areas were three times as likely to have personally seen or heard the broadcast live (20%) than were those residents living in suburbs (7%) or those living in urban areas (4%).
- Younger residents (18-30) are least likely age group to have seen or heard the broadcast in real time as only 3% say they have done so compared to 10% of residents aged 41-61 and 11% of older residents (62 and older).
- Parents (mainly moms) with very young children (5 or younger) are significantly more likely to have experienced the broadcast live (21%) than those residents that do not have any children (8%). In fact, at 21%, this group had the highest incidence of experiencing the broadcast.

Where and How Was The Broadcast Experienced?

More than 7-in-10 residents (75%) who personally saw or heard the broadcast did so via television, while the rest mostly heard the broadcast on the radio (22%). Likewise, the majority of residents who heard of the broadcast after it was known to be a false alert learned about it via TV news (61%) while others heard of it on radio news (18%) or from another person (13%).

About three-quarters (75%) of residents who saw or heard the broadcast when it aired were at home and 61% of them say it is very typical that they have a radio or TV on at home during the early afternoon. Slightly more than one-tenth (12%) of residents who saw or heard the broadcast were at work, while less than 1-in-10 (8%) residents say they heard the broadcast in their car in route from one location to another.

Just about all those who were home heard about the alert via TV (92%). For those at work, most heard about it via the radio (72%).

Location Crossed With Medium

	Was home during the emergency broadcast	Was at work during the emergency broadcast
Saw alert on TV	93%	28%
Heard alert on radio	7%	72%

Base: those who experienced the broadcast live when it occurred, alerted by a medium. (n = 267)

IV. Reactions to the False Alert

Immediate “Gut” Reaction

When asked how they would describe their immediate gut reaction at the time they first heard or were first informed of the emergency broadcast, residents had a mix of reactions.

- 28% didn’t believe it
 - Thought it was a false alarm
 - Some sort of test
- 20% were concerned, afraid, anxious
- 16% were confused, not sure what to make of it
 - Basic reaction of “what’s going on?”
- 11% ignored it completely
- 4% were annoyed by it

Actions Taken

Residents who experienced the alert as it aired that day (11% in total) searched for more information, either by turning to other TV or radio stations (39%), looking outside to see if they could see anything (29%), calling their neighbors (14%), calling a friend or relative who did not live close by (14%), or checking the Internet (10%).

In response to the emergency message, about 13% of residents checked their home supplies to see if they had enough essentials, such as food and water, while a small number of residents headed to their basement or a safe area in their home (4%). Very few residents attempted to call local political offices such as mayor's office (2%) or local emergency personnel (6%). Only a mere 1% of residents who experienced the broadcast live evacuated their home and attempted to drive out of the state.

Reaction To The Broadcast – What People Did

	Did %
Turned to other TV or radio stations to get more information	39
Looked outside to see if you could see anything	29
Called a neighbor or someone else close by	14
Called a friend or relative who did not live close by	14
Checked your home supplies to see if you had enough essentials, such as food & water	13
Looked on the internet for more information	10
Called local police, firefighters or other emergency personnel	6
Headed to a basement or safe area in your home	4
Called local political offices – such as the mayor's office or town hall	2
Evacuated your home and attempted to drive out of the state	1

Base: among those who experienced the broadcast live when it occurred, including those contacted by others. (n = 301)

Adds to more than 100% due to multiple responses.

Clearly, the general impulse during the event was to *confirm* the situation, rather than immediately react to it. Confirmation centered on checking the media, looking outside the home or calling others (calling neighbors and friends more so than calling authorities).

V. Degree of Public Concern

Level of Concern

Less than one-fifth of residents (16%) who experienced the broadcast said they were “very concerned” about the alert. Most reported being generally unfazed. Two-thirds of residents (63%) who experienced the alert said they were “just a little” (24%) or “not at all” concerned (39%) when they first saw or heard the broadcast.

Among the 16% who were “very concerned” when they experienced the broadcast, nearly half thought the emergency was terrorism related (49%) while over a third volunteered that they had no idea what type of emergency it was (36%). About 6% thought that the emergency was related to a problem at a nuclear or power plant.

- Residents with young children at home expressed a higher level of concern than those without children. Residents with children aged 5 or less were twice as likely (27%) as residents who do not have any children (13%) to say they were “very concerned” when they experienced the alert.
- Nonwhite residents were significantly more likely to be very concerned (39%) than were white residents (12%).
- Interestingly, older residents did NOT express more concern than their younger counterparts.

Why Such A Low Level Of Concern?

Residents who said they were not very concerned when they experienced the broadcast were asked to rate a series of potential reasons as to why they were not very concerned.

Connecticut residents mostly blamed the broadcast’s lack of mention of a specific threat (58%) and its failure to identify a specific area other than the entire state (49%) as the major reasons why they were not very concerned about it. The vagueness of the broadcast made many feel that it could not be real, or, at least, not that serious.

The third major reason why residents were not very concerned about the broadcast is because they could not get confirmation from other news sources on TV, radio or the Internet. Most assumed that if the emergency were severe, other news sources would be reporting on it.

One-third to one-fifth of respondents mentioned each of the following as a main reason for not being very concerned about the broadcast: they didn’t see any activity on the street (33%); they do not consider Connecticut to be a likely place for such a large scale emergency to happen (22%); they were too busy at the time doing other things to pay much attention to the broadcast (21%); or their neighbors were not evacuating (18%).

Reasons For Low Level Of Concern

	Major Reason %	Minor reason %	Not a reason at all %	Does not apply %
Because the emergency broadcast did not mention any specific threat	58	17	21	3
Because the broadcast message did not mention any specific area – other than the entire state of Connecticut	49	18	24	5
Because you could not get confirmation from other news sources on TV, radio or Internet	39	17	33	9
Because you did not see any activity on the street that signaled an emergency or evacuation	33	25	37	3
Because you don't consider Connecticut to be a likely place for such a large-scale emergency to happen	22	25	43	6
You were too busy at the time doing other things to pay much attention to it	21	24	50	3
Because your neighbors were not evacuating	18	18	51	10

Base: those who experienced the broadcast and did not express significant concern (n = 254)

VI. Future Responses to Emergencies

Impact On Faith In The EBS

Despite the indifferent response to the erroneous emergency broadcast, the majority of all Connecticut residents (77%) say that the accidental February 1st alert had no real effect on their faith in the Emergency Broadcast System. Still, almost one-fifth (19%) of state residents disclose that the false alarm decreased their faith in the system a lot (9%) or a little (10%).

- Residents who say the February 1st emergency broadcast message decreased their faith in the system “a lot” include:
 - Younger residents 18-30 (16%) vs. older residents 62+ (3%)
 - Nonwhite residents (18%) vs. white (7%)
 - Male (14%) vs. Female (4%)
 - Residents who work outside their home (11%) vs. those who don't (3%)
 - Residents not living with a significant other (13%) vs. those who do (6%)
 - Residents with a ‘go kit’ (24%) vs. those without one (6%)

Likely Future Reactions

If, in the future, they saw or heard an emergency broadcast message instructing them to evacuate their area, nearly all Connecticut residents (90%) say they would be very or somewhat likely to switch to some form of news media – whether radio, TV, or Internet – to try to confirm the emergency.

About 8-in-10 residents (77%) say they would be very/somewhat likely to call a friend, neighbor, or relative to confirm the emergency and about 7 in 10 (69%) would be very to somewhat likely to call local emergency personnel. A smaller proportion of Connecticut residents (43%) would be very or somewhat likely to call the local town hall to confirm the emergency. Just over half (54%) of residents would be very (27%) or somewhat likely (27%) to stay at home and wait it out for as long as they could.

Connecticut residents, however, are evenly split over whether or not they should evacuate immediately if they saw or heard an emergency broadcast message in the future. Half of residents say they would be very (21%) to somewhat likely (27%) to evacuate while the other half would be not too (22%) or not at all likely (27%) to evacuate.

Likely Reactions To Future Emergency Broadcasts

	Very likely %	Somewhat likely %	A little likely %	Not likely at all %	Don't Know %
Switch to a news station on the radio, TV or Internet to try to confirm the emergency	74	16	3	6	1
Call a friend, neighbor or relative to try to confirm the emergency	56	21	9	13	1
Call local emergency personnel such as police or fire department to confirm emergency	47	22	11	16	3
Stay at home and wait it out for as long as you could	27	27	17	23	7
Call local town hall to confirm	22	21	21	33	1
Evacuate immediately	21	27	22	27	3

Base: all CT residents (n = 503)

VII. Who To Believe?

Credibility – Who Would Be Believed?

Connecticut residents were asked what sources they would be likely to believe in the event of a serious emergency.

Nearly three-quarters of Connecticut residents say they would be very likely to believe the Governor or some other high level state official (74%) or a local policeman or fireman (74%) if they heard from them that there was a serious emergency in their area. An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency and *offered specific details* about the emergency would be the second most believable source of information about an emergency, as 58% of the Connecticut population would be very likely to believe it. Local officials such as a town mayor or first selectman are also considered to be very trusted sources of information by 57% of the surveyed residents.

Residents are more prone to be very likely to believe a national news reporter (50%) than a local reporter (37%) informing them of a serious emergency in their area. At least 28% of state residents would be very likely to believe sources such as their ministers or religious leaders (35%), their employers (35%), and their closest neighbors (28%) if these sources told them that there was a serious emergency in their area. Less than 1-in-10 residents would be very likely to believe that there was a serious emergency in their area if they saw or heard an automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency, but offered no specifics. Clearly, specifics are needed in order to achieve credibility.

(table on next page)

How Likely To Believe The Following

	Very likely %	Somewhat likely %	A little likely %	Not likely at all %	Not applicable %
A local policeman or fireman	74	21	4	1	*
Governor or other high level state official	74	17	2	6	*
An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency and offered specific details about the emergency	58	30	7	4	0
Town mayor or first selectmen	57	31	4	7	0
A national news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	50	35	8	5	0
A local news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	37	44	11	6	1
Your boss or employer	35	28	8	9	17
Your minister or religious leader	35	26	12	12	13
Your closest neighbor	28	41	13	15	2
An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency, but offered no specifics	9	33	31	24	0

Base: all CT residents (n = 503)

Influential – Who Would Cause You To Take Action?

State residents were also asked how likely they would be to listen and do what they were told by the same sources, if they were told to evacuate the area immediately. The responses in this area were very similar to those in the credibility area.

Nearly 7-in-10 Connecticut residents would be very likely to evacuate the area immediately if they were told to do so by the Governor or some other high level state official (69%) or a local policeman or fireman (67%). Residents are equally as prone to be very likely to evacuate immediately if they were asked to do so by their town mayor or first selectman (52%) as an automated broadcast message offering specifics about the emergency (51%). A national reporter (42%) is a bit more likely to be believed than a local reporter (32%), according to Connecticut residents.

Out of all the sources mentioned, an automated message on TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency but *offered no specifics* is the least authoritative source, as less than 1-in-10 resident would be very likely to evacuate the area immediately as a result of such a broadcast.

(table on next page)

How Likely To Do As Told By The Following

	Very likely %	Somewhat likely %	A little likely %	Not likely at all %	Not Applicable %
The governor or other high level state official	69	24	2	5	0
A local policeman or fireman	67	24	4	4	0
Town mayor or first selectmen	52	32	9	6	0
An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency and offered specific details about the emergency	51	33	7	8	0
A national news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	42	34	12	12	0
Your boss or employer	33	29	10	11	16
A local news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	32	43	15	9	1
Your minister or religious leader	31	26	13	15	14
Your closest neighbor	20	40	18	17	3
An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency, but offered no specifics	9	32	27	31	*

Base: all CT residents (n = 503)

VIII. Home, Family, Preparedness and Evacuation

Home As Refuge

Most Connecticut residents would stay in their homes until they had no choice but to evacuate. Three quarters of residents (75%) agree with the statement: “If there is an emergency, I’d rather stay in my home as long as I could, until I am 100% sure that I have no choice but to evacuate”.

Children and Spouses

The majority of state residents with children would make sure they had their children with them before they evacuated. Nearly 7-in-10 (64%) residents with children aged 18 or younger would only evacuate with their children in the same vehicle. Another 30% would evacuate without their children if they were certain their children were also being evacuated.

Connecticut residents are less impacted by their spouses or significant other than they are about their children when it comes to evacuation. Just about one-third of residents (33%) currently living with a spouse or significant other would only evacuate if their spouse or significant other was with them, compared to almost two-thirds of respondents (61%) who would evacuate without their spouse or significant other if reassured that they were being evacuated as well.

“Go Kit”

When asked if they have a ‘go kit’ in their home, a ‘go kit’ being defined as an already-prepared collection of the essential things that one would need to take with him/her in the case of an evacuation, only 16% of Connecticut residents say they had one ready in their home.

Connecticut residents who said that they did not have a ‘go kit’ in their home were asked where they would go to look for information to find what to put in a ‘go kit’. Nearly 4-in-10 residents mentioned the Internet in general. Among other places to look for information on how to put a ‘go kit’ together, residents mentioned asking first responders or 911 (7%), their own experience or common sense (7%). Residents would also check with federal, state, and local government organizations to provide information on ‘go kits,’ either on their websites or in other manners. About one-third (32%) of residents without a ‘go kit’ say they have no idea where they would look for information.

IX. Project Staff

Project Staff – CSRA, University of Connecticut

George Pettinico
Associate Director
CSRA
george.pettinico@uconn.edu

Alexandre Sene
Project Manager
CSRA
alexandre.sene@uconn.edu

Chase Harrison
Chief Methodologist
CSRA
chase.harrison@uconn.edu

Project Staff – Institute for Crisis, Disaster and Risk Management, George Washington University

Jerome Conley
Senior Research Scientist
Institute for Crisis, Disaster and Risk Management
The George Washington University
jconley@gwu.edu

Annotated Questionnaire

IX. Annotated Questionnaire

Q1. A state-wide broadcast of the Emergency Broadcast System took place on Tuesday, February 1st early in the afternoon. Did you, by any chance, personally see or hear that broadcast **WHEN IT AIRED?**

Yes	9%
No	91%
Don't know	0%
Count (# of interviews)	(503)

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO PERSONALLY SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST WHEN IT AIRED)

Q1A. Did you see or hear the broadcast on television, radio or some other way? (ACCEPT UP TO 4 CHOICES)

Television	75%
Radio	22%
Pager	1%
Other (Specify)	1%
Count	(267)

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO PERSONALLY SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST WHEN IT AIRED)

Q1B. When you saw or heard the broadcast, were you home, at work, at another person's home, in your car or somewhere else?

Home	75%
Work	12%
Another House	3%
Car/enroute from one location to another	8%
Somewhere else/Other	1%
Count	(267)

(ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO EXPERIENCED THE ALERT AT HOME)

Q1C. How typical is it that you have a radio or TV on at HOME during the early afternoon - very typical, somewhat typical, not that typical or not typical at all?

Very typical	61%
Somewhat typical	21%
Not that typical	10%
Not typical at all	9%
Count	(200)

(ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO EXPERIENCED THE ALERT AT WORK)

Q1C. How typical is it that you have a radio or TV on at WORK during the early afternoon - very typical, somewhat typical, not that typical or not typical at all?

Very typical	69%
Somewhat typical	19%
Not that typical	3%
Not typical at all	9%
Count	(32)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO DID NOT SAY “YES” IN Q#1)

Q2. Did anyone call you or alert you while the emergency alert was being broadcast, not later in the day, but right at that time?

Yes	2%
No	98%
Count	(462)

(ASKED OF THOSE CALLED OR ALERTED BY SOMEONE ELSE)

Q2A. Who called or alerted you about the broadcast? (ACCEPT UP TO 9 RESPONSES)

Spouse	9%
Companion/significant other	3%
Parent	6%
Sibling	6%
Other relative	20%
Neighbor	3%
Friend	14%
Coworker/employer	14%
Other	23%
Don't know	3%
Count	(34)

(ASKED OF THOSE CALLED OR ALERTED BY SOMEONE ELSE)

Q2B. Where did that person hear about the broadcast? (ACCEPT UP TO 4 RESPONSES)

Television	66%
Radio	14%
Internet	3%
Other (Specify)	11%
Don't know	6%
Count	(34)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO DID NOT SEE OR HEAR THE BROADCAST FIRSTHAND, OR BE ALERTED ABOUT IT WHILE IT HAPPENED)

Q3. Did you hear about the broadcast after it was known to be a false alert - either later that day or later in the week?

Yes	60%
No	40%
Don't know	0%
Count	(455)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST FIRSTHAND, OR WERE ALERTED ABOUT IT WHILE IT HAPPENED)

Q4. Where did you hear about it? (ACCEPT UP TO 6 RESPONSES)

TV news	61%
Radio news	18%
Newspaper	4%
Internet	2%
From another person	13%
Other (Specify)	1%
Don't know	0%
Count	(286)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST FIRSTHAND, OR WERE ALERTED ABOUT IT WHILE IT HAPPENED)

Q5. Thinking back to when you first heard the emergency broadcast that day, or were informed of the broadcast when it occurred, how would you describe your immediate gut reaction?

<u>Disbelief --- net (28%)</u>	
False alarm/error/didn't believe it	21%
Just a test/Common test	7%
<u>Fear --- net (20%)</u>	
Concerned/alarmed/frightened/panic	15%
Thought it was real/I believed the alert	3%
Terror/Terrorist Attack/Sept 11th	2%
<u>Confusion --- net (16%)</u>	
Questioned the alert/Confused	13%
What's happening/what's going on	3%
<u>Ignored it --- net (11%)</u>	
Nothing/not concerned/ignored it	11%
<u>Other</u>	
Surprised	6%
Weird/strange/stupid/funny	6%
Checked other sources & waited for more info, then ignored	4%
Annoyed/Irritated	4%
Calm	1%
Other	2%
Don't Know	3%
Count	(301)

***(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST
FIRSTHAND, OR WERE ALERTED ABOUT IT WHILE IT HAPPENED)***

Q6A-J. Which of the following did you do, if any, when you first heard the broadcast, or were informed of the broadcast?

	Did	Did NOT do	Don't Know	N
a. Looked outside to see if you could see anything	29%	70%	1%	301
b. Turned to other TV or radio stations to get more information	39	60	1	301
c. Looked on the internet for more information	10	90	1	301
d. Called local police, firefighters or other emergency personnel	6	93	*	301
e. Called local political offices – such as the mayor's office or town hall	2	98	*	301
f. Called a neighbor or someone else close by	14	85	*	301
g. Called a friend or relative who did not live close by	14	86	*	301
h. Evacuated your home and attempted to drive out of the state	1	99	*	301
i. Checked your home supplies to see if you had enough essentials, such as food and water	13	87	*	301
j. Headed to a basement or safe area in your home	4	95	*	301

***(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST
FIRSTHAND, OR WERE ALERTED ABOUT IT WHILE IT HAPPENED)***

Q6K. Is there anything else that you did in reaction to the broadcast that I did not already mention?

No, nothing else	77%
Ignored it/knew it was a mistake	6%
Paid attention & waited for more information	5%
Called family/friends/coworkers	4%
Checked level of supplies/made preparation	2%
Turned to other TV or radio stations/checked other sources	2%
Called local police/emergency personnel	2%
Checked outside for sirens/other commotion	1%
Other	2%
Count	(301)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE WHO SAW OR HEARD THE BROADCAST FIRSTHAND, OR WERE ALERTED ABOUT IT WHILE IT HAPPENED)

Q7. Still thinking about when you first saw or heard the broadcast, or were informed of the broadcast, how concerned were you - very concerned, somewhat concerned, a little concerned or not concerned at all?

Very concerned	16%
Somewhat concerned	22%
A little concerned	24%
Not concerned at all	39%
Refused	0%
Count	(301)

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO SAY THEY WERE NOT VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE BROADCAST)

Q8A-G. You say that you were NOT very concerned by the broadcast when it aired or when you were informed. For each of the following, please say if it was a major reason, a minor reason or not a reason at all as to why you were NOT very concerned by the broadcast when it first aired...

	Major Reason	Minor reason	Not a reason at all	Does not apply	Don't Know	Refused	N
a. Because the emergency broadcast did not mention any specific threat	58%	17%	21%	3%	1%	1%	254
b. Because the broadcast message did not mention any specific area – other than the entire state of Connecticut	49	18	24	5	3	1	254
c. Because you could not get confirmation from other news sources on TV, radio or Internet	39	17	33	9	2	1	254
d. Because you did not see any activity on the street that signaled an emergency or evacuation	33	25	37	3	1	1	254
e. Because your neighbors were not evacuating	18	18	51	10	2	1	254
f. Because you don't consider Connecticut to be a likely place for such a large-scale emergency to happen	22	25	43	6	4	1	254
g. You were too busy at the time doing other things to pay much attention to it	21	24	50	3	1	1	254

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO SAY THEY WERE NOT VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE BROADCAST)

Q8K. Is there any other reason why you were NOT very concerned by the broadcast when it first aired, other than those already mentioned?

No, nothing else	59%
Knew it was a mistake	10%
Heard signal only but no detail information/instructions	6%
Thought it was a test/routine tests	6%
Questioned message - how to evacuate a whole state	4%
No widespread panic, i.e. friends, relatives, coworker	4%
Checked outside for indication of an emergency; none	3%
Not worried about an attack in CT	2%
No confirmation from other news sources	2%
Ignored message/didn't care	2%
Other	3%
Refused	0%
Count	(254)

(ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO WERE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE BROADCAST)

Q9. What type of emergency did you think it was?

Terrorism	49%
Nuclear plant/power plant	6%
Weather/natural phenomenon	2%
Other	6%
Don't know (had no idea)	36%
Count	(47)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q10. As you probably know by now, the emergency broadcast message sent on February 1st was sent in error. There was no emergency. Has this mistake decreased your faith in the Emergency Broadcast System, increased your faith in the system or has it had no

Decreased a lot	9%
Decreased a little	10%
No real effect/No change	77%
Increased a little	2%
Increased a lot	1%
Don't know	1%
Count	(503)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q11A-F. In the future, if you saw or heard an emergency broadcast message on the TV or radio, asking you to evacuate your area, how likely would you be to do each of the following - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely or not likely at all?

(RANDOMIZE ORDER)	Very likely	Somewhat likely	A little likely	Not likely at all	Don't Know	Refused	N
a. Evacuate immediately	21%	27%	22%	27%	3%	*	503
b. Switch to a news station on the radio, TV or Internet to try to confirm the emergency	74	16	3	6	1	*	503
c. Call a friend, neighbor or relative to try to confirm the emergency	56	21	9	13	1	*	503
d. Call local emergency personnel such as police or fire department to confirm emergency	47	22	11	16	3	*	503
e. Call local town hall to confirm emergency	22	21	21	33	1	1	503
f. Stay at home and wait it out for as long as you could	27	27	17	23	7	0	503

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q11G. Is there anything else that you might do in response to an emergency broadcast message asking you to evacuate, that I have not already mentioned?

No, nothing else	78%
Call family/parents/kids/spouse/neighbors	5%
Get family/kids	4%
Find more information (general)	2%
Call 911/first responders/hospital	1%
Gather essentials/personal effects	1%
Check the Internet	0%
Check the radio	0%
Move to cellar/emergency location	0%
Other	6%
Don't Know	1%
Count	(503)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q12. If you heard from the following sources that there was a serious emergency in your area, how likely would you be to BELIEVE them - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely or not likely at all to believe them? First...

(RANDOMIZE ORDER)	Very likely	Somewhat likely	A little likely	Not likely at all	Not applicable	Don't Know	Refused	N
a. An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency, but offered no specifics	9%	33%	31%	24%	0%	3%	*	503
b. An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency and offered specific details about the emergency	58	30	7	4	0	1	0	503
c. A local news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	37	44	11	6	1	1	*	503
d. A national news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	50	35	8	5	0	1	*	503
e. A local policeman or fireman	74	21	4	1	*	*	*	503
f. Town mayor or first selectmen	57	31	4	7	0	1	0	503
g. Governor or other high level state official	74	17	2	6	*	1	*	503
h. Your closest neighbor	28	41	13	15	2	0		503
i. Your boss or employer	35	28	8	9	17	1	1	503
j. Your minister or religious leader	35	26	12	12	13	2	0	503

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q13A-J. If you were told by each of the following that you had to evacuate the area immediately, how likely would you be to immediately do as they say - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely or not likely at all to immediately do as they say? First...

(RANDOMIZE ORDER)	Very likely	Somewhat likely	A little likely	Not likely at all	Not Applicable	DK	Ref	Count
a. An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency, but offered no specifics	9%	32%	27%	31%	*	1%	0%	503
b. An automated message on the TV or radio from the Emergency Broadcast System that informed of an emergency and offered specific details about the emergency	51	33	7	8	0	1	0	503
c. A local news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	32	43	15	9	1	0	0	503
d. A national news reporter reporting on the TV or radio	42	34	12	12	0	0	0	503
e. A local policeman or fireman	67	24	4	4	0	0	0	503
f. Town mayor or first selectmen	52	32	9	6	0	0	0	503
g. The governor or other high level state official	69	24	2	5	0	1	0	503
h.. Your closest neighbor	20	40	18	17	3	3	0	503
i. Your boss or employer	33	29	10	11	16	0	1	503
j. Your minister or religious leader	31	26	13	15	14	1	1	503

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

Q14. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: If there is an emergency, I'd rather stay in my home as long as I could, until I am 100% sure that I have no choice but to evacuate?

Agree	75%
Disagree	21%
Don't Know	3%
Refused	0%
Count	(503)

(ASKED OF EVERYONE)

QDKT. Do you have a 'go kit' in your home - meaning an already-prepared collection of the essential things that you would take with you in the case of an evacuation?

Yes	16%
No	83%
Refused	1%
Count	(503)

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO DO NOT HAVE A 'GO KIT' IN THEIR HOME)

QDKT2. Where would you look for information to find out what to put into a go kit?

Check the Internet - General/other	38%
Ask 911/first responders/fire dept/police/hospital	7%
Myself/common sense/my own experience	7%
Check media/TV/radio/general	3%
Check newspapers	3%
Wouldn't make one/not interested	3%
State/local govt. /Governor's office/Info line	2%
Ask friends/family	1%
Check the Internet - State/federal govt.	1%
Check local news	1%
The Red Cross	1%
Other	2%
Don't Know/No idea	32%
Refused	0%
Count	(425)

IQD1. I now have a few questions for classification purposes...

QD1. Do you currently work outside of the home?

	General Population
Yes	69%
No	31%
Refused	0%
Count	(503)

(ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO WORK OUTSIDE THEIR HOME)

QD1A. On days that you work, are you typically home in the early afternoon?

	General Population
Yes	27%
No	70%
Don't	3%
Refused	0%
Count	(355)

QD2. Do you have children aged 18 or younger who live with you either part or all of the time?

	General Population
Yes	41%
No	59%
Refused	0%
Count	(503)

QD3. Are any of your children aged...?

	General Population
Yes – 5 or younger	9%
Yes – 6 to 12	15%
Yes – 13 to 18	16%
No	59%
Refused	1%
Count	(503)

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO SAY THEY HAVE AT LEAST ONE CHILD AGED 18 OR YOUNGER LIVING WITH THEM)

QD4. Which statement do you agree with more: I would only evacuate if my kids were with me in the same vehicle OR I would evacuate without my kids, if I felt certain that they were also being evacuated from their schools or wherever else they were.

	General Population
Only evacuate with kids in the same vehicle	64%
Evacuate without kids if certain they were evacuated	30%
Other (Specify)	4%
Don't Know	2%
Refused	0%
Count	(217)

QD5. Do you currently live with a spouse or significant other?

	General Population
Yes	58%
No	42%
Refused	0%
Count	(503)

(ASKED OF THOSE WHO SAY THEY CURRENTLY LIVE WITH A SPOUSE OR SIGNIFICANT OTHER)

QD6. Which statement do you agree with more: I would only evacuate if my spouse or significant other were with me in the same vehicle OR I would evacuate without my spouse or significant other, if I felt certain that he or she were also being evacuated from wherever they were.

	General Population
Only evacuate with spouse or significant other were with me	33%
Evacuate without spouse or significant other if reassured	61%
Other (Specify)	4%
Don't Know	2%
Count	(357)

QD7. Age:

	General Population
18-30	23%
31-40	21%
41- 61	35%
62 and older	18%
DK/REF	3%
Count	(503)

QD8. What was the last grade of school you completed?

	General Population
Some high school (9-11)	4%
High School (12)	49%
Some College (1-3 years)	23%
College Grad (4 years)	14%
Post Graduate (Beyond 4 years)	9%
Refused	1%
Count	(503)

QD9. How would you describe where you live: city, small town or suburb, or rural area?

	General Population
City	23%
Small town/suburb	61%
Rural	14%
Don't Know	1%
Refused	0%
Count	(503)

QD11. Household Income

	General Population
Under \$20,000	19%
\$20,000 to less than \$40,000	16%
\$40,000 to less than \$50,000	10%
\$50,000 to less than \$75,000	17%
\$75,000 or more	24%
Don't know/Refused	13%
Count	(503)

QD11. How would you describe your race or ethnic background? (ASK OPEN ENDED, READ ONLY IF NECESSARY)

	General Population
Black/African American	6%
White/Caucasian	81%
Hispanic/Latino	7%
Asian	1%
Native American	1%
Biracial (Vol.)	0%
Other	1%
Don't know	0%
Refused	3%
Count	(503)

QD12. Gender

	General Population
Male	49%
Female	51%
Count	(503)

Those are all the questions. Thank you for your time and cooperation.