

# **Cognitive Interviewing Evaluation of the Survey on Emerging Traumatic Events: Surveillance (Tier I) Questionnaire**

Results of cognitive laboratory interviews conducted July 29 – September 16, 2004

Kristen Miller and Stephanie Willson  
National Center for Health Statistics  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Tier I Interviewing Team: Kristen Miller, Lisa Moses, Paul Beatty, Ainura Hoessel, Eric Hjermstad, and Karen Whitaker

## **1. Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to document the results of cognitive testing on the Emerging Traumatic Events Survey. This survey is designed to be a multi-tiered approach to monitoring the nation's emotional, cognitive and behavioral well-being with regard to extreme events, such as terrorist attacks or natural disasters. This project is the outcome of an interagency agreement between the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and the National Center for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (NCPTSD). The objective is to design questionnaires that assess and track responses to large-scale traumatic events that may significantly impact public mental health. This is to be achieved by implementing two questionnaires (Tier I and Tier II), each designed to capture different phases of human response to traumatic events. Tier I is a surveillance tool which will provide baseline indicators of mental health prior to a traumatic event.

The majority of this report (section 3) is dedicated to presenting a question-by-question analysis of the Tier I questionnaire. Emphasis is placed on those questions that generated notable response error, that is, they did not capture the information they were designed to measure. The discussion of these questions includes descriptions of how respondents interpreted question intent, explanations of why and how the question failed and, where appropriate, recommendations for question improvement. Section two briefly describes the methodology of cognitive interviewing, outlines interviewing procedures, and discusses how respondents were chosen to participate.

## **2. Methods**

Intensive verbal probing techniques were the primary cognitive interviewing method used for the project. With this technique, interviewers probe for other information relevant to each administered survey question. This yields rich and detailed information on how respondents answered the question, what they were thinking when answering, and how they interpreted the meaning of the question. This information allows the analyst to determine whether the question language is too complex in general or whether one word in particular may not be understood by some respondents. The appropriateness of response categories can also be evaluated with this procedure, as can the ability of respondents to draw upon their own experiences and knowledge to answer the question effectively. Because this intensive interviewing method produces rich detail on the question-response process, not only does it allow the interviewer to identify *which*

questions and/or response categories are problematic, it also shows *why and how* questions are problematic, leading to possible strategies for improving question design.

### Procedures

Twenty two face-to-face interviews were conducted for Tier I in the NCHS Questionnaire Design Research Laboratory (QDRL) between July 29 and September 16, 2004. Prior to the interview, respondents filled out several forms, including a consent form for video-taping the interview. Once paperwork was completed, the interviewer described the mission of NCHS, the purpose of the current study, and how the interview would take place. Interviews lasted one hour, and a \$40 token of appreciation was given to each respondent for their efforts.

During the interview, participants were asked each survey item and were then probed to explain their answer. Each interview varied depending on the type of traumatic event that the respondent had experienced. Typical follow-up questions included, “How so?” and “Why do you say that?” Participants’ interpretations of key words were also examined and compared from participant to participant.

Because of the degree of interpretative variation found in the initial interviews, an iterative approach was used; that is, changes to questions were made and tested during the interviewing process. For example, researchers had originally intended to design questions so that respondents would include many types of traumatic events, from acts of violence (e.g. 911, the DC area sniper) to natural disasters (e.g. Hurricane Ivan, Californian wildfires). However, the first few interviews revealed that individuals’ interpretations of a “traumatic event” differed dramatically. Furthermore, some respondents held extremely broad conceptualizations and included events that were outside the scope of research (such as the death of a loved one). Because these interpretations were not comparable (meaning the data would not be comparable), these questions were altered to include only terrorist attacks. Throughout the interviews, questions were additionally revised to further hone the definition of terrorism for respondents. Through the course of interviewing, then, problems were identified, remedied and then re-tested. However, particular attention should be given to questions 13 through 17. These questions were added towards the end of the testing process and were, therefore, unable to undergo formal cognitive testing. QDRL staff conducted 10 informal interviews in order to gain at least a preliminary understanding of how respondents interpret these questions.

### Respondents

The demographic breakdown of respondents appears in Table 1 below. In a manner typical of most NCHS cognitive lab projects, participants were recruited through newspaper advertisements and by re-contacting previous respondents who met the criteria of this study. A screening process was employed over the telephone to determine the caller’s eligibility for participation. Because Tier I questions focused primarily on respondents’ experiences and reactions to terrorism, particular effort was made to recruit individuals who had experienced some type of terrorist activity (e.g. the pentagon attacks, the anthrax letters, and the DC area sniper).

Table 1: Demographic summary of respondents

---

	<u>Tier I</u>
Age	
18-24	0
25-40	1
>40	21
Gender	
Female	7
Male	15
Education	
< H.S.	2
H.S.	7
> H.S.	13
Income	
< 20,000	7
20,000 +	14
DK	1

---

### 3. Results

During the course of the cognitive interviews, questions were revised and tested in an iterative fashion. The final questionnaire appears in Appendix A, and the original questionnaire appears in Appendix B. By far, the greatest source of response difficulty was generated by the concept of terrorism. Although terrorism has become a more common word, there is no single definition understood across all people, and as a result, respondents demonstrated multiple interpretations. The concept of terrorism meant different things to different respondents depending on their own particular experiences. In fact, some respondents even switched definitions throughout the course of the interview, depending on the context of the question. In light of this difficulty, the following strategies were used to develop the questionnaire:

Clarify concepts: Special consideration went into laying out a definition of terrorism so that respondents approached each question consistently. This involved examination of what terrorism meant to respondents, and then incorporating that understanding into a workable introduction statement. This involved several iterations of the definition development.

Re-organize: The questionnaire was re-organized so that the section on direct experiences began the questionnaire. Because these questions were much more tangible—as opposed to the questions on attitudes or emotional reactions to terrorism, the direct experience questions helped to define terrorism as well as to set the parameters for respondents when answering questions in the other sections.

Strive for conciseness: Questions were shortened or eliminated if they were deemed repetitive or wordy. The extraneous verbiage tended to create confusion for respondents, as well as generate room for additional layers of interpretation.

### **Question by Question Review**

The following is a question review of each finalized question for the Tier 1 Baseline Survey. For each question, discussion will 1) describe the development process for the intended construct, specifically, how the final question was derived and the various preceding iterations, 2) the ways in which the final question was interpreted, and 3) potential response errors. Finally, suggested wording changes will be included for those questions identified by QDRL as having notable response problems.

#### **Question 1**

**Final Version**: The next questions are about your direct experiences with terrorism. When I use the word ‘terrorism,’ I mean an attack against the American people, such as the September 11 attacks in 2001 and the anthrax letters in 2002. With that definition in mind...

- a. **Were you ever within 5 miles of a terrorist attack at the time it occurred?**  
Yes  
No (Go to c)
- b. **Were you injured?**  
Yes  
No
- c. **Were you ever forced to evacuate a building because of a concern about terrorism?**  
Yes  
No
- d. **Did you ever have a close friend or relative, not just an acquaintance, who was within 5 miles of a terrorist attack at the time it occurred?**  
Yes  
No (Go to f)
- e. **Were they injured?**  
Yes  
No
- f. **Did you ever help in the recovery or clean up after a terrorist attack?**  
Yes  
No

### Introduction statement

Overwhelmingly, the primary source of confusion for this question was the lack of a workable definition of terrorism. In the beginning, designers hoped the questionnaire would accommodate respondents' experiences with all kinds of catastrophic events, not simply experiences with terrorism. Consequently, in the initial version of the questionnaire, the first question set forth a very broad scope of the types of events that respondents could include:

Sometimes things happen to people that are unusually or especially frightening, horrible, or traumatic. Have you ever had this kind of experience? Yes/No

Only if a respondent asked for clarification, would the following statement be read:

For example, have you ever experienced an event such as a serious accident or fire, physical or sexual assault, earthquake or flood, war, seeing someone be killed or seriously injured, or having a loved one die through homicide or suicide?

Because this first question did not ask about a specific or discrete type event, but rather asked about a relative experience which was open to subjective interpretation, respondents invariably answered yes to this question—they simply thought of the times in their own lives that they deemed as being especially traumatic or frightening. Several respondents immediately answered thinking of the loss of loved ones from natural death. Another woman responded yes, thinking of the time that her paddleboat tipped over in the tidal basin. Another respondent considered the time that her granddaughter had cut her eye. From the respondents' perspective, they were providing accurate and relevant information consistent with the type of information being requested in the question. Consequently, none of the respondents asked for clarification—they all could relate to the feeling of fright or horror to the extent that they could provide an answer.

For the purposes of the cognitive interviews, interviewers did read the follow-up statement to the respondent afterward in the discussion of the question. In several cases, the respondents changed their answer, realizing that they had used too broad of a definition. For the respondent who had initially thought of the time that her paddle boat tipped, it was only after the clarifying statement was read that she realized that she should consider the time that she was sexually assaulted—without the statement it did not occur to her that the question was asking about sexual assaults.

With such broad parameters set in the initial questionnaire, respondents incorporated many interpretations of terrorism into their responses, most of which were not in agreement with the survey intent. Some examples include living in a bad neighborhood, robbery, assault, Timothy McVeigh, and Viet Nam experiences.

This lack of discrete definition established upfront generated problems throughout the questionnaire. Depending on respondents' interpretations, questions about concerns over terrorism, avoiding exposure and feeling safe, made no sense or took on entirely different meanings than what was originally intended. Additionally, without a set definition in the beginning, some respondents' interpretations of terrorism shifted throughout the course of the interview. For example, in the beginning of his interview, one man who had just retired from the

State Department defined terrorism strictly as a foreign attack against the American government. By the middle of the questionnaire, his definition had expanded to include his own political ideology, including the war in Iraq and the Abu Ghraib Prison scandal.

To address these problems, a definitional statement which set forth the parameters of terrorism was introduced at the beginning of the questionnaire. Various definitions of terrorism were tested to assist respondents in what should and should not be included. The first version included an explicit, detailed description:

The next questions are about your direct experiences with terrorism. When I use the word terrorism, I mean things such as the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks on September 11, 2001 and the anthrax letters in 2002. I do not want you to include things like living in a neighborhood with gang violence or having an abusive spouse. With that definition in mind, did you ever have any of the following direct experiences with terrorism while in the US? Please do not include any experiences you had while overseas.

Despite the lengthy narrative and use of specific examples, respondents still grappled with the question intent. Therefore, further interviews were conducted, with an emphasis on gaining an understanding of how and why respondents continued to struggle with the concept of terrorism.

Throughout the course of discussions of “what terrorism means,” several core dimensions that constituted a general definition of terrorism were identified. Respondents’ definitions of terrorism were based, not so much on the act itself, but on the characteristics of the perpetrator (e.g. Are they foreigners? What is their motivation?) and on the characteristics of the victim (e.g. Is more than one person killed? Is the attack random?) In conceptualizing a definition of terrorism, respondents considered the characterization of victims in terms of their numbers (an individual vs. a group) and their arbitrariness (random vs. specific). Perpetrators were considered in terms of being insiders (i.e. Americans) or outsiders (i.e. foreigners), and also have two dimensions, affiliation (organized group vs. loner) and motivation (political/ideological vs. “temporary insanity”). Tables 2, 3, and 4 graphically depict the many dimensions that respondents considered when framing a definition of terrorism.

Table 2: Dimensions of terrorism – victims

VICTIMS		
	Individual	Group
Random		
Specific		

Table 3: Dimensions of terrorism – Perpetrators (outsiders)

---

PERPETRATOR (OUTSIDER)		
	Organized	Loner
Political		
Insane		

---

Table 4: Dimensions of terrorism – Perpetrators (insiders)

---

PERPETRATOR (INSIDER)		
	Organized	Loner
Political		
Insane		

---

Without a definitional statement outlining these dimensions, respondents needed to generate their own personal definition of terrorism so that they could then formulate a response to the question. This created a great deal of cognitive burden for respondents (who sometimes asked the interviewer to provide “more information” or answered with a “that depends”). Perhaps more serious, these make-shift interpretations of *terrorist attack* varied immensely across respondents. For example, one respondent saw police brutality as a form of terrorism, another included burglary in her definition, and still another decided that one person could potentially “terrorize” another.

Although examples of terrorism were included in the question as a way to help respondents understand what types of events to focus on, alone they did not go far enough in clarifying the term *terrorism*. For instance, despite the fact that the Anthrax letters of 2002 were included in the introductory statement, at least three participants did NOT include anthrax in their answers, even though one received his mail from, and lived within walking distance of the Brentwood Post Office. This is because they did not define those events as a terrorist act (“we never found out who it was”). Lacking knowledge of the perpetrator made it difficult for some respondents to judge whether or not those letters constituted terrorism.

As these dimensions of the definition of terrorism became clearer, the next iteration included a phrase that would aim to capture some of these identified themes. The introductory statement became:

The next questions are about your direct experiences with terrorism. When I use the word ‘terrorism,’ I mean an attack against the American people, such as the September 11 attacks in 2001 and the anthrax letters in 2002. With that definition in mind...

This final version defines terrorism through at least some of the dimensions that were identified in the cognitive interviews. Specifically, “American people” is meant to convey the idea that the perpetrators are an organized group, and that the potential victims are groups of people rather than a single individual.

This definitional approach was coupled with discrete examples (i.e. the September 11 attacks and the anthrax letters) which helped to establish a context for the entire questionnaire. However, because the introduction incorporates some dimensions and does not only rely on examples, it provides a foundation for respondents to conceptualize potential or future attacks—this was necessary for them to be able to answer the other sections on fear and preparedness.

It should also be noted that this final version is the more concise one, thereby reducing interviewer and respondent burden—especially desirable for telephone surveys. It also appeared that some respondents did not hear the entire instruction. The list of examples of what not to include (i.e. living in a neighborhood with gang violence or having an abusive spouse) compelled respondents to consider these types of experiences as acts of terrorism. It was concluded that it is best to provide examples of what should be included and then provide definitions of the underlying dimensions.

#### Questions A - G

The initial version (below) of questions underwent numerous revisions. The majority of changes were intended to reduce overall burden as well as to clarify concepts for respondents. For example, questions were reordered to take advantage of logical skip patterns, thereby reducing the number of questions for respondents who did not experience a terrorist attack; it made little sense to ask respondents who had never experienced an attack if they were injured.

- A. Were you ever forced to evacuate a building in the US because of a terrorism scare?
- B. Were you ever in a neighborhood in the US at a time terrorists released a dangerous biological or chemical agent?
- C. Were you ever in the neighborhood at the time of any other terrorist attack?
- D. Were you ever injured in a terrorist attack in the US?
- E. Did you ever have a close friend or relative, not just an acquaintance, who was injured or killed in a terrorist attack in the US?
- F. Not counting the people who were injured or killed, did you ever have a close friend or relative who was in the neighborhood at the time of a terrorist attack?
- G. Were you ever directly exposed to any other kind of terrorist attack in the US?

Additionally, questions that were deemed repetitive were dropped to reduce burden. Specifically, Question C (Were you ever in the neighborhood at the time of any other terrorist attack?) did not provide additional information and was, consequently, dropped. Instead of dropping Question G (Were you ever directly exposed to any other kind of terrorist attack in the US?) which could also be deemed repetitive, was changed to the following wording: Did you ever help in the recovery or clean up after a terrorist attack? This new wording helped to avoid repetitiveness as well as to clarify what was meant by the phrase *exposure to an attack*.

Question B, the biological agent question, was also ultimately dropped because of the difficulty respondents experienced in distinguishing the various types of terrorist attacks; they were simply not relevant to respondents. Interestingly, several of the respondents lived, worked near, or had their mail come through the D.C. post office that had carried the anthrax letters. Despite the clear introduction that mentioned this event, respondents did not conceptualize this as a form of terrorism and no one answered yes. It was only through discussion of the question and reminding respondents of the introduction that they realized that they could have answered yes.

Finally, respondents' interpretation of *neighborhood* was extremely broad and was based less upon actual distance and more upon how traumatized they felt by the events of 911. For example, one respondent who was very shaken, stated that she thought neighborhood meant the entire DC metropolitan area and so responded yes because of the Pentagon attacks. Two other respondents who lived approximately 7 miles from the Pentagon reported similar experiences on 911-- the plane's collision shook both of their homes. However, one respondent included this as being *in the neighborhood* and the other did not, stating this was not close enough to be considered *in the neighborhood*. To increase consistency across reports, the word *neighborhood* was replaced with the phrase *within 5 miles*.

The final version (below) is much more concrete, inquiring into objective facts regarding their actual experience with a terrorist attack. There is little room for respondents to insert their personal interpretations.

- A. Were you ever within 5 miles of a terrorist attack at the time it occurred?
- B. Were you injured?
- C. Were you ever forced to evacuate a building because of a concern about terrorism?
- D. Did you ever have a close friend or relative, not just an acquaintance, who was within 5 miles of a terrorist attack at the time it occurred?
- E. Were they injured?
- F. Did you ever help in the recovery or clean up after a terrorist attack?

Given the reworking of the questions, it is expected that respondents will provide factual information, specifically, whether or not they perceived themselves as being within a 5 mile radius of an attack and, if so, whether or not they were injured. It is possible that respondents may report mental injury along with physical injuries—though some respondents may only consider physical harm and not mental or emotional harm as an injury. Only respondents reporting that they were within 5 miles of an attack will be asked whether they were forced to evacuate a building. This skip pattern will limit the possibility of false positive reporting, though it should be noted that even though people are asked to leave a building it is not always clear whether or not they were forced to evacuate specifically because of a terrorism concern. A few

of the cognitive interview respondents were government employees working downtown at the time of the Pentagon attacks. Though they left their building, they were uncertain as to whether or not this constituted an evacuation. Another respondent described a time over 10 years ago when she was working at the White House and a bomb threat was called in. She was uncertain whether or not to count this as evacuating a building *because of a concern about terrorism* because, at the time, bomb threats were not labeled acts of terrorism.

## **Question 2**

**Final Version: Some people have had strong emotional reactions to the rise of terrorism.**

- A. How often in the past 30 days did you have uncontrollable, disturbing thoughts about terrorism? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or very often?**  
Never  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Very often
- B. How often in the past 30 days did you try hard not to think about terrorism?**  
Never  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Very often
- C. How often in the past 30 days did you have nightmares about terrorism?**  
Never  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Very often
- D. How often in the past 30 days did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of terrorism? Never**  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Very often
- E. How often in the past 30 days were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled because of terrorism? Never**  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Very often

**F. How often in the past 30 days did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities, or surroundings because of terrorism?**

- Never**
- Rarely**
- Sometimes**
- Often**
- Very often**

Like the previous question, this question also underwent numerous changes throughout the cognitive testing process. Originally, this set of questions was tied to the introductory question about *unusually or especially frightening, horrible or traumatic events* and was intended to capture reactions to all types of traumatic events, not simply those stemming from terrorist experiences. The questions included:

- A. In the past 30 days, how often did you have nightmares or upsetting thoughts about such experiences?
- B. In the past 30 days, how often did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of these experiences or try hard not to think about these experiences?
- C. In the past 30 days, how often were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled?
- D. In the past 30 days, how often did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities or your surroundings?

Because the introductory statement (as described in the previous question) did not adequately define the types of events to be considered, respondents included a variety of inappropriate experiences, such as the natural death of a relative or an accident in childhood. A couple of the respondents viewed the original question as asking generically, “have you ever had a frightening experience,” and answered yes without reflecting on a specific event. Consequently, the follow-up questions about the impact of *such event* in the past 30 days made little sense.

The decision was made to focus only on the impact of terrorist experiences, and the question was changed to the following:

Some people have strong emotional reactions to terrorist experiences. How often in the past 30 days did you have any of the following reactions:

- A. How often in the past 30 days did you either have nightmares about terrorist experiences or think about these experiences when you did not want to—would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often or very often?
- B. How often in the past 30 days did you either go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of terrorist experiences or try hard not to think about these experiences?
- C. How often in the past 30 days were you on guard, watchful or easily startled?
- D. How often in the past 30 days did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities, or surroundings?

After additional interviews, the decision was made to shift the focus of this question from the impact of an actual terrorist event (something that most people have not directly experienced) to

the impact of increased exposure to terrorism in general. With this decision, the question was changed to the following:

Some people have had emotional reactions to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the continuing threat of terrorist attacks here in the United States.

- A. How often in the past 30 days did you either have nightmares or horrible ongoing thoughts during the day about terrorism—would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often or very often?
- B. How often in the past 30 days did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of terrorism?
- C. How often in the past 30 days were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled because of terrorism?
- D. How often in the past 30 days did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities or surroundings because of terrorism?

Additionally with this revision, the phrase *because of terrorism* was added to Question C and Question D. Without the phrase, respondents complained that the questions seemed strange and out of place. For example, one respondent answered *often* to Question D, explaining that he does not have many friends and is going through a divorce, and he did not understand why his personal life would be relevant in this context. To him, the question was “out of the blue.”

Question A and B were also revised because the phrases *or think about these kinds of experiences when you did not want to* and *or try not to think about these kinds of experiences* were too broad and generating false positive responses in the cognitive interviews. At the time of the interviews, the prison scandal had just broken along with the terrorist kidnapping in Russia where school children were held hostage, and these images were constantly shown on television. While no respondent reported having nightmares, they all explained that television and the media was forcing them to think about these horrible acts. Therefore, the phrase in Question A was replaced with the phrase *or horrible ongoing thoughts during the day about terrorism*, and the phrase in Question B was deleted.

The last revision of the question further simplified the introductory statement by eliminating unnecessary words and adding a question so that each construct (specifically having nightmares, having uncontrollable thoughts, and trying not to think about terrorism) was separated as a unique question. The following is the final version of Question 2:

Some people have had strong emotional reactions to the rise of terrorism.

- A. How often in the past 30 days did you have uncontrollable, disturbing thoughts about terrorism? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or very often?
- B. How often in the past 30 days did you try hard not to think about terrorism?
- C. How often in the past 30 days did you have nightmares about terrorism?
- D. How often in the past 30 days did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of terrorism?
- E. How often in the past 30 days were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled because of terrorism?

- F. How often in the past 30 days did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities, or surroundings because of terrorism?

Response difficulty with this question is rooted in the apparent shift in definition of the term terrorism. While the set of questions for Q1 point respondents to consider only an “attack against the American people,” this set of questions suggests that a broader conceptualization of terrorism should be considered. Additionally problematic, while the introduction to the question implies a more inclusive definition, a few of the questions in the section appear to direct respondents to consider a terrorist attack near their home. This was especially problematic in Questions D (How often in the past 30 days did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of terrorism?) and Question E (How often in the past 30 were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled because of terrorism?) Though this version of the questionnaire was only tested on a few respondents, it is clear that the shifting definition generates response difficulty. When asked Question A, for example, one woman replied, “Do you mean here in Maryland or terrorism in general?” (She experienced the same problem for Questions D and E). Because she did not fear an attack near her home but did have concern about terrorism abroad, her answer would have differed depending on the particular interpretation.

Recommendation: The definitional problem is likely be resolved by further specifying the particular definition that respondents should use when considering an answer: Either “the rise of terrorism throughout the world” or “...the rising threat of terrorism in the US.”

### **Question 3**

**Final Version: How often do you worry about terrorism? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or very often?**

- Never (Go to 5)**
- Rarely (Go to 5)**
- Sometimes**
- Often**
- Very often**

In the original questionnaire, the initial version of the question was:

How often do you worry about future terrorist attacks in the US—would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often or very often?

Like question number 2, this question was revised to reflect the rise of terrorism in general so that more respondents could relate. The same type of definitional problem as discussed in the previous two questions also applies here. Providing further elaboration is likely to resolve this problem entirely.

Recommendation: Specify either “terrorism throughout the world” or “... terrorism in the US.”

#### Question 4

**Final Version: How often do you worry so much about terrorism that it interferes with your life and activities?**

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very often

As in Question 3, respondents are unsure whether they should consider their worry about the rise of terrorism in general or the increased terror in the United States. However, because the question addresses their personal lives and activities, the problem is less likely to be an issue as it is in the previous question. That is, respondents are more likely to think that this question pertains to terrorism in the US—where they live and conduct activities. Still, some respondents may interpret the question as asking about terrorism in general and consider whether or not they turn off the television or avoid media coverage about terror abroad. Providing further elaboration is likely to resolve this problem entirely.

Recommendation: Specify either “terrorism throughout the world” or “... terrorism in the US.”

#### Question 5

**Final Version: How likely do you believe it is that another terrorist attack will occur in the US in the next 12 months? Would you say very likely, somewhat, not very or not at all likely?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ very likely
- \_\_\_\_\_ somewhat
- \_\_\_\_\_ not very
- \_\_\_\_\_ not at all likely

The original version of this question asked respondents to provide a likelihood estimate on a scale between 0 and 100:

The next question is about the likelihood of a major terrorist attack occurring in the US in the next 12 months. When I say a major attack I mean one as big as the attacks on September 11, 2001. On a scale from 0 to 100 where 0 means definitely will not happen, 100 means definitely will happen, and 50 means a 50-50 chance, what number describes how likely you think a major terrorist attack is over the next 12 months? You can use any number between 0 and 100.

Several problems were identified with this initial question. First, the question itself is very long and was extremely overwhelming to respondents. Almost all of the respondents asked to have the question repeated more than one time. There was simply too much instructional information in the question. Additionally, once respondents understood what was being asked of them—that they were to provide an answer between 0 and 100, many complained that there was no way for them to provide an answer that was even remotely accurate. One respondent, for example,

replied “the CIA doesn’t even know—and they have access to a lot more information! How am I supposed to know?” Almost every respondent resisted providing an answer and then, when pushed, reported a 50 percent chance—not because they believed that the odds were 50-50, but because they had no idea.

The revised version of the question eliminated the 0 to 100 scale and provided respondents with categories that suggested that the question was looking for an estimation, not a reasoned calculation of an odds ratio:

How likely do you believe it is that there will be another major terrorist attack occurring in the US in the next 12 months? By major attack I mean one as big as the attacks on September 11, 2001? Would you say... not at all likely, somewhat likely, very likely, or extremely likely?

With the new response categories, the question was much less intimidating to respondents. Still, many struggled in attempting to determine what the question meant by an attack *as big as the attacks on September 11*. Did this mean thousands of people would be killed? That multiple sites would be hit? That buildings would be destroyed? Should they include the likelihood of the water supply being contaminated? Because this statement about magnitude was included in the question, respondents understood that this was an important piece of the question that needed to be considered in their answer. For the final revision, this was dropped and tested in the remaining interviews. Still, response difficulty centered around the definition of a *terrorist attack*.

Recommendation: Again, this problem is likely to be resolved with a clarification clause that articulates at least some of the dimensions that are considered when defining a terrorist attack, for example, “an attack here in the United States where at least one citizen is killed.” While this additional statement will likely assist respondents, however, the question will remain problematic in that it asks respondents for information that they do not know. Providing a *don’t know* category would certainly ease respondents’ burden, however, it is extremely likely that the vast majority of respondents will answer don’t know. Given this, designers should consider the usefulness of this question altogether.

## Question 6

**Final Version:** If a terrorist attack occurred in the next 12 months, how likely do you believe it is that you or someone close to you would be seriously injured? Would you say very likely, somewhat, not very or not at all likely

- \_\_\_\_\_ very likely
- \_\_\_\_\_ somewhat
- \_\_\_\_\_ not very
- \_\_\_\_\_ not at all likely

The original version of this question, similar to the previous question, used a response option scale from 0 to 100:

Using the same 0 to 100 scale, how likely do you think it is that you or someone close to you will be seriously injured in a terrorist attack in the next 12 months? You can use any number between 0 and 100 in your answer.

When the response options for Question 5 were added, this question was also revised by adding the same response options. Interestingly, while most respondents struggled to answer Question 5, they were able to provide an answer for this question—simply because they believed that the odds of them being hurt would be very low. One man who resisted providing an answer in the previous question and then settling on 50-50, for example, answered 0 to this question, explaining that “unless they drive a plane into a golf course, I’m safe!” Indeed most people explained that they were not in sensitive jobs and did not live near places that would be targeted. Unlike the previous question, they had an essential piece of information to help them answer this question, specifically, what their lives were like and if they perceived them to be in dangerous or vulnerable positions.

The final version was changed to focus more on the respondents’ sense of proximity to threat and less on the likelihood of the threat. In forming an answer respondents considered their daily activities and where they and their families lived. Although they were still asked to speculate, respondents appeared to have an easier time because the most important factors (i.e. where they lived and worked) were known entities, unlike whether or not terrorists were planning to strike again.

### **Question 7**

**Final Version: If a terrorist attack occurred in your community, how much help and support would you expect to receive from ...**

- a. **Your family? Would you say none, a little, some or a lot?**
  - None
  - A little
  - Some
  - A lot
  
- b. **Anyone else you know such as friends, neighbors, or co-workers?**
  - None
  - A little
  - Some
  - A lot
  
- c. **Religious and other voluntary organizations, such as the Red Cross and local churches?**
  - None
  - A little
  - Some

**A lot**

**d. The Federal government?**

**None**

**A little**

**Some**

**A lot**

The initial version of this question was:

If a terrorist attack occurred in your community, how much help and support would you expect to receive from each of the following kinds of people:

- A. First, your family—How much help and support would you expect to receive from your family if you were harmed in a terrorist attack? Would you say none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support?
- B. Your friends, neighbors and co-workers?
- C. Local government, religious or voluntary organizations?

The second version added another question, separating government from religious and voluntary organizations. The final version then specified Federal government because respondents did not know if they should consider local, state, or Federal governments; their answer would be affected depending on the particular government in question.

Like the two previous questions, this question is speculative, that is, it asks respondents to consider a hypothetical event. Additionally, it asks respondents to consider how others would respond if this hypothetical event occurred. To answer the question, respondents first needed to consider what an attack in their community would be like and what types of help or support they would need. Because the scenario was set in their own community, respondents primarily assumed that this was a serious attack and suggested that they might need basic supplies such as food, water and shelter.

In considering their answer to Question A, respondents considered their relationships with family members and whether they lived near family. A couple respondents described plans that they have already made with family members should there be such a type of emergency. For Question B, most considered their relationship with their neighbors as opposed to co-workers most likely because they were imagining a scenario in their neighborhood. Their responses were based on the quality of the relationship, however, a few respondents also considered that their neighbors would also be needing to “fend for themselves” and would not be able to provide complete support. Questions C and D were much more speculative in that respondents’ answers were based on complete conjecture. Instead of basing their answer on the quality of relationships (as they did in the previous two questions), respondents based their answer on a more general perception of the group in question. This was especially true for Question D—if respondents were cynical of government, they answered None or a little; if they were patriotic, they were likely to answer Some or A Lot.

### Question 8

**Final Version:** Concerns about terrorism have caused delays at airports, parking garages, banks, and other places. How much have these delays interfered with your daily activities in the past 30 days? Would you say none, a little, some, or a lot?

None (Go to 10)

A little

Some

A lot

For respondents who traveled by plane at least once in the past year or who worked in a government building, the question worked well. Respondents considered their routine and the degree of frustration or irritation that they felt. The question caused the most difficulty, however, for respondents who, in the course of their daily lives, do not come across these types of security delays. For a couple of these respondents, it was not always clear that they completely understood the question was asking. A screener question placed prior to this question asking whether or not they encounter security inspections would resolve this problem.

### Question 9

**Final Version:** How much would you say these measures have increased your safety? Would you say none, a little, some, or a lot?

None

A little

Some

A lot

The initial version was:

Would you agree or disagree with the following statement? The hassles and delays related to terrorism security are worth it because they increase our safety.

Would you (agree/disagree) with this statement a lot, some or only a little?

Respondents primarily considered security measures in the places referred to in the previous question, particularly airports and government buildings. Most did not appear to have a strong opinion.

### Question 10

**Final Version:** Do you have a home emergency preparedness plan that all members of your house know about? (FR INTSTRUCTION: If necessary: Do you have a home preparedness for yourself?)

Yes

No

Interestingly, almost all of the respondents answered no to this question even though they had many if not all of the items in the next question. To them, a preparedness plan was more official

than simply having the following items—it needed to be discussed and even practiced on a regular basis.

### **Question 11**

**Final Version: Which of the following do you have in your home:**

- at least two days of food and water**
- a flashlight**
- a portable radio**
- spare batteries**
- emergency phone numbers**
- a plan to communicate with family and friends**

The original version of Question 11 was:

Do you have all, some, or none of the following: at least two days of food and water, a flashlight, a portable radio, spare batteries, emergency phone numbers and a plan to communicate with family/friends?

The question, in its original form, was difficult to answer. Most respondents needed the question repeated at least once so they could first consider which items they indeed had, and then translate that number into the response category options. The revised version made it so that the last step was taken out, reducing respondent burden.

### **Question 12**

**Final Version: In thinking about all of the steps that you may have taken to prepare for a terrorist attack, how much more would you need to do to feel as fully prepared as is possible? Would you say nothing more, a little, some or a lot more?**

- Nothing more**
- A little**
- Some**
- A lot more**

In trying to flesh out the constructs of this question, it was realized that there is another set of questions attempting to measure various levels and feelings of preparedness and effectiveness. Thus, questions 12 through 17 were added at the end of cognitive testing and, therefore, underwent only informal interviews with 10 people.

The first version for Question 12 was:

Overall, how prepared are you for a terrorist attack? Would you say completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all prepared?

The next version was:

Overall, how prepared would you say you are for a terrorist attack? Would you say completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all prepared?

The next version was:

Overall, how prepared do you feel to deal with or manage after a terrorist attack? Would you say completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all prepared?

Again, the primary problem with this question is that it asks for a speculative answer without providing necessary details that describe the terrorist attack. Because answers are based on the type of and magnitude of the terrorist attack, it is very difficult for respondents to provide an answer that they feel reflects their feeling of preparedness. For example, if an attack cut off water supply, then those who had stored water would be completely prepared. However, if the hypothetical attack were incredibly destructive, like a dirty bomb being released, then simply storing water would not be enough to be fully prepared. Additionally, it should be noted that, some respondents who had not done anything to prepare and who considered the event of a highly destructive attack, stated that they were “completely prepared” because there was nothing that they could do to plan for such an event.

Recommendation: Incorporating some of the definitional dimensions of terrorism into the question would clarify the event and help respondents judge their ability to manage afterward. Similarly, specifying what is meant by being “able to manage” would help respondents understand what they should take into consideration when answering this question. Formal cognitive testing should be conducted on this question.

### Question 13

**Final Version:** To what extent do you feel that you would be able to manage after a terrorist attack? Would you say very well, somewhat, not very, or not at all?

**Very well** [N=2]

**Somewhat** [N=8]

**Not very**

**Not at all**

In general this question was difficult for people to answer, in part because the question does not give them enough information about the hypothetical terrorist attack it asks about. Hypothetical questions are frequently difficult for respondents to answer, especially if they ask them to predict their behavior for a situation they have never experienced. If the person can never “really know” the answer, they struggle with providing one. Additionally, more information about the type of terrorist attack under question would have provided guidance for people. Five out of 10 asked how large the attack was, how close in proximity it was, and/or whether or not they were they

directly involved. Supplying more information about the nature of the attack would have been helpful.

The vagueness of the expression “be able to manage” also rendered this question difficult to answer. People exhibited a wide range of interpretations related to the expression “be able to manage.” Some respondents thought the expression related to basic survival while others took it to mean something much less serious, such as interruptions in daily routine. Some of the specific interpretations included:

- Ability to “do what you have to do in order to survive”
- Ability to obtain medical attention if necessary
- Ability to secure food, water and shelter
- Ability to cope with the situation emotionally or psychologically (i.e., remain calm in order to carry out necessary tasks)
- Ability to “get on with life”
- Ability to drive places
- Ability to go about daily business without being inconvenienced

Recommendation: Incorporating some of the definitional dimensions of terrorism into the question would clarify the event and help respondents judge their ability to manage afterward. Similarly, specifying what is meant by being “able to manage” would help respondents understand what they should take into consideration when answering this question. Formal cognitive testing should be conducted on this question.

#### Question 14

**Final Version: In thinking about the steps that the government has taken to prevent terrorist attacks, how much more could the government possibly do to prevent terrorism? Would you say nothing more, a little, some or a lot more?**

**Nothing more** [N=3]

**A little** [N=3]

**Some** [N=4]

**A lot more**

The principle problem with this question is that it is double-barreled. Many of the people (five) did not believe terrorism is preventable, yet the question essentially requires them to assume that it is. When respondents believed there are no steps that government can take to prevent terrorism, it becomes difficult to choose an appropriate response category – because all assume that there ARE steps that can be taken. Responses included “we will always have some vulnerability; we can’t be 100% protected,” “terrorism can’t be prevented,” or “Where there’s a will, there’s a way.”

When put in this awkward position, people answered based on either:

- 1) what the government could do to “slow down” terrorist efforts or
- 2) what the government has done in the past, not what it could do in the future, or
- 3) what government should do, not what it could do. (This was an important distinction to the extent that people took economic resources into account when thinking about what

government could do. On the other hand, the argument for what government should do is not constrained by fiscal matters, and is, therefore, less realistic.)

Another difficulty for some people is that they have little to no knowledge either of what the government has done to prevent terrorism, or even of what can be done. In other words, “emergency management” is not their area of expertise, as expressed by this person: “They might be able to do a little more, I just don’t know what, exactly.” Some people believe that kind of information isn’t made public, so they would have no way of knowing what steps have actually been taken. Others expressed the idea that there are an “unlimited number” of steps that might be taken, but that it’s unrealistic to assume they all can be.

Recommendation: Make this item into two separate questions. Conduct formal cognitive testing.

### Question 15

**Final Version:** To what extent do you feel that the government is able to prevent terrorist attacks? Would you say very able, somewhat, not very, or not at all?

Very able	[N=1]
Somewhat	[N=4]
Not very	[N=4]
Not at all	[N=1]

This question was less problematic because it allowed people to express their belief that it is impossible to prevent terrorism. “You can’t be totally prepared.” “It’s impossible to defend everything.” “You don’t know what the terrorists are going to do.”

### Question 16

**Final Version:** In thinking about the government’s steps to prepare for recovery after a terrorist attack, how much more would the government need to do to be as fully prepared as possible? Would you say nothing more, a little, some or a lot more?

Nothing more	[N=1]
A little	[N=4]
Some	[N=2]
A lot more	[N=2]
	[DK=1]

People felt that they lack about as much knowledge of the government’s recovery plan as they do of its preparedness efforts. Additionally, in order to answer this question, some people felt they needed an understanding of what steps even go into a recovery plan before they can evaluate the governments efforts in this regard. Some responses to this question were: “I don’t know what their current plans are, so I can’t answer. I don’t think their plans are public,” and “I don’t know what they need to do.”

Recommendation: Perhaps emphasize that respondents are expected to provide a “best guess” or estimate, rather than an educated response to this question. Conduct formal cognitive testing on the revision.

### **Question 17**

**Final Version: How effective do you believe that the government would be after a terrorist attack? Would you say very effective, somewhat, not very, or not at all effective?**

<b>Very effective</b>	[N=6]
<b>Somewhat</b>	[N=3]
<b>Not very</b>	[N=1]
<b>Not at all effective</b>	

Many people had reasonable interpretations of “effective” vis-à-vis the intent of the question, some of which included:

- The ability to make sure society can continue to function
- Ability to provide people with food, water, and shelter
- Cleaning up the aftermath
- Rebuilding

However, there was at least some vagueness to this question too, causing questions to surface such as “effective in what manner?” “government as in what? What part of government? All levels or just FEMA?” Others believed effectiveness depended on the nature of the attack (i.e., size and location). Without knowing this, it was difficult to predict how effective the response would be.

In questions 13 through 16, virtually everybody was thinking of the Federal government. In this one, however, “the government” became more vague, and respondents were not certain what level to consider. As a result, some continued to consider only the Federal government, while others considered all levels. For some, effectiveness of response depends on funding, therefore, state governments’ ability to handle the aftermath is contingent on support from the Federal government. Another person suggested that an effective response depends on coordination between different levels of government; this is why she considered all levels in this question.

Recommendation: Consider defining the level of government respondents should consider as well as what is meant by “effective after a terrorist attack.” Conduct formal cognitive testing on the revision.

### **Question 18**

**Final Version: Disagreements about how the United States should handle terrorism has led to arguments among some people. To what extent have these kinds of discussions led to arguments among the people you know?**

**None**  
**A little**  
**Some**  
**A lot**

This question did not pose any significant problems for respondents. In fact, many suggested that most of the people they know hold similar opinions about such matters, so they do not argue much about them.

**Help Seeking and Treatment Questions**

Questions in this section are standard questions that have been evaluated numerous times in the QDRL. Therefore, given the constraints of the one hour interview, it was decided to focus attention on the other sections questionnaire that consist of original untested material.

**Tier I: Baseline Questions**

**1. The next questions are about your direct experiences with terrorism. When I use the word ‘terrorism,’ I mean an attack against the American people, such as the September 11 attacks in 2001 and the anthrax letters in 2002. With that definition in mind...**

- g. Were you ever within 5 miles of a terrorist attack at the time it occurred?**  
Yes  
No (Go to c)
- h. Were you injured?**  
Yes  
No
- i. Were you ever forced to evacuate a building because of a concern about terrorism?**  
Yes  
No
- j. Did you ever have a close friend or relative, not just an acquaintance, who was within 5 miles of a terrorist attack at the time it occurred?**  
Yes  
No (Go to f)
- k. Were they injured?**  
Yes  
No
- l. Did you ever help in the recovery or clean up after a terrorist attack?**  
Yes  
No

**2. Some people have had strong emotional reactions to the rise of terrorism.**

- a. How often in the past 30 days did you have uncontrollable, disturbing thoughts about terrorism? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or very often?**  
Never  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Very often
- b. How often in the past 30 days did you try hard not to think about terrorism?**  
Never  
Rarely

**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**c. How often in the past 30 days did you have nightmares about terrorism?**

**Never**  
**Rarely**  
**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**d. How often in the past 30 days did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of terrorism? Never**

**Rarely**  
**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**e. How often in the past 30 days were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled because of terrorism? Never**

**Rarely**  
**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**f. How often in the past 30 days did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities, or surroundings because of terrorism?**

**Never**  
**Rarely**  
**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**3. How often do you worry about terrorism? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or very often?**

**Never (Go to 5)**  
**Rarely (Go to 5)**  
**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**4. How often do you worry so much about terrorism that it interferes with your life and activities?**

**Never**  
**Rarely**

**Sometimes**  
**Often**  
**Very often**

**5. How likely do you believe it is that another terrorist attack will occur in the US in the next 12 months? Would you say very likely, somewhat, not very or not at all likely?**

\_\_\_\_\_ **very likely**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **somewhat**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **not very**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **not at all likely**

**6. If a terrorist attack occurred in the next 12 months, how likely do you believe it is that you or someone close to you would be seriously injured? Would you say very likely, somewhat, not very or not at all likely**

\_\_\_\_\_ **very likely**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **somewhat**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **not very**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **not at all likely**

**7. If a terrorist attack occurred in your community, how much help and support would you expect to receive from ...**

**e. Your family? Would you say none, a little, some or a lot?**

**None**  
**A little**  
**Some**  
**A lot**

**f. Anyone else you know such as friends, neighbors, or co-workers?**

**None**  
**A little**  
**Some**  
**A lot**

**g. Religious and other voluntary organizations, such as the Red Cross and local churches?**

**None**  
**A little**  
**Some**  
**A lot**

**h. The Federal government?**

**None**  
**A little**

Some  
A lot

**8. Concerns about terrorism have caused delays at airports, parking garages, banks, and other places. How much have these delays interfered with your daily activities in the past 30 days? Would you say none, a little, some, or a lot?**

None (Go to 10)  
A little  
Some  
A lot

**9. How much would you say these measures have increased your safety? Would you say none, a little, some, or a lot?**

None  
A little  
Some  
A lot

**10. Do you have a home emergency preparedness plan that all members of your house know about? (FR INTSTRUCTION: If necessary: Do you have a home preparedness for yourself?)**

Yes  
No

**11. Which of the following do you have in your home:**

\_\_\_\_\_ at least two days of food and water  
\_\_\_\_\_ a flashlight  
\_\_\_\_\_ a portable radio  
\_\_\_\_\_ spare batteries  
\_\_\_\_\_ emergency phone numbers  
\_\_\_\_\_ a plan to communicate with family and friends

**12. In thinking about all of the steps that you may have taken to prepare for a terrorist attack, how much more would you need to do to feel as fully prepared as is possible? Would you say nothing more, a little, some or a lot more?**

Nothing more  
A little  
Some  
A lot more

**13. To what extent do you feel that you would be able to manage after a terrorist attack? Would you say very well, somewhat, not very, or not at all?**

- Very well
- Somewhat
- Not very
- Not at all

**14. In thinking about the steps that the government has taken to prevent terrorist attacks, how much more could the government possibly do to prevent terrorism? Would you say nothing more, a little, some or a lot more?**

- Nothing more
- A little
- Some
- A lot more

**15. To what extent do you feel that the government is able to prevent terrorist attacks? Would you say very able, somewhat, not very, or not at all?**

- Very able [N=1]
- Somewhat [N=4]
- Not very [N=4]
- Not at all [N=1]

**16. In thinking about the government's steps to prepare for recovery after a terrorist attack, how much more would the government need to do to be as fully prepared as possible? Would you say nothing more, a little, some or a lot more?**

- Nothing more
- A little
- Some
- A lot more

**17. How effective do you believe that the government would be after a terrorist attack? Would you say very effective, somewhat, not very, or not at all effective?**

- Very effective
- Somewhat
- Not very
- Not at all effective

**18. Disagreements about how the United States should handle terrorism has led to arguments among some people. To what extent have these kinds of discussions led to arguments among the people you know?**

- None
- A little

Some  
A lot

**Help Seeking and Treatment Questions**

**1. In the past 30 days, did you receive any sort of professional counseling, treatment or advice for problems with your emotions, nerves, or mental health?**

Yes  
No

**2. In the past 30 days did you ever take a prescription medicine for problems with your emotions?**

Yes  
No

**3. IF BOTH 1 AND 2 ARE NO: Was there ever a time in the past 30 days when you felt that you might need to see a professional because of problems with your emotions, nerves, or mental health?**

Yes  
No

**TIER I Surveillance Questions**

<p><b>Distress Questions</b></p> <p>1. <b>Sometimes things happen to people that are <i>unusually or especially</i> frightening, horrible, or traumatic. Have you ever had this kind of experience?</b></p> <p>YES / NO</p> <p>If YES—go to 2</p> <p>If NO—go to next section</p> <p><i>If not clear, “For example, have you ever experienced an event such as a serious accident or fire, physical or sexual assault, earthquake or flood, war, seeing someone be killed or seriously injured, or having a loved one die through homicide or suicide”?</i></p>
<p>2. <b>In the past 30 days, how often did you have nightmares or upsetting thoughts about such experiences?</b></p> <p>Would you say: <i>all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?</i></p>
<p>3. <b>In the past 30 days, how often did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of these experiences or try hard not to think about these experiences?</b></p> <p>Would you say: <i>all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?</i></p>
<p>4. <b>In the past 30 days, how often were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled?</b></p> <p>Would you say: <i>all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?</i></p>
<p>5. <b>In the past 30 days, how often did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities, or your surroundings?</b></p> <p>Would you say: <i>all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?</i></p>

<p><b>Social Support Questions</b></p> <p>1. <b>If a terrorist attack occurred in your community, how much help and support would you expect to receive from each of the following kinds of people:</b></p> <p>a. First, your family (if NEC, PROBE: How much help and support would you expect to receive from your family if you were harmed in a terrorist attack?)</p>
--

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support*

b. Your friends , neighbors and co-workers?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support*

c. Local government, religious or voluntary organizations?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support*

**2. To what extent have concerns about terrorism led you to stop getting together with friends and doing things you enjoy?**

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot*

**3. To what extent have different opinions about the causes of, or solutions to, terrorism led to conflicts or hostility among people you know?**

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot*

### **Help Seeking and Treatment Questions**

**1. In the past 30 days, did you receive any sort of professional counseling, treatment or advice for problems with your emotions, nerves, or mental health?**

YES -- GO TO 1b

NO --- GO TO 2

1B) (IF YES to a) What kind of professional did you see?

(IF NEC, PROBE: For example, was it a family doctor, psychologist, minister?)

FIELD CODE. RECORD ALL MENTIONS. DO NOT PROBE FOR AO.

PSYCHIATRIST  
PSYCHOLOGIST  
SOCIAL WORKER  
MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELOR  
PSYCHOTHERAPIST  
THERAPIST  
MARRIAGE COUNSELOR  
DRUG OR ALCOHOL COUNSELOR

PRIMARY CARE DOCTOR (e.g. INTERNIST, FAMILY DOCTOR, GENERAL PRACTITIONER)

OTHER MEDICAL DOCTOR (e.g., CARDIOLOGIST, GYNECOLOGIST)

OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER (e.g., NURSE, OCUPATIONAL THERAPIST)

RELIGIOUS COUNSELOR (e.g., MINISTER, PRIEST, RABBI)  
HEALER (E.G. HERBALIST, CHIROPRACTOR, SPIRITUALIST)

OTHER SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_

2): In the past 30 days did you ever take a prescription medicine for problems with your emotions?

YES-- GO TO next section

NO--GO TO 3

3) IF BOTH 1) AND 2) ARE NO: Was there ever a time in the past 30 days when you felt that you might need to see a professional because of problems with your emotions, nerves, or mental health?

YES / NO

### **Exposure and Functions Questions**

**1. Have you ever been in any of the following situations: directly injured in a terrorist attack, in a place where terrorists released something harmful, forced to evacuate, or otherwise exposed to a terrorist attack?**

1a. IF YES: What happened? In what month and year did that happen?

1b. Have you had any other exposure to a terrorist attack? (IF, YES, REPEAT WHAT AND WHEN Qs. ACCEPT UP TO THREE MENTIONS.)

**2. Have you ever had a close loved one who was exposed to a terrorist attack?**

**2a. IF YES (IF NEC): What was the relationship of that person to you? What happened? In what month and year did that happen?**

**2b. Have you had any other close loved one who was exposed to a terrorist attack?**

YES / NO

(IF YES AND IF NEC: REPEAT WHO, WHAT, AND WHEN Qs. ACCEPT UP TO THREE MENTIONS.)

**3.** Concerns about terrorism have caused increased delays at airports, parking garages, banks, and other places. How much have such delays interfered with your daily activities in the past 30 days?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, a lot, or a great deal?*

IF A LOT OR A GREAT DEAL, GO TO Q4

IF NONE, A LITTLE, OR SOME, GO TO THE NEXT SECTION

**4. How much would you agree with the following statement: "The hassles and delays related to terrorism security are worth it." Do you agree or disagree?**

1. AGREE

2. DISAGREE

3. (IF VOL) NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE GO TO NEXT SECTION

8. DK GO TO NEXT SECTION

9. REFUSE GO TO NEXT SECTION

5a. Do you (agree/disagree) strongly, somewhat, or only a little?

**5. Overall, how much has terrorism affected your life?**

Would you say: *none, a little, some, a lot, or a great deal?*

### **Risk Perception and Behavior Change Questions**

**1. How often do you worry about the future**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

If NEVER OR RARELY, go on to 2. If RARELY, SOME, OFTEN, OR NEARLY ALL THE TIME, ask 1a.

**1a. How often do you worry about future terrorist attacks in America?**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

If NEVER, go to 2. IF RARELY, SOME, OFTEN, OR NEARLY ALL THE TIME, ask 1b.

**1b. How often are you so worried about terrorism that it interferes with your life and activities?**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

If NEVER, go to 2. IF RARELY, SOME, OFTEN, OR NEARLY ALL THE TIME, ask 1c.

**1c. How often do you avoid things you want to do because of worries about terrorism?**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

**2. How safe do you feel in general?**

Would you say: *completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all safe?*

IF COMPLETELY, go on to 3. IF MOSTLY, SOMEWHAT, NOT VERY, OR NOT AT ALL SAFE, ask 2a.

**2a. How safe do you personally feel from terrorism?**

Would you say: *completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all safe?*

**3. Do you have a home emergency preparedness plan that all members of your household know about?**

YES / NO

**3a. Do you have all, some, or none of the following: at least two days of food and water, a flashlight, a portable radio, spare batteries, emergency phone numbers and a plan to communicate with family/friends?**

Would you say: *all, some, or none?*

**4. Many people have changed their daily routines in order to avoid exposure to terrorism.**

HAVE YOU MADE ANY SUCH CHANGES?

YES / NO

IF YES How much have these changes interfered with your daily activities in the past 30 days?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, a lot, or a great deal?*

(IF VOL, "I MADE NO CHANGES", CODE "None")

**5. Overall, how prepared are you for a terrorist attack?**

Would you say: *completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all prepared?*

--

**Distress Questions**

**1. Sometimes things happen to people that are *unusually or especially* frightening, horrible, or traumatic. Have you ever had this kind of experience?**

YES / NO

If YES—go to 2

If NO—go to next section

*If not clear*, “For example, have you ever experienced an event such as a serious accident or fire, physical or sexual assault, earthquake or flood, war, seeing someone be killed or seriously injured, or having a loved one die through homicide or suicide”?

**2. In the past 30 days, how often did you have nightmares or upsetting thoughts about such experiences?**

Would you say: *all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?*

**3. In the past 30 days, how often did you go out of your way to avoid situations that reminded you of these experiences or try hard not to think about these experiences?**

Would you say: *all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?*

**4. In the past 30 days, how often were you on guard, watchful, or easily startled?**

Would you say: *all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?*

**5. In the past 30 days, how often did you feel emotionally numb or detached from other people, activities, or your surroundings?**

Would you say: *all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, or never?*

**Social Support Questions**

**2. If a terrorist attack occurred in your community, how much help and support would you expect to receive from each of the following kinds of people:**

a. First, your family (if NEC, PROBE: How much help and support would you expect to receive from your family if you were harmed in a terrorist attack?)

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support*

b. Your friends , neighbors and co-workers?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support*

c. Local government, religious or voluntary organizations?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot of help and support*

**4. To what extent have concerns about terrorism led you to stop getting together with friends and doing things you enjoy?**

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot*

**5. To what extent have different opinions about the causes of, or solutions to, terrorism led to conflicts or hostility among people you know?**

Would you say: *none, a little, some, or a lot*

#### **Help Seeking and Treatment Questions**

**1. In the past 30 days, did you receive any sort of professional counseling, treatment or advice for problems with your emotions, nerves, or mental health?**

YES -- GO TO 1b

NO --- GO TO 2

1B) (IF YES to a) What kind of professional did you see?

(IF NEC, PROBE: For example, was it a family doctor, psychologist, minister?)

FIELD CODE. RECORD ALL MENTIONS. DO NOT PROBE FOR AO.

PSYCHIATRIST  
PSYCHOLOGIST  
SOCIAL WORKER  
MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELOR  
PSYCHOTHERAPIST  
THERAPIST  
MARRIAGE COUNSELOR  
DRUG OR ALCOHOL COUNSELOR

PRIMARY CARE DOCTOR (e.g. INTERNIST, FAMILY DOCTOR, GENERAL PRACTITIONER)  
OTHER MEDICAL DOCTOR (e.g., CARDIOLOGIST, GYNECOLOGIST)  
OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER (e.g., NURSE, OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST)

RELIGIOUS COUNSELOR (e.g., MINISTER, PRIEST, RABBI)  
HEALER (E.G. HERBALIST, CHIROPRACTOR, SPIRITUALIST)

OTHER SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_

2): In the past 30 days did you ever take a prescription medicine for problems with your emotions?

YES-- GO TO next section  
NO--GO TO 3

3) IF BOTH 1) AND 2) ARE NO: Was there ever a time in the past 30 days when you felt that you might need to see a professional because of problems with your emotions, nerves, or mental health?

YES / NO

### **Exposure and Functions Questions**

**1. Have you ever been in any of the following situations: directly injured in a terrorist attack, in a place where terrorists released something harmful, forced to evacuate, or otherwise exposed to a terrorist attack?**

1a. IF YES: What happened? In what month and year did that happen?

1b. Have you had any other exposure to a terrorist attack? (IF, YES, REPEAT WHAT AND WHEN Qs. ACCEPT UP TO THREE MENTIONS.)

**2. Have you ever had a close loved one who was exposed to a terrorist attack?**

**2a. IF YES (IF NEC): What was the relationship of that person to you? What happened? In what month and year did that happen?**

**2b. Have you had any other close loved one who was exposed to a terrorist attack?**

YES / NO

(IF YES AND IF NEC: REPEAT WHO, WHAT, AND WHEN Qs. ACCEPT UP TO THREE MENTIONS.)

**3. Concerns about terrorism have caused increased delays at airports, parking garages,**

banks, and other places. How much have such delays interfered with your daily activities in the past 30 days?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, a lot, or a great deal?*

IF A LOT OR A GREAT DEAL, GO TO Q4

IF NONE, A LITTLE, OR SOME, GO TO THE NEXT SECTION

**4. How much would you agree with the following statement: "The hassles and delays related to terrorism security are worth it." Do you agree or disagree?**

1. AGREE

2. DISAGREE

3. (IF VOL) NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE GO TO NEXT SECTION

8. DK GO TO NEXT SECTION

9. REFUSE GO TO NEXT SECTION

5a. Do you (agree/disagree) strongly, somewhat, or only a little?

**5. Overall, how much has terrorism affected your life?**

Would you say: *none, a little, some, a lot, or a great deal?*

### **Risk Perception and Behavior Change Questions**

**6. How often do you worry about the future**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

If NEVER OR RARELY, go on to 2. If RARELY, SOME, OFTEN, OR NEARLY ALL THE TIME, ask 1a.

**1a. How often do you worry about future terrorist attacks in America?**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

If NEVER, go to 2. IF RARELY, SOME, OFTEN, OR NEARLY ALL THE TIME, ask 1b.

**1b. How often are you so worried about terrorism that it interferes with your life and activities?**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

If NEVER, go to 2. IF RARELY, SOME, OFTEN, OR NEARLY ALL THE TIME, ask 1c.

**1c. How often do you avoid things you want to do because of worries about terrorism?**

Would you say: *never, rarely, some of the time, often, or nearly all the time?*

**7. How safe do you feel in general?**

Would you say: *completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all safe?*

IF COMPLETELY, go on to 3. IF MOSTLY, SOMEWHAT, NOT VERY, OR NOT AT ALL SAFE, ask 2a.

**2a. How safe do you personally feel from terrorism?**

Would you say: *completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all safe?*

**8. Do you have a home emergency preparedness plan that all members of your household know about?**

YES / NO

**3a. Do you have all, some, or none of the following: at least two days of food and water, a flashlight, a portable radio, spare batteries, emergency phone numbers and a plan to communicate with family/friends?**

Would you say: *all, some, or none?*

**9. Many people have changed their daily routines in order to avoid exposure to terrorism.**

HAVE YOU MADE ANY SUCH CHANGES?

YES / NO

IF YES How much have these changes interfered with your daily activities in the past 30 days?

Would you say: *none, a little, some, a lot, or a great deal?*

(IF VOL, "I MADE NO CHANGES", CODE "None")

**10. Overall, how prepared are you for a terrorist attack?**

Would you say: *completely, mostly, somewhat, not very, or not at all prepared?*