

In Press, Political Psychology

**The Consequences of Terrorism:
Disentangling the Effects of Personal and National Threat**

Leonie Huddy

Stanley Feldman

Theresa Capelos

Colin Provost

Department of Political Science

SUNY at Stony Brook

Stony Brook, NY 11794

(631) 632-7639

Leonie.Huddy@sunysb.edu

We wish to thank Newsday for use of the Newsday-Stony Brook survey data.

Abstract

The events of September 11 shattered Americans' sense of security and dramatically elevated the risk of terrorism on US soil. To better understand the political consequences of 9/11, a more complete accounting of the nature and consequences of perceived threat is imperative. We contribute to research on threat by more closely examining the distinction between perceived personal and national risks. We explore two major, competing hypotheses: (1) The personal threat of terrorism has a pervasive influence even on national decisions and perceptions, in line with its highly arousing nature. (2) The effects of personal threat are highly circumscribed and overshadowed by the impact of perceived national threat, consistent with findings on the meager impact of self-interest and other personal concerns on public opinion. We examine the degree to which personal and national threat affect the perceived consequences and possible solutions to terrorism in a local survey conducted with 1221 residents of Long Island and Queens. As expected, there was a clear distinction between perceived personal and national threat, although the two are related. Perceived personal threat did not, however, influence the perceived economic consequences of terrorism; rather it had a more narrow effect on personal behaviors designed to minimize risk. Overall, our findings demonstrate the circumscribed effects of personal threat, consistent with past research on the limited personal basis to political judgments. Nonetheless, our test of these hypotheses is constrained by a limited set of dependent variables that includes the national consequences but not policy solutions designed to limit terrorism.

The events of September 11 shattered Americans' sense of security and dramatically elevated the risk of terrorism on US soil. Suddenly understanding the political effects of threat has become a pressing topic for researchers of American public opinion. Threat had not been ignored by political behavior researchers prior to the terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. It has played a role in understanding the origins of political intolerance (Feldman and Stenner 1997; Marcus et al 1995), the development of prejudice (Schimmel et al 1999), and the dynamics of Israeli public opinion (Arian 1989; Gordon and Arian 2001; Jacobson and Bar-Tal 1995). But the events of September 11 gave new urgency to understanding the degree, origins, nature, and consequences of the threats experienced by Americans in the aftermath of that day's events.

Consequences of Threat

The general effects of threat on attitudes, cognitive processing, and behavior have been quite well documented by psychologists and political scientists. Threat increases ethnocentrism and xenophobia (Levine and Campbell 1972; Seago 1947; Struch and Schwartz 1989). It promotes intolerance and a willingness to forego basic civil liberties (Doty et al 1991; Feldman 1988; Marcus et al. 1995). It leads to closed-mindedness and rejection of challenging beliefs (Lodge and Taber 2000; Rokeach 1960). It reduces the efficiency of memory processes (Blaney 1986) and promotes both threat-related thought content (Gilligan and Bower 1984) and perceptual hypersensitivity to information concerning threat (Mathews and Macleod 1986). Certain types of threat increase reliance on stereotypes (Bodenhausen, Sheppard, and Kramer 1994), reduce susceptibility to persuasive messages (Janis and Feshbach 1953), bias cognitive processing (Liberman and Chaiken, 1993), and increase willingness to take risks (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). Perceptions of international threat lead some citizens to oppose international

involvement (Niemi, Mueller, and Smith 1989) and tend to increase reliance on enemy images (Hermann 1984), although there are instances in which threat increases support for belligerent policy options (Gordon and Arian 2001). And among elites, threat accompanied by time pressure has been found to heighten group conformity pressures (Janis 1982; t'Hart 1990) and reduce consideration of policy alternatives (Hermann 1969). Most of these findings suggest some degree of cognitive "shutdown" under threatening conditions, which has also been a central theme in work on fear emotions (Cacioppo and Gardner 1999).

Personal Threat

The general effects of threat are, thus, well known. There have been many fewer attempts, however, to distinguish between the differing effects of personal and more remote national or collective threats. Personal threat, especially threats that pose a physical danger, are likely to be very affectively arousing and elicit fear to a greater degree than more remote threats to the nation. Indeed this is what we find in a related national study on reactions to the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington in which personal threat is much more likely than national threat to elicit fear, anxiety and related somatic symptoms such as depression and insomnia (Huddy et al 2002). By design, there is something personally disturbing, immediate, vivid, and frightening about the threat of terrorism. It raises the specter of one's mortality, and elicits pervasive feelings of insecurity and fear of physical harm (Greenberg et al 1992; Jacobson and Bar-Tal 1995).

Research on threats that involve the potential for physical harm such as crime, natural disasters, and violent conflicts provide clear evidence that personal threat and fear leads to a change in personal behavior designed to minimize exposure to risk. Consider crime research. Warr (1990) reports that in 1987, 40% of respondents to the General Social Survey (GSS) said

there was an area within a mile of their house where they were afraid to “walk alone at night.” And there is some evidence that this fear motivates changes in personal behavior, referred to as “constrained behavior” by crime researchers (Ferraro 1996). Smith and Uchida (1988), for instance, found a link between the perceived risk of crime and gun ownership. Outside the area of crime, there is additional supportive evidence that personal risk leads to behavioral change. Sattler and colleagues (2000) found that the perceived risk of a hurricane improved hurricane preparedness. The possible threat of biological weapons during the Gulf War appears to have influenced the personal behavior of Israelis; 65% said that they went into sealed rooms and wore gas masks during Iraqi missile attacks (Arian and Gordon 1993).

Personal threat clearly motivates individual behavior designed to reduce risk but does it have the same effect on support for threat-reducing national policies? Evidence on this point is less clear cut, although relevant research is not extensive. Sears and colleagues (1980) found that having been a victim of crime increased support for law and order policies. But other indices of crime-related threat such as viewing one’s neighborhood as unsafe at night or staying away from certain parts of town to avoid crime had no impact on attitudes toward law and order policies, which included questions about the rights of the accused and gun control. Of course, Americans disagree over the perceived effectiveness of policies such as gun control in reducing crime, complicating the link between perceived threat and support for policy solutions in this instance. There is, thus, a plausible link between personal threat and support for public policies designed to reduce threat.

As noted, personal threat is also likely to elicit the effects associated with threat more generally— some form of cognitive shutdown which produces a more limited processing of information and a heightened sensitivity to threatening information. Decision theorists have

found that risks are exaggerated for events that are highly vivid, widely reported in the news, involuntary, responsible for a large number of deaths, and unusual. Such events lead to the exaggeration of risk because they are more readily available in memory (Thaler 1983; Lichtenstein et al. 1978). Events that arouse negative feelings also lead to an overestimation of risk (Johnson and Tversky 1983).¹ Taken together, these findings help to explain why Americans wildly overestimated the personal risk of terrorism after the events of September 11. In reality, a large number of people -- but a very small proportion of the US population -- died in the attacks. Nonetheless, in a poll conducted days after the attack by NBC and the Wall Street Journal (September 14 – 15) 45% of Americans were worried that they or a member of their immediate family “might become the victim of a terrorist attack”. By early December a quarter of respondents in a national CBS poll (24%) said that they were “personally very concerned about a terrorist attack” in their area (Polling Report). It would not be surprising to find that Americans not only overestimated the risk posed by terrorism but also exaggerated their broader consequences.

National Threat

Alternately, Americans may base their reactions to the events of September 11 on the threat posed to the country as a whole. This prediction is consistent with a broad range of studies that find a separation between citizens’ personal concerns, especially self-interest, and their support for a broad array of social issues and related policies (Sears and Funk 1991). For example, personal finances have less impact than national concerns on vote choice and policy positions (Citrin et al 1997; Feldman 1988; Kinder and Kiewiet 1981), perceived group finances

¹ This prediction is at odds with the finding that anxiety prompts a search for information and elicits a potentially more reasoned response to political choices (Marcus and MacKuen, 1993; Marcus, Neuman and MacKuen 2000) or that some sources of stress can improve the quality of decision making by resulting in a more complete search for information Vertzberger (1998). The difference arises in part because of the added role of fear associated with the threat of terrorism which impairs cognitive reasoning.

(Kinder, Adams and Gronke 1989), or the welfare of other groups (Mutz and Mondak 1996). This tendency to “morselize” politics -- to keep personal considerations out of decisions about national policies or political figures – is well documented (Kinder and Sears 1985). Typically, voters choose their candidates or decide their position on current political issues from an assessment of the state of national events not their immediate personal situation. As evidence, Arian (1989) reports that Israelis who perceived the outbreak of war as highly or moderately likely in the late 1980s were more likely to support an increase in military power over peace negotiations, and were more willing to cede land and grant civil rights to inhabitants of the (then) Palestinian territories.

We, therefore, have competing predictions about the impact of perceived threats to oneself v. the nation. On the one hand, there is reason to think that personal threat will motivate support for policies that minimize threat and, at the same time, lead to a distorted view of the magnitude of threat and its impact. On the other hand, there is also reason to expect that national threat will drive national perceptions and influence policy solutions to a greater degree than personal threat, as has been found in a slew of past research studies. Based on this latter research, we would expect citizens to put aside their personal needs and concerns to focus instead on the national situation.

Personal v. National Threat

Several studies have distinguished between the personal and collective threat of violent conflict, although findings are inconclusive. Arian and Gordon (1993) found that personal threat was more emotionally arousing than perceived threats to the collective. In their research, Israelis who felt that Saddam Hussein was out to get them personally during the Gulf War experienced higher levels of anxiety four weeks after the war than did those who felt Hussein was out to get

them as a Jew, an Israeli, or the Jewish people. Jacobson and Bar-Tal (1995) directly examined the differing impact of personal and national threat on socio-political beliefs. They found that feeling insecure about one's personal life (i.e., job, finances, family, and health) had less impact on feeling insecure about social and economic conditions in Israel (including economic growth) than feeling insecure about Israel's relationship with the world and other national matters. But feeling insecure about a job or one's health may not arouse the same level of emotion as being concerned about becoming the victim of terrorism. As a consequence, these findings do not rule out the possibility that the personal threat and fear of terrorism colors reactions to national issues.

Determinants of Personal Threat

The goal of the current research is to examine the differing effects of perceived personal and national threat. A focus on the relative impact of the two types of threat raises a parallel concern about the extent to which personal and national threats are truly distinct. Research on the determinants of personal threat suggests that perceived personal risk is based to some degree on actual risk factors which often vary geographically within a nation and thus lead to differences between perceived personal and national threat. Tyler (1984) reports that estimates of crime victimization are derived from direct personal experience with crime and the indirect victimization experiences of other relatives and friends. This fits with Arian and Gordon's (1993) evidence that residents of the Tel Aviv area -- where scud missiles were aimed -- were more likely to feel fearful than other Israelis during the Gulf War. Interestingly, general information from the media about base rates of victimization -- which are likely to have a broader and more uniform effect on a population -- have almost no impact on estimates of personal vulnerability, helping to further reduce the link between perceived national and personal threat. The limited use of base rate information has been well documented by social psychologists and extends to the

estimated risk posed by floods, earthquakes, other natural disasters, and automobile accidents (Tyler 1984).

Based on this evidence, we argue that personal and national threat are distinct. But this does not mean that they are unrelated. Indeed, in the context of terrorism it would be strange if strong feelings of personal threat existed in the absence of any perceived national threat.

Pervasive gender differences in perceived personal and national threat serve to further heighten the connection between the two types of threat. One of the most consistent findings to emerge from research on physical threat is that women are more afraid of victimization than are men, despite the fact that men are more likely to be the victims of violent crime (Ferraro 1996; Stafford and Galle 1984; Warr 1984). Women both overestimate the risk posed by a specific crime, such as murder, and respond with higher levels of fear than men to the same level of perceived risk of crime (Ferraro 1996; Warr 1984). This gender difference is found not only for personal threat but also extends to perceived national threat. Young Finnish women were more afraid than young men of nuclear war before the onset of the Gulf war (Poikolainen, Kanerva, and Loennqvist 1998). Arian and Gordon (1993) found that Israeli women were more fearful than men during the Gulf war. The thought of terrorist attacks or memories of the Gulf war aroused higher levels of insecurity among Israeli female than male students (Jacobson and Bar-Tal 1995). In a related study, the same researchers found that women settlers living in the occupied territories felt less secure about Israel's current situation (including the Arab-Israeli conflict and relations with the US) than did men (Bar-Tal, Jacobson and Freund 1995). And

Israeli girls reported higher levels of negative emotions including fear/anxiety, sorrow, and despair than did boys in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in early 1996 (Raviv et al. 2000).²

Perceived Threat of Terrorism in the US Prior to 9/11

Americans were concerned about terrorism prior to September 11, 2001. The Rand corporation conducted a study of public opinion on terrorism in 1988 and 1989 in the aftermath of the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. In that survey, 57% of Americans thought terrorism was a somewhat or very serious problem in the US -- a level of concern that far exceeded the numbers of individuals killed on US soil by terrorists. The threat posed by terrorism was seen as even greater in the aftermath of the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing and the explosion at the 1996 summer Olympics in Atlanta with roughly 90% of Americans viewing terrorism in the US as a somewhat or very serious problem at that time (Kuzma 2000). Sixty-two percent of Americans said that the threat of terrorism was “a big problem” in a Time/CNN poll conducted in March, 1997, and 64% of respondents reported that terrorism posed a “major threat to the well being of the United States in a poll by Princeton Survey Research Associates in May, 2001 (Roper Center). Yet, terrorism was never very salient as a national issue. In several polls conducted between 1995 and 2001, terrorism was mentioned by 1% or fewer of the respondents as one of the most important problems facing the country (Roper Center).

Levels of perceived personal threat were also quite high in the Rand study when compared to actual probabilities: 14% said they were somewhat or very likely to be “a passenger on a plane that is hijacked” and 14% said they were somewhat or very likely to be “injured by a

² Women’s greater fear of personal crime such as murder, burglary, or assault arises almost completely out of their greater fear of rape (Ferraro 1996). This does not explain, however, women’s greater fear of nuclear weapons or the risks posed by violent conflicts, such as terrorism.

bomb left by terrorists.” Through the 1990s somewhere between 23% and 36% of Americans were personally worried or concerned about terrorism when they were in public places in the United States (Kuzma 2000). Moreover, consistent with evidence that perceived risk of crime leads to behavioral changes designed to reduce risk, individuals in the Rand study who felt personally threatened by terrorism were more likely to say they would refuse to travel in the future. There were no apparent gender differences in fear of terrorism in the Rand survey but there were differences by education, with less educated individuals being more likely to fear terrorism (Downes-Le Guin and Hoffman 1993).

Hypotheses

Data for this study is drawn from a telephone survey on reactions to the events of September 11 among the residents of Queens (within the city of New York) and Long Island (in the larger New York metropolitan area). We use the data to test the following hypotheses: (1) The perceived personal threat posed by terrorism is distinct from perceived threats to the nation. (2) Personal threat will have a greater impact than national threat on the perceived negative personal and national consequences of terrorism and will be more likely to alter personal behavior that is designed to reduce risk. We refer to this as the *personal threat* hypothesis. This is contrasted with the expectation that (3) perceived national threat will have a greater impact than personal threat on assessment of the national consequences of terrorism. This is referred to as the *national threat* hypothesis. Moreover, based on past findings, we expect (4) women to feel more personally threatened by terrorism than men. We explore the determinants of personal and national threat and examine their impact on the perceived economic consequences of the events of September 11 and personal solutions adopted to avoid the threat of terrorism.

Methods

The Newsday-Stony Brook survey was conducted via telephone with 1,221 adults over age 18 in Nassau, Suffolk and Queens counties in New York between October 20 and November 11, 2001. The study was conducted by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) at SUNY at Stony Brook. Up to 7 callbacks were made at each number and limited attempts made to convert individuals who initially refused.

Sample

Telephone numbers were generated by Random Digit Dial (RDD) from telephone blocks with at least one listed residential number (one-plus) by Genesys Inc. Respondents were selected randomly within the household using the last-birthday method (Lavrakas 1993). Residents of Long Island were oversampled (N=818) and Queens' residents undersampled (N=403) during sample selection. Respondents in these two areas were reweighted to reflect their true prevalence in the combined population.

Measures

Personal threat was assessed by the following two questions: "How concerned are you personally about you yourself or a family member being the victim of a future terrorist attack in the United States?" and "How worried are you that you yourself or someone in your immediate family might receive a letter in the mail at home or at work contaminated with the anthrax bacteria?" *National Threat* was assessed by the following two questions: "How concerned are you that there will be another major terrorist attack on US soil in the near future?" and "How concerned are you that there will be a major terrorist attack in the US involving biological, or chemical weapons?" The survey was conducted during the height of the anthrax scare and

interviewers were allowed to clarify that future biological attacks were in addition to the current anthrax incidents.

National economic assessments were one of the primary dependent variables in this study. Concerns about national and personal economic conditions were drawn from the Consumer Sentiment Index (from the Survey of Consumers conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan). All questions are treated as single items because they deal with differing time frames. Some are retrospective, others deal with the next 12 months, and others ask about the next 5 years. The first question assesses perceived business conditions in the next 12 months and asks “Now turning to business conditions in the country as a whole – do you think that during the next twelve months we’ll have good times financially, or bad times, or what?” Long-term prospective economic conditions were assessed by the following question: “Looking ahead, which would you say is more likely – that in the country as a whole we’ll have continuous good times during the next five years or so, or that we will have periods of widespread unemployment, or depression, or what?” The following two questions were also included about the future of the *stock market*: “Where do you think the stock market will stand one year from now? Do you think it will be up 10% or more, up somewhat but not as much as 10%, down somewhat but not as much as 10 percent, down 10% or more, or will it stay the same?” and “Where do you think the stock market will stand five years from now. Do you think it will be up 10% or more, up somewhat but not as much as 10%, down somewhat but not as much as 10 percent, down 10% or more, or will it stay the same?”

Personal Economic Assessments were also included as a check on the pervasiveness of the effects of personal and national threat. The following question tapped perceived retrospective finances: “We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you

say that you are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago?” A second question tapped prospective finances and asked “Now looking ahead – do you think that a year from now you will be better off financially, or worse off, or just the same as now?”

Several questions asked respondents about *behavioral changes* that they had undertaken since September 11 to reduce their exposure to risk. One question addressed anthrax and asked “Have you been handling your mail at home more carefully as a consequence of recent news about anthrax?” Another dealt with changes in time spent with family and asked “Have you changed your daily routine to spend more time with your children or family since the attacks?” Several questions dealt with changes in travel plans. The first concerned air travel and asked “Have you delayed or canceled any specific plans to travel by air in the near future as a consequence of the attacks?” The second set of questions were combined to assess any changes in other travel plans and included the following questions: “Are you planning to take a vacation or a weekend getaway in the next six months?” If yes: “Have you changed the destination of any planned vacations or weekend getaways as a consequence of the attacks? If no: “Did you cancel any specific vacation or weekend plans as a consequence of the attacks?” Two questions dealt with traveling into and around Manhattan: “Since the attacks have you driven by car into Manhattan more often, less often, or about as often as before?” and “Since the attacks have you used public transportation to get into and around Manhattan more often, less often, or about as often as before? “

Several questions tapped the *direct and indirect effect of terrorism*. Living in Queens was obtained from area code information; respondents who worked in Queens were identified by a single question on work location. Individuals who knew someone killed in the attacks were

identified by the following question: “Do you, or someone in your family know someone who is missing, hurt, or killed in the terrorist attacks of September 11?”

Analysis

About six weeks after the September 11 terrorist attacks, survey respondents saw pervasive future threats to the nation: 82% were very or somewhat concerned about another major terrorist attack in the near future and 81% were similarly worried about a biological or chemical attack. These results are presented in Table 1. On both questions, almost 50% of all respondents reported being *very* concerned about further terrorist attacks. Similar levels of perceived threat were recorded in a CBS News national poll conducted at roughly the same time, in late October. In the national poll, 88% of respondents were somewhat or very concerned that there would be “another attack on the US in the next few months” (Polling Report).

A large number of Long Island and Queens’ respondents also felt threatened personally by the possibility of future attacks: 70% were very or somewhat concerned that they or a family member would be the victim of a future terrorist attack and 48% were somewhat or very worried about receiving an anthrax-tainted letter. Of those concerned about receiving a letter containing anthrax, about half were *very* concerned that they or a family member would be affected. These numbers are not that different from those observed for the nation as a whole. In a Fox News poll conducted in mid-October, 46% of national respondents reported being somewhat or very concerned that they or a family member would be “exposed to bioterrorism, such as anthrax” (Polling Report).

It is clear that in the immediate aftermath of the September 11 attacks, residents of the New York metropolitan area were very worried about the likelihood of additional terrorist attacks in the United States. This is understandable given news coverage in the weeks after the

attacks and continuing statements from government officials that more attacks were probable. Moreover, in some respects New Yorkers were more concerned about attacks in their area than were residents in other parts of the country. In early October, 74% of New Yorkers expressed concern about another terrorist attack in the area in which they lived compared to 31% of national poll respondents, interviewed in a separate poll (CBS News).

Perhaps somewhat more surprising is the number of people who worried that they would be directly affected by terrorism. This level of personal concern might be the result of the graphic images of the destruction of the World Trade Center Towers and the damage to the Pentagon, and is consistent with previous research demonstrating that people tend to over-generalize from vivid, negative events (Lichtenstein et al 1978; Johnson and Tversky 1983). In addition, almost 54% of people interviewed in this survey said that they, or someone in their family, knew someone who was missing, hurt, or killed in the September 11 attacks. This is substantially higher than the national percentage (20% in a poll conducted in mid-September; Pew 2001). Knowing someone who was killed in the attacks would help to reinforce the immediacy of the events of September 11. However, even after the attacks and the reports of anthrax-contaminated mail, the objective likelihood of being hurt in a terrorist attack or receiving a letter contaminated by anthrax was very low for most people, even in the greater New York area. Objectively, local residents should not have been very concerned that they would be *directly* affected by another terrorist attack, even if they believed such attacks to be likely.

We also find that significant numbers of people reported that they had altered their behavior in the weeks after September 11. Most notably, 55% of the respondents said that they were handling mail at home more carefully as a consequence of the news about anthrax contamination. In addition, 26% said that they had delayed or cancelled plans to travel by air, 7%

said that they had changed upcoming vacation travel plans, 18.4% said that they were driving into Manhattan less often, 13% reported taking mass transportation into Manhattan less often, and 31% said that they had changed their daily routine to spend more time with their children or family since September 11. The impact of the terrorist attacks (including the anthrax contaminated mail) on people's lives is also evident from the 52% of respondents who said that, in the week before the interview, they had found it somewhat or very difficult to concentrate on their job or normal activities. Regardless of the validity of people's fears, these behavioral consequences of the terrorist attacks clearly had a substantial effect on the economies of the U.S. and New York City.

** INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE **

In order to further explore the causes and consequences of the perceived threat of terrorism, we factor analyzed the four subjective threat questions. A principal axis extraction with an oblique (direct oblimin) rotation produced two distinct but correlated dimensions that separated the two personal threat and the two national threat items. The estimated correlation between the two factors is .60 so, not surprisingly, the more people believed that there would be future terrorist attacks on the U.S. the more they were concerned for themselves and their families. Based on these results we constructed two scales: one for perceived national threat (inter-item $r = .71$) and one for personal threat ($r = .56$). Both variables were recoded to range from a minimum of 0 (no perceived threat) to 1 (maximum threat). Confirmation of two distinct factors lends support to our first hypothesis: that the perceived threat posed by terrorism to oneself and one's family is distinct from the perceived threat of terrorism to the nation.

Personal and national threat are distinct but related as observed in the factor analysis. One of the reasons for a healthy relationship between personal and national threat is that personal

threat is conditional on perceived national threat. Not surprisingly, respondents who minimized the likelihood of a future attack on US soil experienced very low levels of personal threat. Among those perceiving low levels of future national threat, only 4% felt highly threatened personally. In contrast, 47% of those perceiving a high level of national risk also felt highly threatened personally. In essence, high levels of personal threat were concentrated among individuals who perceived that an attack on US soil was highly likely. Among those who perceived a high level of national risk, roughly half felt highly threatened personally by such an event while the other half felt moderately threatened. This relationship is presented in Table 2.

** INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE **

Determinants of Perceived Threat

To examine the determinants of perceived threat we regressed both threat measures on a number of variables. As shown in Table 3, these included demographic variables such as age, occupation, income, religion, gender, race, and ethnicity, whether the respondent works in New York City (with a higher likelihood of terrorist victimization), whether they live in Queens (closer to Manhattan and associated with higher levels of risk than suburban Long Island), whether they knew anyone who was injured or died in the September 11 attacks, and partisanship – a likely influence on levels of perceived national threat. Table 3 reports the unstandardized regression coefficients and their estimated standard errors.³

The most notable result of this analysis is the hypothesized effect of gender on both perceived threat scales. Men are significantly less likely than women to perceive the US as at risk from an additional terrorist attack and are less worried about being directly affected by such

³ Missing income information was imputed from a regression equation that included the following variables as predictors: worse financial situation, local business conditions, marital status, own stock, made stock market gains, professional occupation, sales or clerical occupation, education, gender, live in Queens, age 18-30, age 30-50, perceived length of recession. The Adj. R² for this model was .31

attacks. The estimated difference between men and women on both variables is about 12% of their full range, as seen from the size of the two coefficients (-.12 for national and -.13 for personal). In addition, white collar workers (the primary victims in the collapse of the World Trade towers) are more likely to perceive both national and personal threat than blue collar workers and those who are unemployed. The other consistent finding across the two measures is that Hispanics are more likely to be threatened (especially personally) than are whites.

** INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE **

Several variables influence perceived personal but not national threat. The most interesting effect is for education. Better educated individuals are less likely to worry about being directly affected by terrorism, in parallel with an earlier finding that less educated individuals were more likely to fear terrorism (Downes-LeGuin and Hoffman 1993). There is, however, no effect of education on concern about further terrorist attacks in the U.S. This suggests that education improves the use of base rate information to arrive at a more accurate and less alarming view of the personal risks posed by terrorism. People who live in Queens (a borough of New York City) are somewhat more likely to worry about the personal threat of terrorism. Finally, two other significant, but small coefficients indicate that blacks and Democrats are somewhat more worried about the personal threat of terrorism than whites and Republicans, respectively.

It is clear that an assessment of personal threat is only partially influenced by objective risk factors: living in Queens and working in a white collar occupation could both be seen as factors that increased the chance of victimization on September 11. But other factors such as less education, partisanship, being female, black or Hispanic are not associated with a higher risk of

exposure to terrorism. Rather they seem to hint at differences in the way in which threat is appraised.

Overall, these two regressions leave much *unexplained* about the determinants of threat perceptions. Unfortunately, the Newsday-Stony Brook survey does not contain the questions necessary to test other potential explanations such as differential attention to news reports, personality differences, and social network communications.

Perceived Threat and the Economy

To examine the effects of threat on the perceived national consequences of terrorism, we examined the determinants of a series of questions from the Newsday-Stony Brook survey on the perceived current and future state of the national economy. Two of these questions concern prospective assessments of the national economy; one asks about changes over the next year and the other over the next five years. Two other questions use the same one year and five year time frames to obtain future assessments of the U.S. stock market. Responses from these four questions were regressed on the two threat measures and a series of other variables shown in Tables 4 and 5. For the most part, the predictor variables are identical to those used in the previous regression analysis. The dependent variables in Tables 4 and 5 are scored so that they range from 0 (most negative economic assessments) to 1 (most positive).

As shown in Table 4, the greater the perceived risk of future terrorist attacks on the U.S. the more negative the assessments of the U.S. economy in both the coming year and the next five years. In both instances the coefficient for national threat is sizeable (-.27 and -.20). There is no evidence in these analyses, however, that perceived personal threat has any effect on judgments of the national economy. Both coefficients are barely different from zero and much smaller than their standard errors.

** INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE **

The same general results are found in respondents' assessments of the future of the U.S. stock market, as shown in Table 5. National threat has a significant effect on the perceived future of the stock market for both the one year and five year time frames, although national threat perceptions have less impact on judgments of the stock market than on assessments of the national economy. Once again, there is no effect of personal threat on economic forecasts. The only other consistent trend is that lower income individuals are more optimistic about the economy and the stock market over the next 12 months.

** INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE **

These findings suggest that people consider their beliefs about the likelihood of additional terrorist attacks on the US when assessing the future of the national economy, consistent with the national threat hypothesis. There is no evidence, however, that the personal threat of terrorism has any additional impact on economic judgments, at odds with the personal threat hypothesis. Within days after September 11, the media were prominently reporting stories of the likely negative economic consequences of the terrorist attacks. Undoubtedly the salient link drawn in the media between the events of September 11 and an economic downturn heightened this connection among members of the public as well. There is no evidence, however, that fears about one's own victimization distorted estimates of future conditions beyond concerns about the nation as a whole.

To check that the influence of perceived national threat on national economic conditions involves a reasonable calculation of the effects of terrorism, we examine the effects of national threat on respondents' prospective and retrospective judgments of their own economic situation. To the extent that the national economy is hurt by future terrorist activity, people should be more

pessimistic about their own economic future. However, there is no reason why the fear of terrorism should influence people's reports of how their economic well-being has changed in the *preceding* year.

The results of these two regression analyses are presented in Table 6. Consistent with our prior findings, national threat has a substantial effect on respondents' assessments of their own economic prospects. Respondents who perceived the nation to be at greater risk of a future terrorist attack were more pessimistic about their own future finances. In contrast, national threat perceptions had no effect on judgments of respondents' retrospective finances. This is consistent with the notion that judgments of national threat are carefully evaluated and involve a reasoned guess about the likely impact of terrorism on the economy. But even individuals who thought they were at risk of victimization did not translate this into concern about their own personal finances over the next 12 months or 5 years.

There were several other interesting predictors of one's economic future. Individuals who had lost a job or lost money in the stock market were more pessimistic in the short-term. Older respondents were more pessimistic about their finances in the short and long-term. Republicans and those with higher incomes were more optimistic about their personal finances in the next 12 months and 5 years.

** INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE **

Fear of Terrorism and Personal Behavior

To this point we have found significant evidence that the perceived risk of a future terrorist attack on the nation influences assessments of the national economy and one's future economic well-being. We have found no evidence, however, that the perceived personal threat of terrorism has any effect on assessments of the national economy or personal economic well-

being. Holding national threat constant, the coefficients for personal threat are all close to zero. Previous research suggests, however, that personal fears may motivate behaviors designed to minimize risk even if it does not extend to judgments about the economy or other national issues. Do people adjust their behavior to deal with the personal fear of terrorism, consistent with the personal threat hypothesis?

To test this prediction, we used questions from the Newsday-Stony Brook survey to gauge the extent to which people report that they have changed their behavior since September 11. We noted earlier in the analysis that significant numbers of people reported that they had exercised greater caution in handling the mail, spent more time with their families, canceled or postponed air-travel, altered vacation plans, driven into Manhattan less, and been less likely to use public transportation to get into or around the city since September 11. We now use those six indicators as dependent variables in probit equations to determine the relative impact of national and personal threat on the occurrence of behavioral change since the attacks. The six sets of estimates are shown in Table 7.

As opposed to the previous results, personal threat of terrorism has a significant effect on four of the six personal behaviors. Personal threat has its largest effect on increased care in handling the mail, though the size of this coefficient should be viewed cautiously since one of the personal threat items is fear of receiving anthrax in the mail. In addition, personal threat increases the amount of time respondents report having spent with their children or family, leads to a postponement of air travel, and a decreased use of mass transportation into and around Manhattan. The personal threat of terrorism is thus real and consequential. It substantially affects the ways in which people live their daily lives. And while some of these behaviors – for example, being more cautious with the mail – may have few collective consequences, others,

such as traveling less, can have a major effect on the nation's economy. These results show that the personal threat of terrorist victimization has a significant effect on individual behavior with broader national implications in the aggregate.

**** INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE ****

Perceived national threat also has a modest effect on personal behavior. It leads to canceled or delayed air travel plans, canceled weekend trips or vacations or a change in destination for such travel, and a decreased likelihood of driving by car into Manhattan. In other words, a perceived future terrorist attack on US soil encouraged local residents to change their travel plans in both the local area and to other destinations. The link between travel and a national attack may have been heightened by national security precautions at airports and Manhattan's bridges and tunnels, suggesting that officials expected a future attack to target air travel or the auto routes in and out of Manhattan. There were few other consistent demographic predictors of behavioral changes in the equations presented in Table 7.

Discussion and Conclusion

In support of the national threat hypothesis, the residents of Queens and Long Island based their estimates of the national consequences of terrorism on concerns about a future terrorist attack in the US, not on their personal concerns about being victimized. Thus, individuals who saw a future terrorist attack on US soil as more likely were more pessimistic about the future of the economy and the stock market. This is consistent with a large amount of research that finds that personal interests and concerns are rarely translated into support for specific candidates or policies at the national level (Sears and Funk 1991). Our findings are also

consistent with studies that find a minimal effect of a fear of being drafted or the threat of nuclear war on support for militaristic policies (Sears and Funk 1991).

Several different reasons have been put forward to explain why individuals rarely translate their personal concerns into national considerations. These include the tenuous link between national policy and one's own situation or the myriad other factors, including idiosyncratic forces, that shape an individual's position but do not influence the fortunes of others or the nation as a whole (Sears and Funk 1991). From this perspective, personally receiving an anthrax-tainted letter has tremendously negative consequences for one's personal health but does not necessarily bode poorly for the economy as a whole.⁴

This explanation is not fully satisfying, however, when it comes to reactions to terrorism. Surely, there is a more direct link between effective homeland security and a lower risk of personal victimization by terrorism than between declining personal finances and taxation policy. If tightened security averts a terrorist attack, the chances of personal terrorist victimization decrease unambiguously. It is less clear that a tax cut will improve a given family's economic circumstances. Even Sears and Funk (1991) suggest, as they review and find relatively few political effects of self-interest, that a feared outcome provides one condition in which negative personal circumstances stimulate the translation of personal concerns into national assessments.

At the outset, we suggested that fearful and highly arousing personal concerns would influence national views in two different ways. First, we expected personal threat to result in some form of cognitive shutdown in which greater attention is paid to threatening information and less careful attention is given to processing information about terrorist-related events more generally. We suggested that this might bias estimates of the possible impact of future terrorist

⁴ We also examined a possible interaction between personal and national threat to test the idea that the personal threat amplifies the effects of national threat. But the interaction was significant for only one of the 12 dependent variables presented in Tables 4-7 in analyses not shown.

attacks by exaggerating the negative impact of such events on the future national economy. In relation to this expectation, there is no question that respondents, along with residents of the nation as a whole, overestimated the threat of personal victimization. This exaggerated view of personal risk did not translate readily into a heightened concern about the national economy, however. It appears that personal threat did not bias the processing of information when it came to assessing the consequences of terrorism.

But we suggested a second way in which personal threat is likely to shape reactions to a threatening event, based on findings from studies on crime victimization. Individuals who felt personally threatened by terrorism were expected to take or support actions that decreased their exposure to terrorism. Such actions are motivated by a desire to reduce the negative emotions, such as fear, associated with threat. We find some support for this notion when it comes to personal behaviors. Consistent with evidence from research on crime victimization, individuals who perceive themselves as the likely victims of crime tend to change their behavior in ways that minimize their risk (Ferraro 1996) – they use more caution in handling their mail, spend more time with their families, change their plans to travel by air, and use public transportation less frequently. From this perspective, it may be irrational to avoid flying, given the very small percentage of people who die in airplane accidents, but it is emotionally sensible to avoid flying if it prevents the arousal of intensely fearful emotions.

We did not have items to test this link at the national level, however, leaving open the possibility that the personal threat of terrorism motivates support for national policies designed to minimize the risk of terrorism, such as tightened homeland security policies and the curtailment of civil liberties. The only questions on national events and circumstances included in the Newsday-Stony Brook survey concerned the perceived economic consequences of the

September 11 terrorist attacks and, as has been noted, these were unaffected by levels of perceived personal threat. . Thus, the limitations of the existing data set prevented us from extending our research to a broader set of political and national judgments concerning, for example, the treatment of Arab immigrants or the fate of Osama bin Laden if found by US troops.

Given the results of the current study, it is unclear whether personal or national threat would have greatest impact on support for national policies designed to reduce the risk of terrorism. On the one hand, the perceived economic consequences of terrorism were largely shaped by the degree of perceived national not personal threat, implying that respondents did not place undue emphasis on their own fears when evaluating the state of the nation. On the other hand, personal threat had a substantial effect on solutions, albeit personal solutions, to the threat of terrorism. Further research is needed to untangle whether the effects of personal threat are confined to the adoption of more cautious personal behaviors or extend to support for national policies and candidates designed to minimize the threat of terrorism.

- Arian, A. (1989). A people apart: coping with national security problems in Israel. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 33, 605-631.
- Arian, A. & Gordon, C. (1993). The political and psychological impact of the Gulf War on the Israeli public. In S. A. Renshon (Ed.), *The political psychology of the Gulf War: leaders, publics and the process of conflict*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Bar-Tal, D., Jacobson, D., & Freund, T. (1995). Security feelings among Jewish settlers in the occupied territories. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39, 353-377.
- Blaney, P. H. (1986). Affect and memory: a review. *Psychological Review*, 99, 229-246.
- Bodenhausen, G. V., Sheppard, L. A., & Kramer, G. P. (1994). Negative affect and social judgment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 45-62.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 191-214.
- CBS News (October 12, 2001). New York City: The aftermath of the terrorist attacks. Unpublished report, Manhattan.
- Citrin, J., Green, D. P., & Muste, C. (1997). Public opinion toward immigration reform: the role of economic motivations. *The Journal of Politics*, 59, 858-81.
- Doty, R. M., Peterson, B. E., & Winter, D. G. (1991). Threat and authoritarianism in the United States, 1978-1987. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 629-640.
- Downes-Le Guin, T., & Hoffman, B. (1993). *The impact of terrorism on public opinion, 1988 to 1989*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Feldman, S. (1988). Economic self-interest and political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, 26, 446-466.
- Feldman, S. & Stenner, K. (1997). Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 18, 741-770.

- Ferraro, K. A. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, 75, 667-690.
- Gilligan, S.G., & Bower, G. H. (1984). Cognitive consequences of emotional arousal. In C. Izard, J. Kagan, & R. Zajonc (Eds.), *Emotions, Cognition, and Behavior*. New York: Cambridge.
- Gordon, C., & Arian A. (2001). Threat and decision making. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45, 197-215.
- Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Chatel, D. (1992). Terror management and tolerance: does mortality salience always intensify negative reactions to others who threaten one's world view? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 212-220.
- Hermann, C. F. (1969). *Crises in foreign policy*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Herrman, R. K. (1984). Perceptions and foreign policy analysis. In D. A. Sylvan & S. Chan, (Eds.) *Foreign policy decision making*. New York: Praeger.
- Huddy, L., Feldman, S., Taber, C., & Lahav, G. (2002). The psychological consequences of perceived threat. Unpublished manuscript. SUNY at Stony Brook.
- Jacobson, D., & Bar-Tal, D. (1995). Structure of security beliefs among Israeli students. *Political Psychology*, 16, 567-590.
- Janis, I.L. (1982). *Groupthink*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Janis, I.L., & Feshbach, S. (1953). Effects of fear-arousing communications. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 48, 78-92.
- Johnson, E. J., & Tversky, A. (1983). Affect, generalization and the perception of risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 20-31.

- Kahneman, D., & Tversky A. (1979). Prospect theory: an analysis of decisions under risk. *Econometrica*, 47, 263-291.
- Kinder, D. R., Adams, G. S., & Gronke, P. W. (1989). Economics and politics in the 1984 American presidential election. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33, 491-515.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1985). Public opinion and political action. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 659-741). NY: Random House.
- Kinder, D. R., & Kiewiet, D. R. (1981). Sociotropic politics: the American case. *British Journal of Political Science*, 11, 129-62.
- Kuzma, L. (2000). Trends: Terrorism in the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64, 90-105.
- Lavrakas, P. J. (1993). *Telephone survey methods: Sampling, Selection and Supervision*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and behavior*. New York: John Wiley.
- Lieberman, A., & Chaiken, S. (1993). Defensive processing of personally relevant health messages. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Lichtenstein, S., Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., Layman, M., & Combs, B. (1978). Judged Frequency of lethal events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 4, 551-578.
- Lichtenstein, S., Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., Layman, M., & Combs, B. (1978). Judged frequency of lethal events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 4, 551-578.
- Lodge, M., & Taber, C. (2000). Three steps toward a theory of motivated political reasoning. In A. Lupia, M. McCubbins, & S. Popkin (Eds.), *Elements of political reasoning*:

- understanding and expanding the limits of rationality*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcus, G. E., Sullivan, J. L., Theiss-Morse, E., & Wood, S. L. (1995). *With malice toward some: how people make civil liberties judgments*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcus, G. E. & MacKuen, M. B. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: the emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *The American Political Science Review*, 87, 672-685.
- Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W. R., & Mackuen, M. B. (2000). *Affective intelligence and political judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mathews, A., and C. MacLeod (1986). Discrimination of threat cues without awareness in anxiety states. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 95: 131-138.
- Mutz, D.C., & Mondak, J.J. (1997). Dimensions of sociotropic behavior: group based judgements of fairness and well-being. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41, 284-305.
- Niemi, R. G., Mueller, J., & Smith, T. W. (1989). *Trends in public opinion*. New York: Greenwood.
- Poikolainen, K., Kanerva, R., & Loennqvist, J. 1998. Increasing fear of nuclear war among adolescents before the outbreak of the Persian Gulf war. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 52, 197-202.
- Polling Report. September 26, 1991. www.pollingreport.com/terror.htm

- Raviv, A., Sadeh, A., Raviv, A., Silberstein, O. & Diver, O. (2000). Young Israelis' reactions to national trauma: the Rabin assassination and terror attacks. *Political Psychology*, *21*, 299-322.
- Rokeach, Milton. (1960). *The open and closed mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Roper Center. www.ropercenter.uconn.edu
- Satfford, M. C., & Galle, O. R. (1984). Vicimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. *Criminology*, *22*, 173-85.
- Sattler, D. N., Kaiser, C. F., & Hittner, J. B. (2000). Disaster preparedness: relationships among prior experience, personal characteristics, and distress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *30*, 1396-1420.
- Schimmel, Jeff, Linda Simon, Jeff Greenberg, Tom Pyszczynski, Sheldon Solomon, Jeanette Waxmonsky, and Jamie Arndt. (1999). Stereotypes and terror management: evidence that mortality salience enhances stereotypic thinking and preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 905-926.
- Seago, D.W. (1947). Stereotypes: before Pearl Harbor and after. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *23*, 55-63.
- Sears, D. O., & Funk, C. (1991). The role of self-interest in social and political attitudes. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, *24*, 1-91.
- Sears, D. O., Lau, R. R., Tyler, T. R., & Allen Jr., H. M. (1980). Self-interest vs. symbolic politics in policy attitudes and presidential voting. *American Political Science Review*, *74*, 670-84.
- Smith, D. A. & Uchida, C. D. (1988). The social organization of self-help: a study of defensive weapon ownership. *American Sociological Review*, *53*, 94-102.

Struch, N., & Schwartz, H. S. (1989). Intergroup aggression: its predictors and distinctiveness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 364-373.

t'Hart, P. (1990). *Groupthink in Government*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Thaler, R.H. (1983). Illusions and mirages in public policy. *Public Interest*, 73, 60-74.

Tyler, T. R. (1984). Assessing the risk of crime victimization: the integration of personal victimization experience and socially transmitted information. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40, 27-38.

Vertzberger, Y. Y. I. (1998). *Risk taking and decision making*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Warr, M. (1984). Fear of victimization: why are women and the elderly more afraid? *Social Science Quarterly*, 65, 681-702.

Warr, M. (1990). Dangerous situations: social context and fear of victimization. *Social Forces*, 68, 891-907.

TABLE 1
Frequency Distributions for Personal and National Threat Items

Personal Threat

How concerned are you personally about you yourself or a family member being a victim for a future terrorist attack in the United States?

➤ Very concerned	415	34.1%
➤ Somewhat concerned	437	35.9%
➤ Not very concerned	190	15.6%
➤ Not at all concerned	156	12.8%
➤ Don't know	21	1.7%
	N= 1221	

How worried are you that you yourself, or someone in your immediate family might receive a letter in the mail at home contaminated with the anthrax bacteria?

➤ Very worried	278	22.8%
➤ Somewhat worried	302	24.8%
➤ Not very worried	331	27.1%
➤ Not at all worried	308	25.2%
➤ Don't know	0	0%
	N= 1221	

National Threat

How concerned are you that there will be a major terrorist attack on US soil in the near future?

➤ Very Concerned	579	47.5%
➤ Somewhat Concerned	414	34.0%
➤ Not very concerned	108	8.8%
➤ Not at all concerned	105	8.6%
➤ Don't know	13	1.1%
	N= 1221	

How concerned are you that there will be a major terrorist attack in the US involving biological, or chemical weapons?

➤ Very Concerned	600	49.2%
➤ Somewhat Concerned	387	31.7%
➤ Not very concerned	127	10.4%
➤ Not at all concerned	88	7.3%
➤ Don't know	17	1.4%
	N= 1221	

TABLE 2
Relationship Between Personal and National Threat

Personal Threat	National Threat		
	<i>Low</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>
<i>Low</i>	69.2%	21.7%	6.3%
<i>Medium</i>	26.9%	68.4%	47.0%
<i>High</i>	3.8%	10.0%	46.7%
<i>N</i>	78	452	647

Note: Entries are percentages. The threat scales were split into 3 on the basis of their original 7 categories (constructed by combining the 2 items for each scale listed in Table 1). High threat was made up of the 2 highest values, medium threat of the middle 3 values, and low threat from the 2 lowest values.

TABLE 3
Predictors of Personal and National Threat Perceptions

	National Threat Increase		Personal Threat Increase	
<i>Live in Queens</i>	-.03	(.02)	.05 *	(.02)
<i>Work in NYC</i>	.00	(.02)	-.01	(.03)
<i>Know any Victims</i>	.03	(.02)	.01	(.02)
<i>Gender</i>	-.12 **	(.02)	-.13 **	(.02)
<i>Age</i>	-.01	(.01)	-.01	(.01)
<i>Black</i>	.04	(.03)	.07 *	(.03)
<i>Hispanic</i>	.06 *	(.03)	.11 **	(.03)
<i>Education</i>	.01	(.03)	-.09 **	(.03)
<i>Income</i>	.00	(.00)	-.00	(.00)
<i>Party Identification</i>	.02	(.03)	.06 *	(.03)
<i>Married</i>	-.01	(.02)	.01	(.02)
<i>Children under 18</i>	.03	(.02)	.02	(.02)
<i>Occupation - Professionals</i>	.07 **	(.02)	.05 *	(.02)
<i>Occupation - Sales and Clerical</i>	.05 *	(.03)	.06 *	(.03)
<i>Occupation - Trade</i>	.00	(.03)	.02	(.04)
<i>Occupation - Laborer</i>	.02	(.04)	.07	(.05)
<i>Protestant</i>	-.01	(.03)	-.02	(.03)
<i>Catholic</i>	.01	(.02)	-.00	(.03)
<i>Jewish</i>	.07 *	(.03)	-.02	(.04)
<i>Constant</i>	.75 **	(.05)	.61 **	(.05)
<i>R²</i>	.09		.11	
<i>Adj. R²</i>	.07		.10	
<i>N</i>	1085		1091	

* p<. 05, ** p<. 01

Note: Parameter estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. All variables are coded on a 0 to 1 scale. The dependent variables, national threat and personal threat, are coded so that 1 = maximum threat and 0 = minimum threat; live in Queens is a dummy variable in which 1 = live in queens, 0 = otherwise; work in NYC is a dummy variable in which 1 = work in NYC, 0 = otherwise; gender is a dummy variable in which 0=female, 1=male; age is measured in tens of years; income is a measured in tens of thousands of dollars; party identification is a 7 category scale coded 1= strong Democrat and 0 = strong Republican; married is a dummy variable in which 1 = married or living with partner, 0 = otherwise; child is a dummy variable in which 1 = having at least one child, 0 = otherwise; the occupation variables are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific occupation, 0 = otherwise; Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific religion, 0 = otherwise. All tests of significance are two-tailed.

TABLE 4
Predictors of National Economic Evaluations – Business Conditions

	Improvement in One Year		Improvement in Five Years	
<i>Personal Threat</i>	.00	(.05)	-.09	(.05)
<i>National Threat</i>	-.27	** (.05)	-.20	** (.05)
<i>Gender</i>	.08	** (.02)	.12	** (.03)
<i>Age</i>	-.00	(.01)	.01	(.01)
<i>Black</i>	.03	(.04)	-.05	(.04)
<i>Hispanic</i>	-.07	(.04)	-.01	(.05)
<i>Education</i>	-.03	(.04)	-.01	(.05)
<i>Income</i>	-.01	* (.00)	.00	(.00)
<i>Party Identification</i>	-.11	** (.04)	-.04	(.04)
<i>Married</i>	-.03	(.03)	.02	(.03)
<i>Children under 18</i>	.01	(.03)	.03	(.03)
<i>Occupation - Professionals</i>	-.07	* (.03)	.03	(.03)
<i>Occupation – Sales and Clerical</i>	.02	(.04)	.04	(.04)
<i>Occupation - Trade</i>	.04	(.04)	.08	(.05)
<i>Occupation - Laborer</i>	.09	(.06)	-.03	(.06)
<i>Protestant</i>	-.04	(.04)	-.06	(.04)
<i>Catholic</i>	-.03	(.03)	-.00	(.03)
<i>Jewish</i>	-.01	(.05)	-.01	(.05)
<i>Constant</i>	.74	** (.07)	.59	** (.08)
R^2	.11		.10	
<i>Adj. R²</i>	.10		.08	
<i>N</i>	980		968	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Note: Parameter estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. All variables are coded on a 0 to 1 scale. The dependent variables business conditions in one year, and business conditions in five years are 5 category variables in which 1 = best conditions and 0 = worse conditions; national and personal threat are coded so that 1 = maximum threat and 0 = minimum threat; gender is a dummy variable in which 0=female, 1=male; married is a dummy variable in which 1 = married or living with partner, 0 = otherwise; age is measured in tens of years; income is measured in tens of thousands of dollars; party identification is a 7 category variable in which 1= strong Democrat and 0 = strong Republican; child is a dummy variable in which 1 = having at least one child, 0 = otherwise; the occupation variables are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific occupation, 0 = otherwise; Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific religion, 0 = otherwise. All tests of significance are two-tailed.

TABLE 5
Predictors of Stock-market Evaluations

	Improvement in One Year		Improvement in Five Years	
<i>Personal Threat</i>	-.06	(.05)	-.01	(.03)
<i>National Threat</i>	-.16	** (.04)	-.07	* (.03)
<i>Gender</i>	-.03	(.02)	.01	(.04)
<i>Age</i>	.00	(.01)	.01	(.01)
<i>Black</i>	-.08	* (.04)	-.02	(.03)
<i>Hispanic</i>	-.03	(.04)	-.01	(.03)
<i>Education</i>	.00	(.04)	.08	** (.03)
<i>Income</i>	.01	** (.00)	.00	(.00)
<i>Party Identification</i>	.01	(.03)	-.03	(.02)
<i>Married</i>	-.00	(.02)	.01	(.02)
<i>Children under 18</i>	-.02	(.02)	-.01	(.02)
<i>Occupation - Professionals</i>	.01	(.03)	.04	* (.02)
<i>Occupation - Sales and Clerical</i>	.00	(.03)	.02	(.02)
<i>Occupation - Trade</i>	.04	(.04)	.04	(.03)
<i>Occupation - Laborer</i>	.07	(.05)	.00	(.04)
<i>Protestant</i>	-.09	** (.03)	.01	(.02)
<i>Catholic</i>	-.02	(.03)	.05	** (.02)
<i>Jewish</i>	-.05	(.04)	.00	(.03)
<i>Constant</i>	.80	** (.06)	.81	** (.05)
<i>R²</i>	.07		.07	
<i>Adj. R²</i>	.05		.05	
<i>N</i>	983		882	

* p<. 05, ** p<. 01

Note: Parameter estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. All variables are coded on a 0 to 1 scale. The dependent variables stock market in one year, and stock market in five years are 5 category variables in which 1 = best conditions and 0 = worse conditions; national and personal threat are coded so that 1 = maximum threat and 0 = minimum threat; gender is a dummy variable in which 0=female, 1=male; married is a dummy variable in which 1 = married or living with partner, 0 = otherwise; age is measured in tens of years; income is measured in tens of thousands of dollars; party identification is a 7 category variable in which 1= strong Democrat and 0 = strong Republican; child is a dummy variable in which 1 = having at least one child, 0 = otherwise; the occupation variables are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific occupation, 0 = otherwise; Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific religion, 0 = otherwise. All tests of significance are two-tailed.

TABLE 6
Predictors of Personal Economic Evaluations

	Better off than 12 months ago		Better off in 12 months	
<i>Personal Threat</i>	-.04	(.05)	-.03	(.05)
<i>National Threat</i>	-.00	(.07)	-.11 *	(.05)
<i>Lost Job</i>	-.29 **	(.05)	-.07	(.05)
<i>Lost Money</i>	-.08 **	(.03)	-.04	(.03)
<i>Gender</i>	-.03	(.03)	.01	(.02)
<i>Age</i>	-.04 **	(.01)	-.05 **	(.01)
<i>Black</i>	.11 *	(.04)	.04	(.04)
<i>Hispanic</i>	-.09 *	(.04)	-.02	(.04)
<i>Education</i>	-.06	(.04)	-.01	(.04)
<i>Income</i>	.01 **	(.00)	.01 *	(.00)
<i>Party Identification</i>	-.09 *	(.04)	-.07 *	(.03)
<i>Married</i>	-.01	(.03)	-.06 *	(.03)
<i>Children under 18</i>	-.01	(.03)	.00	(.03)
<i>Occupation - Professionals</i>	.10 **	(.03)	.04	(.03)
<i>Occupation – Sales and Clerical</i>	.05	(.04)	.02	(.04)
<i>Occupation - Trade</i>	.06	(.05)	.14 **	(.04)
<i>Occupation - Laborer</i>	.00	(.06)	-.11 *	(.06)
<i>Protestant</i>	.00	(.04)	.00	(.04)
<i>Catholic</i>	.03	(.03)	.05	(.03)
<i>Jewish</i>	-.01	(.05)	.11 *	(.04)
<i>Constant</i>	.67 **	(.07)	.39 **	(.07)
<i>R²</i>	.13		.11	
<i>Adj. R²</i>	.11		.09	
<i>N</i>	1063		968	

* p<. 05, ** p<. 01

Note: Parameter estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. All variables are coded on a 0 to 1 scale. The dependent variables present personal economic situation, and personal economic situation in one year, are 5 category variables in which 1 = best conditions and 0 = worse conditions; national and personal threat are coded so that 1 = maximum threat and 0 = minimum threat; lost job is a dummy variable in which 1 = lost job due to the attacks, 0 = otherwise; lost money is a dummy variable in which 1 = lost money at the stock market, 0 = otherwise; gender is a dummy variable in which 0=female, 1=male; married is a dummy variable in which 1 = married or living with partner, 0 = otherwise; age is measured in tens of years; income is measured in tens of thousands of dollars; party identification is a 7 category variable in which 1= strong Democrat and 0 = strong Republican; child is a dummy variable in which 1 = having at least one child, 0 = otherwise; the occupation variables are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific occupation, 0 = otherwise; Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific religion, 0 = otherwise. All tests of significance are two-tailed.

TABLE 7
Predictors of Personal Behaviors

	More Caution in Handling Mail			More Time Spent with Family			Change Air-travel			Change Travel Plans			Driving Less into Manhattan			Taking Public Transport. Less into Manhattan		
<i>Personal Threat</i>	1.62	**	(.18)	.66	**	(.18)	.50	**	(.18)	.02		(.25)	.28		(.19)	.48	*	(.21)
<i>National Threat</i>	.08		(.18)	.36		(.20)	.48	*	(.20)	.54	*	(.26)	.62	**	(.23)	.01		(.23)
<i>Gender</i>	-.17		(.09)	-.03		(.09)	-.08		(.09)	-.21		(.13)	-.01		(.10)	-.16		(.11)
<i>Age</i>	.00		(.00)	-.01	**	(.00)	.00		(.00)	-.01		(.00)	-.01	*	(.00)	-.01		(.00)
<i>Black</i>	.55	**	(.17)	.23		(.16)	.19		(.16)	.03		(.24)	.45	**	(.16)	.08		(.19)
<i>Hispanic</i>	.10		(.16)	.03		(.16)	.29		(.16)	.21		(.22)	.17		(.18)	.28		(.17)
<i>Education</i>	-.12		(.16)	-.02		(.17)	.03		(.17)	-.14		(.23)	.04		(.19)	.22		(.20)
<i>Income</i>	-.14		(.25)	-.04		(.26)	.34		(.26)	1.18	**	(.38)	.09		(.29)	-.24		(.33)
<i>Party Identification</i>	.13		(.13)	.14		(.13)	.14		(.13)	.01		(.18)	.09		(.15)	.02		(.16)
<i>Married</i>	.19	*	(.10)	-.04		(.10)	.09		(.10)	-.16		(.14)	-.16		(.11)	.01		(.12)
<i>Children under 18</i>	.12		(.10)	.52	**	(.10)	.01		(.10)	-.06		(.13)	.12		(.10)	-.15		(.12)
<i>Occupation – Professionals</i>	.00		(.12)	.07		(.12)	.16		(.12)	.05		(.16)	-.12		(.13)	-.26		(.14)
<i>Occupation – Sales and Clerical</i>	-.08		(.13)	.08		(.13)	.41	**	(.13)	-.04		(.18)	.02		(.14)	-.44	**	(.17)
<i>Occupation – Trade</i>	.12		(.18)	.06		(.17)	-.03		(.18)	-.28		(.26)	-.08		(.18)	-.32		(.20)
<i>Occupation – Laborer</i>	.22		(.22)	.19		(.22)	.20		(.23)	-		-	.06		(.24)	.33		(.23)
<i>Protestant</i>	-.18		(.14)	.05		(.15)	.07		(.15)	.05		(.20)	-.25		(.15)	.23		(.18)
<i>Catholic</i>	.01		(.12)	.28	*	(.12)	.05		(.12)	.17		(.17)	-.16		(.13)	.18		(.16)
<i>Jewish</i>	-.15		(.16)	.22		(.18)	-.06		(.17)	.05		(.23)	-.28		(.19)	.07		(.21)
<i>Constant</i>	-.88	**	(.28)	-1.24	**	(.29)	-1.86	**	(.32)	-2.17	**	(.42)	-1.19	**	(.32)	-1.11	**	(.34)
<i>N</i>	1087			1087			1081			1043			1089			1089		

* p<. 05, ** p<. 01

Note: Parameter estimates are probit coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. All variables are coded on a 0 to 1 scale. The dependent variables more caution in handling mail, spend more time with family, change air travel, change travel plans, driving less into Manhattan, and taking public transportation less into Manhattan, are dichotomous variables in which 1 = yes, and 0 = no; national and personal threat are coded so that 1 = maximum threat and 0 = minimum threat; gender is a dummy variable in which 0=female, 1=male; age is measured in tens of years; income is measured in tens of thousands of dollars; party identification is a 7 category scale in which 1= strong Democrat and 0 = strong Republican; married is a dummy variable in which 1 = married or living with partner, 0 = otherwise; child is a dummy variable in which 1 = having at least one child, 0 = otherwise; the occupation variables are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific occupation, 0 = otherwise; Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, are dummy variables in which 1 = respondent has specific religion, 0 = otherwise. All tests of significance are two-tailed.