

C I N C I N N A T I L O O K S A G A I N

*A report of the effects of a six
months' information program on be-
half of the United Nations on
interest, information and opinion.*

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

REPORT NO. 37A

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. CHANGES IN INTEREST, INFORMATION AND OPINION WITH RESPECT TO THE UNITED NATIONS.	4
1. Changes in Interest in International Events.	4
2. Changes in General Orientation toward International Relations.	8
3. Changes in Information about the United Nations.	13
4. Changes in Opinion about the United Nations.	14
5. Changes in Action and Apathy with Respect to the United Nations	20
IN SUMMARY.	24
PART II. THE ROLE OF THE CINCINNATI PLAN FOR THE UNITED NATIONS	25
1. Exposure to the Campaign.	26
2. Whom the Campaign Reached	30
3. Effects of Exposure.	31
IN SUMMARY.	33
APPENDIX: OUTLINE OF THE STUDY.	34

INTRODUCTION

In September, 1947, the American Association for the United Nations and the United Nations Association of Cincinnati began a six months' program aimed "not at influencing opinion, but rather at a presentation of facts about the United Nations."¹ Cincinnati was chosen as "a typical American city in which to demonstrate how a whole community may become so intelligently informed on world affairs as to be a dynamic force in the creation of an ordered and eventually a peaceful world." In undertaking this task, the Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations took its keynote from the Preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." The Cincinnati Plan group added, "It is not only our duty, but our right as citizens of the world to know more about the United Nations -- to support it -- to strengthen it -- to help construct this defense of Peace."

It is not within the scope of this report to describe fully the course of the program put into operation in Cincinnati. We assume that the full report of the Committee will give the details of this civic mobilization -- the amount and kind of special information features in newspapers and on the radio; the special pamphlets, signs and posters prepared and distributed, the special meetings, speakers and sermons. This report is concerned with one phase of the Cincinnati Plan; viz., the results achieved by the Plan as reflected in opinion surveys made before the opening of the campaign in September, 1947 and again at its close in March, 1948.

In all, three samples of the adult population of the Cincinnati Metropolitan District were obtained:

1. A sample of 745 adults were interviewed in September, 1947.
2. A sub-sample of 592 of the originally-interviewed sample of 745 were reinterviewed in March, 1948. The 20% who were not reinterviewed were omitted for a variety of reasons: difficulties in locating them; refusals to be reinterviewed; departure from Cincinnati, etc. Careful comparisons indicated, however, that their omission did not introduce any biases.
3. A new sample of 758 adults were interviewed in March, 1948.

In selecting the two main samples, a procedure was followed which gave every household within the city and its suburbs an equal chance of being included. Once this random sample of households was drawn, an attempt was made to interview one person within each house-

¹The unidentified quotations are from the literature of the Committee on the Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations.

hold, these persons to be chosen in such a way as to constitute a representative sample of the adults of Greater Cincinnati. In a quarter of the cases, rigid controls were instituted to make certain that every member of the household would have an equal chance of being interviewed; in the remainder of the sample the individual to be interviewed was not completely predetermined. Careful analysis indicated that the samples obtained tended to give over-representation to the more easily accessible households and individuals, so adjustments to correct for this potential source of bias have been made.

The adjusted samples, on which this report is based, constitute accurate minatures of the adult population of the Cincinnati Metropolitan District. The representativeness of each of these samples as well as their comparability with one another are indicated by data on the composition of each sample shown in the appendix.

The first report summarized attitudes among Cincinnatians in September, 1947 as follows:

...attitudes among Cincinnatians...are not those of active opposition to an international outlook generally or to the United Nations more particularly. There is some criticism and dissatisfaction, but most people nevertheless express confidence in the United Nations and a disposition to continue to work through it. Though this "good will" exists, it is usually not buttressed by more active support. Many people are neither well informed about nor interested in the United Nations and its problems. Their indifference often reflects an inability to see the connection of such vast and remote problems to their immediate personal lives and concerns. For others the sheer bigness and complexity of international issues lead to the apathetic conviction that there is nothing an ordinary individual can do about them anyway.¹

Among the conclusions of the first study of particular importance to recall now were:

A campaign to awaken interest in and promote knowledge about the United Nations... encounters little active resistance, but must reckon with the indifference and passivity which lie behind statements of support.²

Of major importance to the success of any such program is some way of overcoming the widespread lack of interest and indifference to it. The communication of isolated facts of a highly specific nature is of little importance to the larger goals of an information program.³

¹Cincinnati Looks at the United Nations. Report No. 37, National Opinion Research Center (mimeographed), page 3.

²Ibid, page 31.

³Ibid, page 18.

Interest...is rather low among Cincinnatians. While interest can be shown to be a correlate of socio-economic position, it is even more a function of underlying convictions about America's role in the world and of an ability to grasp the personal significance of international developments in the lives of individuals.¹

The first report, then, clearly warned that an information program on behalf of the United Nations must first prepare its way by creating interest in the information to be offered. It also seemed to indicate that little interest could be aroused unless people could be made to see how immediately and personally significant seemingly remote international decisions are.

As this, the report of the second survey, will indicate, the Cincinnati Plan did not achieve these pre-conditions; and interest, information and opinion were left essential unaltered by the Plan. Some changes occurred, but these appear to be results of events taking place outside of Cincinnati. By and large, information media in these six months reached the groups who were already motivated before the campaign and who were, therefore, least in need of the campaign. In failing to awaken new interest, the Cincinnati program failed to reach the new audience it sought.

¹Ibid, page 10.

PART I

CHANGES IN INTEREST, INFORMATION AND OPINION WITH RESPECT TO THE UNITED NATIONS

In the sections which follow, the results of the second survey are compared with those of the first. These comparisons will indicate the extent to which opinion in Cincinnati in March, 1948 was different from that of September, 1947.

The primary intent here is to get clearly before the reader the changes which took place. In Part II we will turn to a discussion of the role of the Cincinnati Plan. Our primary focus here, then, is on change. The reader who is interested in a more complete documentation of the description of the state of opinion in September, quoted in the Introduction, and in the interrelations of interest, information, and opinion in this complex is referred to the earlier report.

1. Changes in Interest in International Events

In March, 1948, international issues assumed much greater importance in the thinking of Cincinnatians than they did in September, 1947. At the earlier date, domestic inflation had been the leading concern, and only 47% had mentioned any international problem as among those presently facing the United States. In September, 74% referred to international developments. This increase was largely a preoccupation with the "cold war" between Russia and the United States. At the time that interviewing was taking place, American-Soviet relations were at a bottom point, and predictions that war was imminent were widespread. It is not surprising, then, that the proportions mentioning problems of maintaining peace or threats of another war rose from 24% to 46%, and those citing Soviet-American relations increased from 16% to 29%.¹ People were asked:

¹It is to be expected that, had the interviewing been done even a few weeks later when the atmosphere of immediate crisis had somewhat subsided, these proportions would not have been so high.

"When you think of the problems facing the United States now, which one comes to your mind first? What other problems do you think of?"

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
<u>Domestic problems</u>		
Inflation, the high cost of living	15% ¹	47% ¹
Housing	4	9
Labor problems	2	6
Depression, unemployment	2	4
Other domestic issues	9	8
<u>International Problems</u>		
Another war, maintaining peace.	46	24
Relations with Russia.	29	16
Control of the atomic bomb	1	4
United Nations.	2	1
Other international issues.	5	11
No opinion.	6	7

¹ Percentages in these columns add to more than 100% because some respondents named more than one problem.

In keeping with these spontaneous expressions of concern, interest in American relations with Russia increased over these six months. In March, 1948, 68% expressed "keen" interest in news about relations with Russia, an increase of 14% from the September finding that 54% were interested. Nevertheless, "the cost of living" remained the topic of deep interest to the largest number of people -- 90% indicating a "keen" interest:

"We'd like to know how much interest the public takes in a number of questions. For example, do you yourself take a keen interest, only a mild interest or practically none at all in news about:"

	Proportions taking a "keen" interest	
	March, 1948	September, 1947
The cost of living.	90%	92%
Our relations with Russia . .	68	54
The control of the atomic bomb	56	51
Strikes and labor problems. .	45	51
The United Nations.	34	31
Our trade with other countries	27	23

It is interesting to note that, of these six topics, all those concerned with international problems show an increase in interest over the six month period, while there are declines in interest in the two domestic issues presented. In three cases -- the cost of living, the United Nations and foreign trade -- the changes are so small that they cannot be considered statistically significant¹; nevertheless the pattern is suggestive.

If we look at the breadth of interest in international problems, as measured by the number of international items from the foregoing list in which people expressed interest, we find that interest levels in March, while still relatively low, did show an increase of interest since September. In September, 25% had not been interested in any of the four

¹Since we are dealing with samples, a certain amount of variation between March and September can be expected because of chance fluctuations in sampling. With the size samples employed here, differences of 5% or more may be regarded as beyond the range of variation to be expected from sampling fluctuations alone. When comparisons are made between subgroups of each sample, the differences must, of course, be larger.

issues, and 28% were interested in only one. In March, however, the corresponding proportions were 19% and 22%, respectively. In other words, the size of the least interested group fell from 53% to 41%. Interest scores are shown in more detail below:

Number of international items for which "keen" interest is expressed:	March, <u>1948</u>	September, <u>1947</u>
None	19%	25%
One	22	28
Two	25	22
Three	21	16
Four	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>
	100%	100%

There is, however, evidence that this growth of interest is wholly accounted for by the then-current concern that war between the United States and Russia was immediately impending. For if we exclude relations with Russia from the list of international issues and limit our attention to interest in the United Nations, in control of the atomic bomb and in foreign trade -- all questions which we would not expect to fluctuate so violently with day-to-day news -- there were in March, 1948, about as many people uninterested in any of these three topics as there had been in September, 1947. At each time period, roughly a third were not interested in any of the three issues cited; a third were interested in only one; and a third interested in two or three of them. The exact figures are:

Number of international items -- excluding relations with Russia -- for which "keen" interest is expressed:	March, <u>1948</u>	September, <u>1947</u>
None	30%	34%
One	37	35
Two	21	21
Three	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>
	100%	100%

2. Changes in General Orientation toward International Relations

By March, 1948, there had been no alteration in the general point of view from which Cincinnati looked at world affairs in September. Majority opinion, with no significant change, continued to support American participation in world affairs and favored an international police force and eventual international control of the atomic bomb. There remained a large minority who viewed other nations with suspicion and a large minority unable to see any influencing of their own lives by international trade:

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

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
Take an active part	66%	65%
Stay out	26	29
Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>
	100%	100%

"Would you like to see the United States join in the movement to establish an international police force to maintain world peace?"

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
Yes	73%	76%
No	15	14
Don't know	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>
	100%	100%

"Do you think there should eventually be some sort of international control of atomic bombs, or should each country remain free to make its own bombs?"

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
International control	57%	60%
Each country free	31	32
Don't know	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>
	100%	100%

"Do you think you would be better off personally if the United States would trade more with foreign countries?"

	<u>March, 1948</u>	<u>September, 1947</u>
Yes, better off	53%	52%
No.	27	28
Don't know.	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>
	100%	100%

"Do you think most foreign countries can be trusted to meet us half-way in working out problems together or do you think most of them cannot be trusted to meet us half-way?"

	<u>March, 1948</u>	<u>September, 1947</u>
Can be trusted.	49%	45%
Cannot be trusted	44	47
Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
	100%	100%

This rejection of isolationism which is, nevertheless, accompanied by a good deal of suspicion and distrust can, perhaps, best be explained by the pervasive fear of wars. Back in September, 72% accepted the statement that "there will always be wars between countries," while 24% felt that "someday we'll find a way to prevent wars." In March, these opinions had not noticeably altered: 68% regarded war as inevitable, while 28% thought they could eventually be prevented. (At each time period 4% were undecided.)

What had sharply changed from September to March was the expectation that the United States was close to its next war. In September, 48% of the adults of Cincinnati expected the United States to fight in another war within the next ten years. By March of this year, 73% were expressing this view:

"Do you expect the United States to fight in another war within the next ten years?"

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
Yes	73%	48%
No	15	38
Don't know	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>
	100%	100%

In this respect, as in the other opinions discussed in this section, Cincinnati paralleled the nation. During a period of about a year, national surveys made by the National Opinion Research Center indicate that the national expectation of war within the next ten years rose from 48% to 74%. The national proportions saying they expected the United States to fight in another war within the next ten years were:

April, 1947	48%
July, 1947	49%
October, 1947.	57%
March, 1948	74%

There can be little question that this rising expectation of war stemmed mostly from a growing distrust of Russia. We have already seen an increase in the number of people referring directly to American-Russian relations and to the threat of war. And the proportion distrusting Russia increased from 74% to 80%. Since so many people distrusted Russia at the beginning of our six months' period the change indicated by these data is not large, but it may be assumed that there was an increase as well in the intensity of the distrust. People were asked:

"Do you think we can count on Russia to meet us half-way in working out problems together?"

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
Yes	10%	14%
No	80	74
Don't know.	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>
	100%	100%

Again, there was a close parallel in national thinking. Throughout the nation, the proportions saying they did not count on Russia were:

July, 1947	62%
October, 1947	67%
December, 1947	73%

Ways of making war less likely occurred to 78% of the adults in Cincinnati in March when they were asked: "What do you think could be done to make war less likely?"

This result reveals no certain or significant shift from September, when 74% were able to make suggestions. Nor had the suggestions themselves changed to any great extent. As in September, the ways of reducing the likelihood of war which people suggested tended to be very general, to stress more desired ends than practical means of attaining them. Thus the three leading suggestions at both periods were that people ought to become more religious, that in some unspecified way nations should acquire more respect, cooperation and understanding among themselves, and that somehow people should achieve greater understanding of one another. More concrete proposals were less often advanced, but the leading ones here were that the United States should alter its policies toward Russia, should turn toward policies of national preparedness, or toward policies of isolation. Very few people referred to the United Nations as an agency for preventing war. In greater detail, the answers given in March and September were:

"What do you think can be done to make war less likely?"

	<u>March,</u> <u>1948</u>	<u>September,</u> <u>1947</u>
<u>Changes in Individuals</u>		
Turn to God, Christianity or religion, pray more...	11%	11%
Get better understanding of one another.	9	7
Promote education.	3	4
People should become less greedy or selfish.	3	2
End racial or religious prejudice or discrimination.	*1	2
<u>Changes in Leadership</u>		
Replace present leadership in U.S. or some other country.	2	2
Leaders should be less selfish, more cooperative, etc.	1	2
<u>Changes in National Policy</u>		
U. S. should change policy towards Russia.	8	4
U. S. should return to policy of isolation.	6	6
U. S. should stress military preparedness, keep atomic bomb secret, etc.	6	6
Miscellaneous.	8	6
<u>Changes in International Relations</u>		
General: More respect, cooperation and understanding among nations.	10	12
Action by or for the United Nations.	3	6
Reliance upon other kinds of international organization: world government, military alliances, etc.	4	4
International disarmament and/or control of atomic bomb.	2	2
More equitable distribution of world resources.	2	2
Other.	2	2
<u>Nothing can be done.</u>	4	7
<u>Don't know, not interested.</u>	18	19
	<u>102%²</u>	<u>106%²</u>

¹In this and succeeding tables an asterisk is used to indicate less than 0.5%.

²Percentages in these columns add to more than 100% because a few respondents offered more than one suggestion.

3. Changes in Information about the United Nations

It may be recalled that information levels with respect to the United Nations were rather low in Cincinnati in September. The March, 1948, survey found that the information picture had not altered during the six months between surveys. In September it was found that 30% of the adults of Cincinnati were unable to say what the main purpose of the United Nations was. In March, 28% seemed by this criterion to be unacquainted with the United Nations. This difference is so small that it must be regarded as a mere sampling fluctuation; both surveys found essentially the same proportion of people unfamiliar, for all practical purposes, with the United Nations.¹

Similarly, when those who had this initial familiarity with the United Nations were asked a series of more specific questions dealing with the work of the United Nations, the March results indicated that misinformation and lack of information were about as general as they had been in September. A large majority still thought, incorrectly, that the United Nations had been given the responsibility for working out peace terms with Germany and Japan. But in two cases, statistically significant gains in information over September were found: In March, somewhat larger proportions knew that securing equal rights for all people and improving world health conditions fell within the scope of United Nations' activities:

"As far as you know, is the job of the United Nations to...."

	Proportions answering each item correctly	
	March, 1948	September, 1947
See that all people everywhere get equal rights? (Yes)	60	55
Improve health conditions in different parts of the world? (Yes)	55	50
Increase trade between countries? (Yes)	50	47
Deal with disarmament and control of the atomic bomb? (Yes)	43	46
Set up a new world language to be used in all countries? (No)	34	38
Work out peace treaties with Germany and Japan? (No)	10	10

¹The question asked was: "What would you say is the main purpose of the United Nations organization?" Interviewers were instructed to interpret answers here liberally, but if they decided that the person had no idea what the United Nations was to omit all further questions about the United Nations. In coding interviews, also, any answers which implied even a remote familiarity with the broad outlines of the United Nations was accepted.

In general, however, information levels were not increased. Using as an index the number of these six items answered correctly, the distribution of information scores is almost identical at the two time periods:

<u>No. of items correctly answered</u>	<u>March, 1948</u>	<u>September, 1947</u>
6	1%	1%
5	14	14
4	27	28
3	19	15
2	8	10
1	3	2
0	-	-
	<u>72%¹</u>	<u>70%¹</u>

The same conclusion must be drawn from questions dealing with another type of information about the United Nations; namely, knowledge of the veto power in the United Nations. In September, 34% said they had heard or read about the veto, though only 7% could explain its working correctly, in terms of the requirement of big power unanimity. In March, 37% said they were familiar with it, and, again, only 7% could explain it. At the earlier date, 7% were aware that the veto power could only be used in the Security Council and not in the General Assembly as well; at the later date, 8% knew this.

4. Changes in Opinion about the United Nations

Satisfaction with the progress which has been made by the United Nations declined somewhat from September, 1947 to March, 1948. In September, 34% said they were satisfied and 28% said they were dissatisfied; in March the proportions were almost exactly reversed: 29% were satisfied; and 33%, dissatisfied. The question:

"In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the progress that the United Nations organization has made so far?"

	<u>March, 1948</u>	<u>September, 1947</u>
Satisfied	29%	34%
Dissatisfied	33	28
Don't know	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
	72%	70%

Since, in this study, the sizeable groups who appeared to have no familiarity with the United Nations were not asked the opinion questions about the United Nations, these results do not reflect the thinking of all adults in Cincinnati and are not directly comparable with the findings of national surveys.

¹It will be recalled that these information questions were not asked of those who were unfamiliar with the United Nations. These columns would add to 100% if the 28% and 30% who did not know what the United Nations was at each time period were shown.

But, these national results indicate that around the time of the second survey in Cincinnati a similar drop in satisfaction with United Nations' progress was taking place throughout the country:

	<u>May, 1948¹</u>	<u>February, 1948²</u>	<u>September, 1947¹</u>
Satisfied	21%	31%	33%
Dissatisfied	54	50	51
Undecided	<u>25</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>
	100%	100%	100%

From these national results, it would seem that many people who did not know what the United Nations was nevertheless expressed an opinion about the United Nations. The obvious implication of the fact that such people could express opinions is that the partial results obtained for Cincinnati cannot be generalized to all the adults of Cincinnati simply by adding these people into the "don't know" group.

Another way to estimate the opinions of all the adults of Cincinnati would be to assume that the people not queried on this issue would have divided on it in approximately the same way as those who were queried. If this assumption were correct,³ the results for Cincinnati would be:

	<u>March, 1948</u>	<u>September, 1947</u>
Satisfied.	40%	48%
Dissatisfied	46	41
Undecided.	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>
	100%	100%

¹These results are from Gallup Polls, as reported in The Chicago Daily News, May 26, 1948. The question used by Gallup was worded somewhat differently: "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the progress that the United Nations has made to date?"

²These results are from NORC national surveys, using the same question quoted in text.

³This assumption is in part employed in the earlier report, for the reason that these figures are the same as the proportions obtained among those queried. In order to make comparisons between groups in which widely varying proportions have been asked these questions, it was necessary to shift to the queried sub-group within each group in order to have comparable bases of 100% in each group. The difference between the size of the groups not queried in March and September is small enough to make results directly comparable without this transformation.

It is probable, however, that this assumption overestimates satisfaction with the United Nations for we know from the earlier report that:

- a. Those not familiar with the United Nations tend to hold more isolationist positions.¹
- b. The less well-informed are more likely to be dissatisfied with United Nations progress than the better-informed.²

It seems reasonable, then, to suppose that if the omitted group had been queried they would have expressed dissatisfaction more often than did the queried group.

The best assumption that can be made, then, is that the actual proportion of Cincinnatians satisfied with the United Nations' performance fell somewhere between the 29% shown in the first table and the 40% shown immediately above, and was probably closer to the first figure than to the second. The proportions dissatisfied and undecided were, correspondingly, probably higher than either of the figures shown. In view of the fact that on other questions relating to international events Cincinnati opinion closely resembled national opinion, the national results may be regarded as not too bad a compromise estimate.³

At any rate, whatever the exact proportion of Cincinnatians satisfied or dissatisfied with the progress being made by the United Nations, there can be little question that satisfaction with the United Nations declined in the six months under study. Accompanying this change was an increase in pessimism about its chances for ultimate success. But despite this growth in dissatisfaction and pessimism, there was no significant alteration in the size of the majority who nevertheless felt that the United States should continue to work within the United Nations framework. People were asked:

¹See earlier report, page 14-15.

²See earlier report, page 23.

³In the following presentation, whenever possible, all these figures are shown. The reader is cautioned to keep this discussion in mind in interpreting the results. Unfortunately, for many of the questions, there are no national comparisons.

"Do you think the United Nations organization will succeed in spite of the disagreements that have come up among England, Russia and the United States, or do you think these disagreements are so serious that the United Nations organization will fail?"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Will succeed..	35%	43%	48%	62%
Will fail.....	25	17	34	24
Don't know....	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>14</u>
	72%	70%	100%	100%

"Some people say there are so many disagreements in the United Nations, that we would be better off to get together with other countries and work on international problems outside the U.N.

"Other people say that working through the U.N. is the best way to preserve peace.

"How do you feel about this? (Should we work separately with any countries that want to join us, or should we work mainly through the United Nations?)"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Work separately.....	12%	10%	17%	14%
Through U.N.....	55	57	77	81
Don't know.....	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
	72%	70%	100%	100%

The things for which people praised and blamed the United Nations remained substantially the same from September to March except for an increase in the feeling that the United Nations was failing -- failing to act, failing to prevent war. As before, sizeable proportions were unable to say anything specific about the United Nations. And the frequency with which people praised or blamed the United Nations for the handling of overseas food and relief -- a problem handled primarily by other agencies -- again indicated the confused and impressionistic nature of their judgments. In more detail:

"What would you say are some of the good things the United Nations has done so far?"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Handling of overseas food and relief.	9%	6%	12%	8%
Creates or is creating unity between nations, has ended isolationism, breaks down cultural or trade barriers.	8	7	11	10
Handling of specific issues: Palestine, Greece, atomic bomb, UNESCO, occupation forces, etc.	6	6	8	8
Helps nations to get together to talk over problems; acts as a forum or sounding board.	5	5	7	8
Has helped small nations, curbed big ones.	3	2	4	3
Has or is trying to curb Russian power.	1	1	1	2
Is creating better understand- ing between Russia and rest of world.	*	*	*	*
Vague general approval of U.N.	8	7	10	9
U.N. has done nothing good so far	11	9	14	12
Don't know, unable to answer. . . .	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>44</u>
	80% ¹	74% ¹	108% ¹	104% ¹

¹These columns add to more than their respective totals of 72%, 70%, 100% and 100% because a few respondents gave more than one response.

The criticisms of the United Nations were:

"What would you say are some of the bad things about the United Nations so far?"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
U. N. is failing, too much talk and not enough action, lack of unity, bickering, arguing.	19%	13%	25%	18%
Russian power is not curbed enough; difficulties with Russia; Russia should be barred.	11	13	14	17
Handling of specific issues: not enough relief to destitute countries, Palestine, Greece, failure to proceed with disarmament and control of atomic bomb. . .	6	3	8	4
Big nations have too much power; should do away with veto; make all nations equal . .	3	2	4	3
U. S. doesn't have enough power; is being taken advantage of.	1	1	2	1
Vague general disapproval of U. N.	5	3	7	4
Everything is bad about it; should never have joined, should leave it now	1	1	2	2
Nothing bad about U.N.; just growing pains.	7	5	9	6
Don't know, unable to answer. .	<u>27</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>51</u>
	80% ¹	76% ¹	108% ¹	106% ¹

¹These columns add to more than their respective totals of 72%, 70%, 100% and 100% because a few respondents gave more than one answer.

5. Changes in Action and Apathy with Respect to the United Nations

At both time periods, most people did not belong to organizations where world affairs were discussed nor attend any such meetings, and there was no noticeable change in this regard during the six month period. In September, 1947, somewhere between 11 and 15% said they did belong to such groups or attend meetings; in March, 1948, the proportion was 12-16%.

At both time periods, close to half the adults actually had organizational affiliations. (The exact figures obtained were 47% in September and 46% in March.) The patterns of membership did not alter. People most frequently belonged to men's or women's social, professional or fraternal groups, labor unions and church groups, in that order. The groups which people named as ones which did discuss world events followed the same pattern as that for their general membership, except that labor unions were less often mentioned in this respect than the size of their membership would warrant. At both times, less than half of one percent (actually, two people in September and one in March) reported participation in the American Association for the United Nations or the United Nations Association of Cincinnati.¹

In March, as in September, eleven out of twelve of those who did not participate said that they had never been approached to join such groups or attend such meetings. At both times, only 7% of those queried (or 5% of the entire sample) said "yes" in answer to the question (asked only of those who did not attend meetings or belong to groups): "Have you ever been approached to join such a group or attend such a meeting?" The picture with regard to membership and participation may be summarized as:

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Belong or participate. . . .	12%	11%	16%	15%
Do not belong or participate				
Have been approached. . .	5	5	7	7
Have not been approached.	<u>55</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>
	72%	70%	100%	100%

¹ Readers interested in more detail on participation are referred to the earlier report, pages 27-28.

These data should not be taken too literally; at the very least it should not be inferred that the bulk of non-participation is primarily attributable to failure to approach people. For most of the non-participants in March continued to explain that fact in terms of the same kind of indifference noted in September. Most reasons given were of the "I don't know why, I just don't" or the "too busy," "not interested" type:

"Do you happen to belong to any groups or organizations or attend any meetings where they talk about world affairs like the United Nations? (If 'No') Is there any particular reason why you don't?"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Belong or participate.	12%	11%	16%	15%
Haven't been asked to join, not familiar with any groups to join.	3	3	4	4
Time: Haven't got the time, too busy, other activities interfere.	13	16	19	23
Just not interested.	2	3	4	6
Personal reasons: age, health, newness in community, etc.	9	5	11	6
Dislike belonging to any organization.	1	2	2	3
Wouldn't do any good, unnecessary, none of my business.	1	1	1	1
Opposed to United Nations	*	*	*	*
Don't know why; no particular reason.	<u>31</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>42</u>
	72%	70%	100%	100%

Just as the low level of participation continued unchanged, general familiarity with the names of Cincinnati organizations trying to help the United Nations did not increase significantly. It was still only a small minority of the population who could name such groups -- about one in ten:

"Do you happen to know the names of any groups or organizations here in Cincinnati that are trying to help the United Nations?"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Yes.	10%	7%	13%	10%
No	62	63	87	90
	72%	70%	100%	100%

As before, the groups named scattered over all possible kinds. About 2% cited either the American Association of the United Nations or the United Nations Association of Cincinnati.

As we noted in September, people were more willing to concede that something could be done by individuals or groups to aid the United Nations than they were to participate themselves. At the same time, there were many who felt that neither organized groups nor individuals could do anything practical to influence world events.¹ These statements remain essentially unaltered for March. Something between a half to two-thirds of Cincinnati adults believed organizations could be of practical use to the United Nations. From a third to a half believed that the average individual could be of assistance. Nevertheless the March results indicate some reduction from September in the number of people holding apathetic or defeatist attitudes toward the efficacy of individual and group action. People were asked:

"In your opinion, can these groups and organizations (groups and organizations that are trying to help the United Nations) do anything to help the United Nations in a practical way?"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Yes.	46%	40%	65%	57%
No	12	10	16	14
Don't know	14	20	19	29
	72%	70%	100%	100%

¹See pages 23-27 in earlier report.

"Do you think there's anything the average person can do to help make the United Nations more successful? (What?)"

	Proportions among entire sample		Proportions among those queried	
	March, 1948	September, 1947	March, 1948	September, 1947
Be better citizens; vote intelligently; write letters to officials.	17%	10%	22%	14%
Become better informed or more interested; attend meetings.	16	11	21	16
Have a peaceful outlook; expect peace and not war; hold attitudes favorable to U.N.	4	5	6	7
Be more religious; have higher ideals; train children to tolerance.	4	2	5	4
Be more economical; combat high prices; accept rationing to help needy in other nations.	1	2	2	3
Miscellaneous.	3	3	4	3
Total suggesting ways average person can help.	39% ¹	33% ¹	54% ¹	47% ¹
Average person can do nothing.	22	26	31	37
No opinion, don't know.	11	11	15	16
	72%	70%	100%	100%

It should be noted that the differences in these two tables indicating a decrease in apathetic, defeatist responses are small. In view of the fact that we are forced to estimate the exact figures for the entire Cincinnati population, too much confidence cannot be placed in them. However, reinterviews in March with a large fraction of the people interviewed in the September study revealed that a small but significant group of them had shifted away from the defeatist position to about the same extent as shown in these tables. It can, therefore, be concluded that some reduction of these attitudes took place.

¹The percentages above add to more than the total making suggestions because a few respondents gave more than one answer.

IN SUMMARY:

In comparing the attitudes in Cincinnati in March, 1948 with those in September, 1947, so far as they pertained to international affairs generally, or the United Nations, more particularly, the following points may be made:

INTEREST

in American relations with Russia mounted as tension in those relations increased. There is no reason to believe, however, that there was any more general widening of interest in international affairs or in the United Nations during this time.

GENERAL ORIENTATIONS

did not shift. Majority sentiment remained anti-isolationist, and there was no change in underlying convictions about America's role in world affairs and the policies she should pursue. There was, however, a growing conviction that another war was approaching, paralleling the mounting tension in American-Russian relations.

INFORMATION

about the United Nations was relatively low and no improvement in this regard was noted during the six month period.

UNITED NATIONS SUPPORT

did not alter so far as willingness for American participation to continue is concerned. There was growing dissatisfaction, however, and pessimism about the possibility of U.N. success as critical current situations did not yield to its handling. There appeared as well to be no increase in activity on behalf of the United Nations, though one factor inhibiting such action -- the feeling that individual and group efforts are useless -- did decrease somewhat.

PART II

THE ROLE OF THE CINCINNATI PLAN FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

As we have just seen, there was for the most part, little change in opinion, interest and information in Cincinnati over the six month period of the Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations. The largest shifts in opinion -- a greater preoccupation with American-Soviet relations and the closely related increased fear and expectation of war, growing pessimism about the United Nations' ability to prevent war and dissatisfaction with its progress so far -- were national trends related to the course of world events rather than local developments in Cincinnati attributable to the Cincinnati Plan. Since this is the case, the only conclusion to be drawn from Part I of this report is that the Cincinnati Plan had little or no effect on those aspects of thinking about world affairs covered by this study.¹ Evaluation cannot stop here, however. If only for future mass educational attempts we need to know why it should be that six months' effort yielded so little in the way of measurable effect.

The effectiveness of an educational program of this type must be judged on at least three levels. There is, first, the basic question of whether the program's efforts actually succeeded in increasing the flow of information into mass media. Unless this primary objective is achieved, the program has never really gotten under way and further inquiries would be useless. There is every reason to believe that the Cincinnati Plan was notably successful in this regard, however.²

Granted that there was an increased flow of information materials, we can then ask the question of the extent to which an increased output of information actually resulted in an increased exposure of people to these materials. Obviously, if newspaper articles are not read, if radio programs go unheard, if meetings are unattended, then there is no more reason to expect an effect than if

¹It is always possible that the Plan had effects not measured by the study, even in these aspects. If, for example, a small number of people became highly motivated and willing to lend their energies to civic undertakings of this kind it would be a gain that would not be reflected in overall data for the entire population. This would not, however, alter the fact that the campaign was primarily intended as mass education, and should, therefore, be judged in those terms.

²Attitude surveys cannot answer this question, of course. Rather it requires an analysis of the major communication media and a comparison of the coverage given in Cincinnati during the campaign with the coverage given in the same period in comparable cities and in an earlier period in Cincinnati. It is understood that this evaluation is being made by the Committee on the Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations and that it will indicate a substantial increase.

there had never been an increased flow of information. And, even if the materials are attended to, if they reach only those persons who, for the program's purposes may be regarded as sufficiently informed or properly oriented, then, again no important effects are achieved, at least in terms of the program's goals. Finally, even if the increased materials reached the desired persons, we must still ask whether they had any effect, and, if not, why not. Let us turn to these questions.

1. Exposure to the Campaign

During the period in which the Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations was in operation, most of the people who were familiar with the United Nations¹ had been in touch with one or another of the United Nations' information media. As might be expected, newspapers and radio news broadcasts reached the most people. Pamphlets and lectures and discussions reached very few. The detailed findings:

¹As with the other questions dealing with the United Nations, the 28% who did not know what the United Nations was were not asked these questions.

"During the last six months, have you:

	Proportions saying "Yes" among entire sample ¹	Proportions saying "Yes" among those queried ²
...seen anything in the <u>newspaper</u> about the United Nations?	59%	83%
...heard any <u>radio news programs</u> about the United Nations?	53	74
...heard any <u>short radio mentions</u> of the United Nations <u>between</u> <u>programs?</u>	26	36
...seen any <u>signs or posters</u> about the United Nations?	21	29
...heard anything about the United Nations <u>in church?</u>	12	17
...read any <u>leaflets or pamphlets</u> on the United Nations?	10	14
...been to <u>any meetings</u> where the United Nations was talked about or discussed?	9	12
...seen or heard <u>anything else</u> about the United Nations?	21	29

¹The complementary figures for those shown in this column are the differences between them and 72%. Thus 59% saw newspaper coverage of the United Nations, 13% did not, and 28% were not asked the question; and similarly for each item.

²The difference between each of these figures and 100% is the proportion not exposed to each of the media among those who were familiar with the United Nations.

The main sources of United Nations' coverage mentioned under the "anything else" category were nationally circulating periodicals, news reels and personal conversations.¹

Not everyone had been exposed, however. Even among those who were familiar with the United Nations (and had, therefore, been asked these questions), 8% had not received information from any sources, 10% had had contact with one of those sources and 25% with two, making a total of 43% of those queried who either had received no information about the United Nations, or whose sources were limited primarily to radio news broadcasts or newspapers. In view of the fact that the 28% who were not asked these questions would probably have reported even less exposure than this group, 43% is probably an underestimate of the size of the group who were minimally exposed to the increased flow of information. The full distribution of amount of exposure is shown below:

<u>Number of Media with which people reported contact</u>	<u>Proportion among entire sample</u>	<u>Proportion among those queried</u>
8 or more	*	*
7	2%	3%
6	3	4
5	7	10
4	12	16
3	17	24
2	18	25
1	7	10
0	6	8
	<u>72%</u>	<u>100%</u>

¹The exact items mentioned were:

	<u>Proportions among entire sample</u>	<u>Proportions among those queried</u>
Conversations, talking to people.	7%	10%
Nationally circulating periodicals, magazines.	7	9
Newsreels, movies.	4	5
Through school children.	2	3
St. Xavier University Pageant. . .	1	1
Books.	1	1
Full length radio programs other than news.	1	1

Another kind of test of exposure was made by asking people: "Have you ever seen or heard this slogan: 'Peace begins with the United Nations; the United Nations begins with you'?" In this case, as a kind of check of the assumptions we have been making, the question was asked of everyone, regardless of whether they were familiar with the United Nations or not. Of the entire sample, 49% claimed familiarity with this slogan. This proportion was 54% among those who were familiar with the United Nations and 36% among those who were not. These figures need to be qualified by the fact that people tend to claim familiarity rather than admit ignorance. For example, even among people who said they had seen or heard none of the sources cited, 15% claimed familiarity with the slogan. Evidence of this may also be seen in the fact that a fifth of the people who said they had seen or heard the slogan could not recall where they had done so:

"Have you ever seen or heard the slogan:
 'Peace begins with the United Nations; the
 United Nations begins with you'? (If 'Yes')
 Do you recall where you saw or heard it?"

Yes	49% ¹
Radio	27%
Posters or signs	5
Newspapers	4
Heard it used in conversations	2
Magazines or books	2
Heard it used at meetings	1
Newsreels	1
Pamphlets	1
Miscellaneous	2
Don't recall	10
No, don't recall	<u>51</u>
	100%

Although a good many people remembered hearing this slogan not all of them can be assumed to have understood it. We have no systematic evidence on this point, but we have on record one interview in which the respondent said, yes, she had heard it over and over again on the radio, but then went on to add, "I never did find out what it means."

¹This figure is smaller than the total for the sources mentioned, because some respondents named more than one source.

2. Whom the Campaign Reached

Since the questions covering exposure to United Nations' information media were not asked in the earlier survey, it is impossible to say whether the foregoing figures represent an increase in exposure from what it would have been without the program. There is, however, indirect evidence on this point in the nature of the audience reached.

To put it briefly, the campaign was most likely to reach the better educated, the younger age groups, and men. Conversely it least often reached the poorly educated, those over 40, and women:

	<u>Proportions reporting exposure to at least three media</u>
College educated.	68%
High School educated.	43
Grammar school educated	17
21-39 years of age	44%
40 and over.	32
Men	43%
Women.	34

To readers of the earlier report, these facts will have a familiar sound, for these are the same groups there shown to be most likely to be interested and informed. In other words, it would appear that the groups least in need of an educational campaign were most likely to be exposed to it. This is in fact the case: among those who were rated as relatively interested¹ in September, 47% reported exposure to three or more of the media by March, whereas among the originally relatively uninterested, 29% did. Similarly among those originally uninformed, 15% reported exposure at this level in March whereas 50% of the poorly informed and 45% of the better informed did.²

¹Relatively interested is defined as expressing "keen" interest in two or more of the international items about which interest was ascertained. See page 7, and earlier report, page 6.

²For definitions of these groups see earlier report, page 12. The apparent reversal between the poorly informed and the better informed (which is maintained rather consistently) should not be generalized to the Cincinnati population. There is evidence that the first interview acted as a stimulus to the poorly informed, accounting for these differences at the time of the second interview. It cannot be assumed that the poorly informed in the general population who were not interviewed in September were correspondingly stimulated to exposure to the program.

3. Effects of Exposure

There is a relationship between the amount of exposure and attitudes expressed. For example, people who reported more exposure were more likely to favor America's taking an active part in world affairs, to express interest in the United Nations, to favor continued American participation in the United Nations and to be optimistic about its chances of success. They were, however, somewhat more dissatisfied with its progress so far. These relationships have been chosen as typical results; such examples could be multiplied.

Proportions making indicated
response among those who report:

<u>Paraphrase of response in March, 1948</u>	<u>No exposure</u>	<u>Exposure to 1 or 2 media</u>	<u>Exposure to 3 or more media</u>
U. S. should take an active part in world affairs.	43%	73%	85%
Keen interest in news about the United Nations	29%	30%	42%
Dissatisfied with progress made by United Nations. .	33%	42%	45%
Think United Nations will fail.	36%	33%	30%
Think United States should work outside the United Nations. . . .	21%	16%	11%

The important question is, of course, whether the more favorable attitudes expressed by those exposed to information media are a result of that exposure. The relationships themselves do not answer this question. By themselves, these data indicate that there is a relationship, but it may be that people with more favorable attitudes were more likely to pay attention rather than that the exposure led to more favorable attitudes.

This would appear to be the case so far as the exposure to information media over these six months goes. For, if we look at the responses made in September by those who would later report various amounts of exposure, we find that exactly the same relationships existed in September before the exposure took place:

Proportions making indicated response in September among those who would report in March:

<u>Paraphrase of response in September, 1947</u>	<u>Proportions making indicated response in September among those who would report in March:</u>		
	<u>No exposure</u>	<u>Exposure to 1 or 2 media</u>	<u>Exposure to 3 or more media</u>
U. S. should take an active part in world affairs. . . .	46%	73%	81%
Keen interest in news about the United Nations.	28%	27%	40%
Dissatisfied with progress made by United Nations.	29%	42%	49%
Think United Nations will fail	27%	21%	19%
Think United States should work outside the United Nations. .	17%	18%	7%

It can only be concluded, then, that in this six month period, at least, if there was an increase in exposure, it was people's previous orientation which determined the extent to which they exposed themselves to further information about the United Nations.

These data indicate the enormous difficulty of reaching an audience unless there is already positive motivation present. At the end of the campaign those who were originally interested were still the most interested; those originally best informed, still the best informed. Although it has no bearing on evaluating the current campaign, it is interesting to note that at every information level, those who were interested were more likely to remain informed or become better informed. Similarly, at each interest level the better-informed were more likely to remain or become interested:

<u>Among those who in SEPTEMBER were..</u>	<u>I n M A R C H:</u>	
	<u>Proportion relatively interested</u>	<u>Proportion better informed</u>
Relatively interested and		
Better informed.	82%	69%
Poorly informed.	71	53
Uninformed.	56	33
Relatively uninterested and		
Better informed.	48	53
Poorly informed.	44	42
Uninformed.	38	25

IN SUMMARY: Most people in Cincinnati received information about the United Nations from one or another source during the six months of the campaign. It is likely, however, that they would have done so even if the campaign had not been in progress for it was the people who were better informed and interested to begin with who were most likely to have been reached. People who were exposed to the campaign more often had the desired attitudes of support of the United Nations and of internationalism, generally, but there is no evidence that this was a result of their exposure to the campaign.

APPENDIX

HOW THE STUDY WAS MADE

Composition of the Samples

As stated in the Introduction, this report is based on three samples. The representativeness of each of these samples as well as their comparability with one another are indicated by the characteristics shown below:

	September, 1947 <u>sample</u>	Sub-sample of Sept., reinter- <u>viewed in March</u>	March, 1948 <u>sample</u>
Men.....	46%	46%	46%
Women.....	54	54	54
Adults, 21-39 years of age.....	48%	48%	47%
Adults, 40 and over.....	52	52	53
White.....	88%	91%	90%
Negro.....	12	9	10
Attended college.....	17%	20%	16%
Attended high school.....	47	44	42
Eighth grade or less.....	36	36	42
Wealthy and prosperous.....	19%	16%	13%
Middle class.....	61	66	65
Poor.....	20	18	22
Veterans.....	13%	15%	16%
Non-veterans.....	87	85	84

The Questionnaire

The complete schedule of questions asked (exclusive of factual items about the respondent) is shown below. Starred items were asked in September, but not in March; doubly-starred items were asked in March, but not in September; all other questions were asked in both surveys.

1. When you think of the problems facing the United States now, which one comes to your mind first? What other problems do you think of?
2. We'd like to know how much interest the public takes in a number of questions. For example, do you yourself take a keen interest, only a mild interest, or practically none at all in news about (each item below)?
 - A. Our trade with other countries
 - B. Our relations with Russia
 - C. The cost of living
 - D. The United Nations
 - E. Strikes and labor problems
 - F. The control of the atomic bomb
3. Do you think there will always be wars between countries, or do you think someday we'll find a way to prevent wars?
4. Do you expect the United States to fight in another war within the next ten years?
5. What do you think could be done to make war less likely?
6. Do you think there should eventually be some sort of international control of atomic bombs, or should each country remain free to make its own bombs?
7. Would you like to see the United States join in the movement to establish an international police force to maintain world peace?
8. Do you think it will be best for the future of this country if we take an active part in world affairs, or if we stay out of world affairs?
9. Do you think most foreign countries can be trusted to meet us half-way in working out problems together, or do you think most of them cannot be trusted to meet us half-way?
10. Do you think we can count on Russia to meet us half-way in working out problems together?
11. Do you think you would be better off personally if the United States would trade more with other countries?
12. What would you say is the main purpose of the United Nations organization?

13. As far as you know, is it the job of the United Nations to (each item below)

- A. Deal with disarmament and control of the atomic bomb?
- B. Improve health conditions in different parts of the world?
- C. Work out peace treaties with Germany and Japan?
- D. Increase trade between countries?
- E. See that all people everywhere get equal rights?
- F. Set up a new world language to be used in all countries?

*14. What would be your best guess on the amount of money the United Nations organization spends each year - about 2 million dollars, about 25 million, about a hundred million or about eight hundred million?

15. Have you heard or read anything about the veto power in the United Nations?

IF "YES"

- A. How do you think it's supposed to work?
- B. Can it be used only in the Security Council or also in the General Assembly of the United Nations?
- *C. Do you think the veto power is a good rule, or not?
- *D. Is it your impression that the United States originally wanted this rule, or did we just agree because other countries wanted it?

16. What would you say are some of the good things the United Nations organization has done so far?

17. What would you say are some of the bad things about the United Nations so far?

18. In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the progress that the United Nations organization has made so far?

*19. Is there anything about the United Nations organization that you would like to know more about? What?

20. Do you think the United Nations organization will succeed in spite of the disagreements that have come up among England, Russia and the United States, or do you think these disagreements are so serious that the United Nations organization will fail?

21. Some people say there are so many disagreements in the United Nations, that we would be better off to get together with other countries and work on international problems outside the U.N.

Other people say that working through the U.N. is the best way to preserve peace.

How do you feel about this? (Should we work separately with any countries that want to join us, or should we work mainly through the United Nations?)

*22. Do you think there is anything the United States can do to make the United Nations more successful, or are we doing all we can?

A. IF "CAN DO MORE": In what way?

23. Do you think there's anything the average person can do to help make the United Nations more successful? What?

24. Do you happen to belong to any groups or organizations, or attend any meetings, where they talk about world affairs like the United Nations?

IF "YES":

IF "NO":

A. Which groups? A. Is there any particular reason why you don't?

B. Have you ever been approached to join such a group or attend such a meeting?

25. Do you happen to know the names of any groups or organizations here in Cincinnati that are trying to help the United Nations?

IF "YES":

A. Which ones?

*B. What do you think about the kind of people who belong?

26. In your opinion, can these groups and organizations do anything to help the United Nations in a practical way?

IF "YES":

*A. What can they do?

*27. Have you ever heard of a private organization called the American Association for the United Nations?

*28. By the way, you know beginning September 14th, they're observing United Nations Week all over the country.

A. Have you heard anything about it?

B. What do you think of the idea?

**29. Compared to six months ago, how much interest do you have now in the United Nations--more, less, or just about the same amount?

A. IF "MORE OR LESS" Why do you think you have become (more) (less) interested?

**30. Compared to six months ago, how much do you know now about the United Nations -- more, less, or just about the same amount?

A. IF "MORE" In the last six months, how or where did you get most of your new information about the United Nations? Do you remember any other way, or place, you got your new information?

**31. During the last six months, have you:

- A. ...heard any radio news programs about the United Nations?
- B. ...hear any short radio mentions of the United Nations between programs?
- C. ...seen anything in the newspaper about the United Nations?
- D. ...seen any signs or posters about the United Nations?
- E. ...read any leaflets or pamphlets on the United Nations?
- F. ...been to any meetings where the United Nations was talked about or discussed?
- G. ...heard anything about the United Nations in church?
- H. ...seen or heard anything else about the United Nations?

**32. Have you ever seen or heard this slogan: "Peace begins with the United Nations; the United Nations begins with you?"

- A. IF "YES" Do you recall where you saw or heard it?