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A B S T R A C T

Despite the likely importance of U.S. public images of countries in shaping U.S. foreign policy, relatively little is known about the nature of those images and their origins. With that observation as a backdrop, this paper treats as a case study U.S. public opinion about the United Arab Emirates. The UAE had not been prominent in American foreign policy until 1990, when Saddam Hussein threatened both U.A.E. and Kuwait. In early 2006, the situation changed, as American media focused on the purchase by Dubai Ports World of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company. The purchase would have given the company, owned by the government of U.A.E., control over several important commercial port operations in the U.S. In this paper, a secondary analysis of public opinion polls conducted during that time is combined with a content analysis of print and broadcast media. The analysis showed that the story, as it unfolded in the U.S. media, had a strong political frame. The public response to the story of the potential purchase of the U.K. firm controlling port management by DP World was largely negative. Attention to these stories was associated with this public response in a complex way that was greatly influenced by the partisan attitudes of the audience members.
A foreign country’s image among the U.S. public can be expected to have impact on U.S. foreign policy, as elected officials and their appointees in the foreign policy establishment view public opinion as one of the constraints on their choice of policy options.

Despite the likely importance of U.S. public images of countries in shaping U.S. foreign policy, relatively little is known about the nature of those images and their origins. The literature that does exist suggests that U.S. public images of countries are shaped by cultural and religious links, the historical relationship of that country with the U.S., and current geopolitics.

The United Arab Emirates, as a relatively new and small state, had not been prominent in American foreign policy until 1990, when Saddam Hussein threatened both U.A.E. and Kuwait. The Emirates were a part of the coalition that defeated Iraq after Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990.

In early 2006, the situation changed, as American media focused on the purchase by Dubai Ports World of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company. The purchase would have given the company, owned by the government of U.A.E., control over commercial port operations in New York, New Jersey, Baltimore, New Orleans, Miami and Philadelphia. For several months, the issue played out in the U.S. media, with the 24-hour cable and satellite channels giving it a great deal of attention. With this backdrop, the U.S. Congress, over the objection of the Bush administration, thwarted the takeover of operation of the U.S. seaports by Dubai Ports.

Given the rapidity and amount of attention paid to this event in the U.S. media, both print and broadcast, it seems likely that the media coverage had an impact on the image of the U.A.E. in the United States. A public attentive to current events would be expected to develop images of the country, particularly given how little exposure the U.A.E. had enjoyed in the U.S. media prior to this controversy.

**Public Images of Foreign Countries**

Many terms are used in the literature to refer to the basic idea that the citizens of a country have images or stereotypes of other countries. Boulding (1969) referred to this as National Image, while Rokeach (1968) used the term Belief System, and Holsti (1969) spoke of a Public Image. For Buchanan and Cantril (1965), the appropriate term was National Stereotype, while Lebedenko (2004) spoke of a National Identity, or the image citizens have of their own country. Alexander, Levin and Henry (2005) were

Lippmann (1922) wrote that the way in which the world is imagined determines, at any particular moment, what people will do. Boulding (1969) argued that the National Image is basically a lie, or at least a perspective distortion of the truth. Some researchers, such as Buchanan and Cantril (1965), said that these images are the basis upon which people feel for or against other nations, interpret their behavior as villainous or good, judge their actions and judge what they themselves as a nation should do in relation to others.

Smith (1973) defined the International Images as the images the people of one nation have of the people and governments of other nations. He said that the images the citizens of any nations hold about some other nations affect the options open to their own government in political economic and social relationships with those other nations.

Merskin (2004) stated that stereotypes are collections of traits or characteristics that present members of a group as being all the same. This signifying mental practice provides convenient shorthand in the identification of a particular group of people. Mowlana (1995) wrote that image may be defined as a combinatorial construct whose subject is itself a collection of images in the individual memory of various aspects or reality. It is the totality of attributes that a person recognizes or imagines. Images are, to varying degrees, interdependent on one another. The structure of one is inferred or predicted by that of another, and change in one produces imbalance and, therefore, change in the other.

Boulding (1969) argued that the images that are important in international systems are those that a nation has of itself and the images the nation has of other bodies in the system that constitute its international environment.

Image theorists suggested that ideas about other actors in world affairs are organized into group schemas, or images, with well-defined cognitive elements (Alexander, et al., 2005). These images are organized in a systematic way, comprised of cognitions and beliefs regarding the target nation’s motives, leadership, and primary characteristics.
In sum, the National Image can be seen as the representations that people have in their minds about another country. It includes their beliefs about that country as well as the objective facts they have stored about that country. It is possible to distinguish this from the affective assessment of the country, though affect and cognitions should be linked.

**Factors that affect National Images**

Boulding (1969) argued that impressions of nationality are formed mostly in childhood and usually in the family. He said it would be wrong to think of these images as being easily manipulated. According to Boulding, the national image is essentially a historical image. The more aware a people is of its history, the stronger the national image of other countries is likely to be. In addition, the consciousness of important shared events and experiences is of great importance.

Buchanan and Cantril (1965) showed that the influence of historical events has shaped somewhat the stereotypes in the U.S. of Germans, Italians and especially the Japanese. Some researchers have emphasized the role of ideology in shaping the national image. For example, the most important factor in shaping the image of the Soviet Union in the western minds was communism in contrast with liberalism. In the late 1980s, for example, when Ronald Reagan identified the Soviet Union as the focus of evil in the modern world, he asked Americans to pray for the salvation of all those who live in totalitarian darkness and for their chance of knowing God (Merskin, 2004). Thus, after the breakup of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, most of the newly independent states faced with the challenges of defining a new identity and of positioning their image in the international arena (Lebedenko, 2004).

When there are good relationships between nations, the mutual images tend to be positive. For example, Guirguis (1988) concluded that the changes of political relations between Egypt and the U.S. affected the image of Egypt in the American media. During the 1960s, since the relations were negative, the image was negative. In the 1970s, as the relations became positive, the image became positive. Rabinovich (2004) found that the world events and changes in U.S. foreign relations have affected evaluations of countries around the world by the U.S. public.

Religion is considered to be one of the most important factors in shaping national images. For example, western Christian cultures perceived the Muslim world as a menace (Rodenson, 1987).
Christians and Muslims presented a religious, intellectual and military challenge to each other (Zeid, 2001; Gerges, 2003).

**The Role of Images in Foreign Policy**

A number of classic studies has shown that the relationship between belief system, perceptions and decision making in foreign policy is a vital one. A decision maker acts based upon his or her image of the situation rather than upon objective reality. It has been demonstrated that the belief system, its structure and its content, play an integral role in the cognitive process (Holsti, 1969).

The relationship between national images and international conflict also is clear. Decision makers act upon their definitions of the situation, their own images and the images others have of the states. These images are in turn dependent upon the decision maker’s belief system, and these may or may not be accurate representations of the reality. Thus it has been suggested that international conflict frequently is not between states but rather between distorted images of states (Holsti, 1969).

Boulding (1969) argued that the people who determine the policies and actions of nations do not respond to the objective facts of the situation, but to their image of the situation. Politicians act according to the way the world appears to them, not necessarily according to the way it is.

Two distinct national images are thus of importance, according to Boulding (1969). First is the image of the small group of powerful people who make the actual decisions that lead to war or peace, the making or breaking of treaties, invasions or withdrawals, the forming of alliances, and other aspects of international relations. The second is the image of the mass of ordinary people who are deeply affected by these decisions but who take no direct part in making them.

International relations scholars have examined the origins and consequences of the images that nation states hold of each other, particularly in the context of international conflict (Alexander, Levin & Henry, 2005). Image theory is a theory of strategic decision making that identifies the primary judgments guiding international images, or stereotypes, and the selection of international policies. Images or stereotypes of one nation stem from perceived relationships between nations and serve to justify a nation’s desired reaction or treatment toward another nation. An image of the other nation as the enemy arises to validate such a behavior inclination (Alexander et al., 2005).
Ayres (1997) found that image change and resolution are correlated. He studied three cases in reaching that conclusion: the Israeli-Egyptian conflict from 1973-1979; the conflict between Turkish and Greek Cypriots from 1979-1983; and the Iraqi-Iranian war from 1982-1985. In the case of Egypt and Israel, where a resolution was reached, images did change, correlated with mediation efforts over time. In the other two cases, where no resolution was obtained, no image change occurred despite mediation efforts.

Some researchers argued that most of the conflicts between nations or between the people of the same nation are due to distorted images. The American civil war is a classic example in this regard. In addition to the objective reasons for this war, there were many distorted images and perceptions that strengthened it (Farrell & Smith, 1976). This also was the case with the tension between the United States and France in the 1960s (Hoffmann, 1968). Similarly, the negative image of Jews in Germany during Hitler’s era was one basis for their being targeted (Miller, 1982). The conflict between the Oriental Islam and Western Christianity from the middle ages until today has been based on negative images (Said, 1979; Gerges, 2003).

Niebuhr (1967) and Schiller (1992) argued that not only are world politics based on images, but they also are based on myths, and myths help to justify the actions and the behaviors of those nations who use them.

The Media and Foreign Policy

The role of the media in shaping a national policy and attitudes toward other peoples and cultures is a subject that has generated a great deal of controversy. Ghareeb (1983), for example, examined the extent to which that imbalanced and biased news reporting, editorializing and drawing of cartoons encourage the people of one country to support political hostility against another group.

Many argue that political battles today are often won or lost first in the media. This continues to be true of the U.S. media coverage of the Middle East, U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East, and the American public perceptions of the politics of the Middle East (Karl, 1983).

Scholars have employed traditional and new theoretical approaches to explore the complex, dynamic relationship between the media and foreign policy making, each focusing on a particular function or effect. Recent attention has focused on what is termed the CNN Effect. This term is used to describe
television coverage, primarily of humanitarian disasters, that forces policymakers to take actions they otherwise would not have taken, such as military intervention (Gilboa, 2003). This phenomenon means that the media determine the national interest and usurps policy making from elected and appointed officials. Politicians, officials, journalists and scholars have argued that the CNN Effect caused the U.S. and western interventions in Northern Iraq, Somalia, Bosnia, and Kosovo.

Wanta, Golan and Lee (2004) have used an agenda-setting framework to study the relationship between media coverage and images of foreign nations. Specifically, they argued that the more coverage a country receives in the media, the more likely it is that members of the public will view the country as “of vital importance to U.S. interests.” They also argued that the direction of coverage should make a difference, with negative coverage producing negative evaluations and positive coverage producing positive evaluations. The researchers used data gathered by the Gallup organization in 1998 for the Chicago Council for Foreign Relations in which questions on 26 countries were included. The respondents evaluated the countries in terms of whether they were of “vital interest” to the U.S. and by using a “feeling thermometer” measuring positive or negative affect. The newscasts of ABC, CBS, NBC and CNN were analyzed for the nine and a half months prior to the Gallup survey. The coding was for frequency of mentions and valence. Wanta, Golan and Lee found that amount of mentions was correlated with the perception that the country was of vital interest to the U.S., and that the more negative coverage a country received, the more likely respondents were to think negatively about the nation. Positive coverage, however, was not correlated with a positive affective response on the part of respondents.

A special report by Media Tenor (2006) for the World Economic Forum showed that coverage of the Middle East, including Iraq, dominated the reporting of international news in four U.S. television networks from January 1, 2005, through March 31, 2006. That coverage by ABC, CBS, Fox and NBC evening newscasts largely focused on Iraq. The other countries receiving coverage were Iran, Palestine, Israel, Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Turkey, in that order. The United Arab Emirates did not receive any coverage during the period. Overall, the coverage of the Middle East was judged to be overwhelmingly negative. Warfare and politically motivated crime dominated the coverage. Politically motivated crime dominated coverage of Egypt, for example, and overall coverage was negative.
Expectations

This paper addresses three questions:

What was the image of the U.A.E. in the American media during the Dubai Ports World controversy and what were the frames in which this image was presented?

What is known about American public opinion regarding this controversy and toward the United Arab Emirates?

Is there a relationship between exposure to the American media and the attitudes regarding the port controversy and toward U.A.E? Which factors and variables affect this relationship?

The basic hypothesis to be tested was:

Hypothesis: Respondents who followed the story about the proposed purchase by DP World of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. will be more critical of the deal than those who do not, controlling for initial differences between those attentive to the news and those not.

Story Line

To create a storyline of the mainstream media’s presentation of the Dubai Ports World story, stories from the Associated Press full-text record in the academic version of LexisNexis were gathered. The stories were then read, and the story line from those dealing with the Dubai Ports World story is summarized below.

Feb 11. The Associated Press reported in a story lead:

“A company in the United Arab Emirates is poised to take over significant operations at six American ports as part of a corporate sale, leaving a country with ties to the Sept. 11 hijackers with influence over a maritime industry considered vulnerable to terrorism.

“The Bush Administration was not objecting to Dubai Ports World’s purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co., the company that managed the U.S. ports. Among those who opposed this deal is Sen. Charles Schumer (D-New York).”

Feb 13: AP reported that the DP World bid was approved by Peninsular & Oriental shareholders.

Feb 19: Sen. Charles Schumer joined some family members of Sept. 11 victims Sunday to urge President Bush to personally intervene to block the port contract. The senator also called for a 90-day
inquiry into all port contracts involving foreign governments. Also, the chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, Representative Peter King (R-New York), said the terms for approving an Arab company's takeover of operations at six major American ports are insufficient to guard against terrorist infiltration.

**Feb 20:** Undersecretary of State Karen Hughes said lawmakers' objection is a backlash from the Sept. 11 attacks, not an expression of wider anti-Arab sentiment among American politicians.

**Feb 22:** U.S. Treasury Secretary John Snow on Wednesday defended the decision to turn over six major U.S. seaports to a government-owned business in the United Arab Emirates.

**Feb 23:** Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), the senior Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, accused the Bush administration of ignoring the law in approving the Dubai ports deal.

The AP also reported concerns with the UAE seven years ago about possible ties between officials in that country and Osama bin Laden, according to a section of the Sept. 11 commission's report.

The Port Authority of NY and NJ said it had security concerns over a plan for a Dubai-based firm to take over operations at a Port Newark container terminal, and it will file a lawsuit to terminate its lease at the port.

**Feb 24:** As controversy raged over the United Arab Emirates' terrorism record, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice met Thursday with UAE officials in Abu Dhabi and discussed ways to improve U.S.-UAE cooperation in combating terrorism.

DP World offered to delay its takeover of most operations at six U.S. ports to give the Bush administration more time to convince skeptical lawmakers the deal poses no security risks. Sen. Schumer contended a cooling down of this issue will not be sufficient to lead to its passage.

The Customs Department, part of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, gave a media briefing and tour Friday at Port Newark to try to ease concerns over the pending sale.

Alabama's two Republican senators favored more congressional oversight before allowing a United Arab Emirates company to manage any U.S. seaports.
Feb 25: AP reported that the Homeland Security Department objected at first to a United Arab Emirates’ company's taking over significant operations at six U.S. ports. It was the lone protest among members of the government committee that eventually approved the deal without dissent.

Feb 26: AP reported that DP World’s operation in U.S. ports would not control selection of the workforce, would not be in charge of security. The UAE company agreed to broader review over security risks in the ports deal and promised to create a U.S. subsidiary that would operate independently of executives in Dubai until May. It also agreed to the request for a 45-day delay and review of the sale. Bush supports the delay.

Feb 27: New Jersey’s two U.S. senators were scheduled to join with teamsters and longshoremen Monday to protest the sale of some American port operations to a state-owned Dubai company. The Bush administration will conduct a highly unusual second review of potential security risks in the deal it previously approved.

Britain’s High Court heard a Miami company’s challenge to the Dubai Ports World deal.

March 1: Congressional Republicans and Democrats tempered calls for an immediate vote to block the takeover as President Bush prodded them to avoid a confrontation. Lawmakers said they would not force a quick showdown.

March 2: AP reported that the DP World routinely works with Israeli firms. According to the story, several Persian Gulf states, especially the ones entering international markets, mostly ignore the boycott of Israel even though they have not formally ended it and do not recognize Israel.

Britain’s High Court approved on the proposed takeover by DP World.

March 4: DP World formally submitted to a broader U.S. security review.

March 9: A House committee voted 62-2 to block the deal, and Senate Democrats also demanded a vote. The company said Thursday that it was prepared to give up its management stake. “DP World will transfer fully the U.S. operations ... to a United States entity,” the firm’s top executive, H. Edward Bilkey, said in an announcement that capped weeks of controversy. Sen. John Warner (R-Va.) said that Sheikh Mohammed Al Maktoum, prime minister of the United Arab Emirates, "advised the company ... that this action is the appropriate course to take."
March 10: President George W. Bush said he was troubled by the political storm, saying it sent a bad message to U.S. allies in the Middle East.

Free trade talks between the United States and the United Arab Emirates were postponed Friday, a day after a Dubai company succumbed to pressure. UAE says the postponement was not related to the ports deal controversy.

March 15: The Dubai company details plans to sell its U.S. port operations to an undisclosed American company. Critics say they are satisfied.

March 23: Department of Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff said Thursday that U.S. would have been safer with the Dubai company operating its ports, referring to the firm’s good record in cooperation with the U.S.

June 25: AP reported that DP World has stepped up acquisitions of global shipping terminals.

July 11: DP World said it has stepped up cooperation with U.S. Customs, announcing that its terminal in the Dominican Republic had joined the United States’ anti-terrorist Container Security Initiative to allow U.S. Customs inspectors to search America-bound shipments before they sail out.

July 26: U.S. House and Senate passed legislation in response to the uproar over the Dubai ports deal that makes it easier for Congress to oversee the federal Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, which was criticized for deciding that a Dubai-owned company could manage some U.S. ports.

Media Transcripts

The television news producers in the United States can be divided into two categories. The first is the news produced by the traditional terrestrial networks, ABC, NBC and CBS. The second is the news produced by the companies that distribute their signals via cable or satellite. CNN is probably the best known of the latter group.

The LexisNexis Academic database contains transcripts from news programs of the three terrestrial networks, ABC, NBC and CBS, as well as the nonterrestrial producers CNBC, CNN, Fox News Network, and MSNBC.
During the Feb. 1, to August 31, 2006, period, a search for the keyword “United Arab Emirates” produced the following stories: ABC (61), NBC (43), CBS (57), CNBC (15), CNN (287), Fox (112), and MSNBC (48).

Each of these files was searched with a word processor for the terms “Dubai” or “DP”. The selected stories were read and characterized by two coders. In addition, stories from the Worldstream data file of the Associated Press were searched and read. The Worldstream database contains reporting from the 82 bureaus of the Associated Press International Service from around the world and represents the foreign reporting of the Associated Press. All stories containing the keywords “United Arab Emirates,” that appeared between February 1, 2006, through August 31, 2006, had been downloaded. A total of 912 stories met the search criteria. More than half—51.7%—appeared in February and March alone.

**Associated Press**

The Associated Press had the most complex stories. The stories reflected not only the sale controversy, but they also offered a broad framework that explained the sale and its consequences, gave information about the country of Dubai and its role in the region, detailed the U.S.-U.A.E. relationship, and discussed global economic trends.

Some of the stories were clearly favorable to DP World. As an example, on February 27, a detailed story started with the planned purchase but then presented the U.S.-U.A.E. relations at many levels: political, economic, military, and terrorism-related.

The Associated Press also gave details about the purchase from Great Britain and about the international activities of the U.A.E. company. Several times, the stories mentioned DP World as “the world’s third-largest port company.” On March 23rd, a story described Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff’s opinion that U.S. would have been safer with DP operating in the U.S. On June 25th, a story showed how DP had expanded its international operations after the U.S. Congress voted to block the purchase. The story quoted an expert saying: “The industry has sympathy for them now.” The story also emphasized DP’s collaboration with China, India and Korea. On July 18, the Associated Press also had a portrait of Edward Bilkey, DP World’s former top American executive.
When the Associated Press described the attitude of the Congress and of the majority of the American people, however, the agency used strong words, such as: “The Congress strongly criticized the Bush Administration,” “Strong bipartisan opposition,” “Storm of protest” of the American people, “U.S. ports scandal,” “Furor in Miami,” and Congress has acted to “block,” “prevent,” and “delay” the “controversial deal.”

_Broadcast Television_

**ABC, CBS and NBC**

In the coverage of ABC, CBS and NBC, there were rarely comments by the TV anchors. The broadcast anchors kept their shows as “news” programs. Anchors asked reporters what they found out to explain the “facts” and asked their guests about their perspectives.

Much of the discussion on the broadcast news was offered by congressional leaders and White House officials about the record of the U.A.E. regarding its role in terrorism or in the war on terrorism. These broadcast reports framed the debate as a fight between the administration and a “bipartisan” congressional effort.

The broadcast news gave much less coverage to the issue than their cable counterparts (below), with a larger “fact” to commentary ratio. The broadcast networks revealed such aspects of the story as who would actually control port security even under DP World ownership.

ABC did present coverage that was critical of the DP Worlds purchase. Several times, its journalists used the words “Arab company” or “Arab-owned DP” to describe the Dubai company (which AP never did). The deal was presented in a less nuanced manner, as illustrated by this phrase, “this deal to sell six American ports to an Arab company.” Some of the news focused on the uncertainties associated with Dubai, such as funding of terrorists and transit on nuclear materials through Dubai to Pakistan.

On February 23rd, the ABC anchor said that the main question was: “Is the Arab nation of Dubai friend or foe?” Strong words were used about the consequences of the decision of the Bush administration, which caused an “uproar,” a “political firestorm,” “an uproar in the Senate.” Most of the people interviewed were senators, representatives, military experts (Wesley Clark). Two sheiks were interviewed.
CBS and NBC had similar news coverage of the controversy. Both networks interviewed senators and House members, Gen. John Abizaid and Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff. The two networks also frequently inserted quotes of President Bush’ assertions. Most often, CBS described DP World as a “Dubai-owned company” or “a company controlled by the Arab country of Dubai,” while NBC once mentioned it only as an “Arab-owned company.” Both networks asserted that “the Congress killed the President’s deal,” while NBC used an expression that ABC also had used: “Dubai, friend or foe.”

The coverage of the story by CBS and NBC did not provide a detailed framework of the story and was based almost entirely on the opinions of the guests on the programs.

**Cable and Satellite Channels**

**CNBC**

Among all the media organizations that were analyzed for this study, CNBC was the most favorable to the deal. The network made reference many times to the economic opportunities in Dubai for U.S. companies, to the economic progress of the Arab country, and to its strategic importance. One anchor said that the blocking of the deal “is a political story.” Another anchor said: “I’m worried there’s protectionism and xenophobia in this rejection of the Dubai deal.” Unlike on the other television networks, most of those interviewed about the controversy by CNBC were not politicians, but journalists and business people.

**CNN**

Of all the TV networks, CNN had the most exhaustive coverage of the DP World purchase. The words that very frequently were used to describe the situation were “Dubai Ports World controversy” and “Dubai deal collapse.” The coverage was substantial, giving explanations for the concerns of the U.S. citizens, but also describing why good relations with the U.A.E. are important for the U.S. military and economic strategy. To describe and explain the situation, CNN used extensively its own journalists (the political analysts, the foreign correspondents, and the journalists working for CNN International). In addition, CNN interviewed politicians, DP World executives, and Dubai government officials. Having international correspondents and media partners in the region enabled CNN to produce a coverage that
was different from other networks, by bringing a variety of voices and perspectives about the event and its potential consequences to the story.

CNN coverage of the DPW purchase also differed among the individual program hosts. Coverage in Lou Dobbs fiercely attacked the DP World deal, while Coverage in Wolf Blitzer’s show was much more moderate, favoring the deal to some extent. In the midst of the firestorm, Blitzer himself visited Dubai and produced some favorable coverage, explaining both the modernization of Dubai and the country’s cooperation with the U.S. He asked: “How will it impact Arab allies in the war on terror?” on March 12, after the deal collapse. In a web question he asked the audience to vote on the question: “Did the Congress overreact?” Blitzer tried to both report and induce the views of his guests. In contrast, Lou Dobbs selected only what supported his own perspective and advanced his views. Blitzer invited guests from Dubai to his show. Dobbs did not. Vocal critics of the port deal were the most frequent guests on the Lou Dobbs show.

**Fox New Network**

Fox’s emphasize was on the importance of the U.S. strategic partnership with the United Arab Emirates. Most of those who were invited to speak about the sale were also asked to indicate how important Dubai is for the United States. A majority of those invited to talk were politicians and military experts.

Words frequently used by the Fox journalists to frame the story were “collapse of the Dubai ports deal” and “GOP revolt.” Another topic that was frequently brought into the conversation by the anchors was whether Dubai was trustworthy.

Fox commentary framed the issue as the Democrats trying to gain political points rather than being concerned about Homeland Security. This was particularly apparent after DP World announced it would pull out from the deal involving U.S. ports and the Democrats continued to push a vote. Most Fox hosts, as was true for CNN’s Lou Dobbs, blatantly advanced their own anti-Democrat views. They brought in guests to support their views, and on occasion, the opposite perspective, with the apparent purpose of challenging and the other perspectives. Compared to the anchors, reporters tried to report the facts more objectively, even though their perspectives on the issue often were suggested by their choice of words.
Of all the media organizations examined in this study, MSNBC had the least coverage (though not the fewest downloaded stories) of the purchase by DP World of the UK company. MSNBC’s coverage was based almost entirely on the opinions of those who were interviewed. In some cases, those interviewed did not have a special expertise in the issue and were asked to talk about a variety of other issues in addition to the DP World situation. The structure of their programming, with many one-anchor talk-shows, probably is the explanation of their approach. Several times, one anchor framed the blocked deal as the “Dubai ports surrender.”

**Summary Comments**

The complexity of the Dubai ports deal varied from one media organization to another, with the Associated Press and CNN (among the TV networks) devoting the most space and the most exhaustive coverage.

The orientation toward the controversy also was different from one media outlet to another, with ABC producing coverage that was mostly negative about the deal and CNBC being the most positive about it. Others, such as CBS and NBC, had a more limited and more neutral coverage, while MSNBC used very little original material in its news coverage.

The TV networks, with CNN being in part the exception, focused more on the differences that the controversy produced, such as Dubai, friend or foe, President vs. Congress, Democrats vs. Republicans, and good deal vs. bad deal.

The Associated Press had the most exhaustive coverage of the controversy, but also used strong words. Mostly, it told the story through the reporting of its details. All the other media organizations used interviewees, to a lesser or greater degree, to tell the story or to make comments about it. In many cases, these interviewees were not selected because they had special expertise on the topic, but because they had conflicting opinions.

CNN’s complex coverage was determined by the structure of the network. Having journalists specialized in international coverage and having foreign correspondents enabled CNN to give voice to a variety of opinions and to interview experts in the region.
The media, then, did not speak in a single voice on the DP World purchase of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company and the controversy that evolved from the purchase. They told the story in multiple ways, giving the audience members much from which to choose. If short on “facts” and details, the coverage was varied in opinions and interpretations. No single frame dominated the coverage.

Summary of Public Opinion Surveys

Although the United Arab Emirates gained independence in late 1971 and played an important role in the Gulf War in 1991, it did not make it into the two more comprehensive polling archives until the Dubai Ports World story put it there in 2006. A search of the poll archives at the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut indicated that “United Arab Emirates” appeared first in a poll question in February of 2006, as the Dubai Ports World’s purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. entered the news. A search of Polling the Nations archive turned up 15 questions, with the first entry also in February of 2006.

No questions using the phrases “Trucial States” or “Trucial Sheikhdoms,” earlier references to what is now the United Arab Emirates, appeared in either data base. Abu Dhabi, the capital city of the UAE, was used in six questions appearing in the Polling the Nations database, but all were based on studies of non-U.S. populations. In the Polling the Nations database, “Dubai” appeared in six surveys, but they all dealt with the Dubai Ports World’s purchase. In the Roper Center data base, “Dubai” appeared in six polls, again all dealing with the DP World purchase.

In sum, publicly archived measures of public opinion about the United Arab Emirates to date consist of measures associated with the purchase of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. by Dubai Ports World and its consequences. A total of 43 questions from 12 different polls are included in the Roper Center archive. The Polling the Nations database included 15 questions from seven different polls. All of these questions and polls were included in the Roper Center archive as well.

The first of the archived polls on the DP World issue was fielded February 22-26 of 2006 by CBS News. It showed strong opposition to allowing “a company from the United Arab Emirates run six shipping ports in the United States.” Seventy percent of the national adult sample said the U.S. should not let the UAE company operate U.S. shipping ports. (See Appendix 1.)
Another poll, fielded a few days later for Democracy Corp, a progressive political group based in Washington, D.C., found that 63% of a sample of likely voters said the decision by the Bush administration to allow a company in the “United Arab Emirates, a country that has a poor record of helping the U.S. in the war on terror, to assume control of ports in six American cities” raised “serious” or “very serious” doubts about “Republicans in Washington.”

A national survey, fielded just a few days later, again showed opposition to “allowing the Dubai-based company to oversee shipping operations at U.S. ports.” In that survey, fielded from February 25 to March 1, 2006, 59% of the respondents said they were somewhat or strongly opposed to having DP Worlds “overseeing” the U.S. ports. Additional interviewing into early March did not change the finding. During the lengthier interview period, ending on March 5, 57% of those interviewed were opposed to the sale. Only one in 5 of the respondents in the polls indicated he or she had not heard enough to voice an opinion on the issue.

In fact, a Gallup Poll conducted for CNN and the newspaper, USAToday, in late February and early March showed that 73% of the respondents reported they were following the story either “very” or “somewhat” closely. The survey also found that 66% of the respondents opposed the sale. Thirty-nine percent of the national sample said the sale was “a major threat to U.S. security.” And 69% said the sale was controversial because it was “not in the best interest of the United States,” rather than because of “discrimination against Arabs.”

A Fox News Poll of a national sample of registered voters conducted February 28 to March 1 posed as its initial question about the sale an overall evaluation of the United Arab Emirates. The poll asked if the respondents felt the UAE was a “strong ally of the United States in the war against terrorism or not.” Just under half (49%) of the respondents said they did not feel the UAE was a strong ally. The poll found that 69% of the registered voters interviewed opposed “allowing a United Arab Emirates company” manage “operations at some US ports” and 77% said they were “very” or “somewhat” concerned “that having a United Arab Emirates-owned company manage United States port operations will jeopardize the security of the United States.”
The Fox News Poll found that 63% of the respondents knew that United States would be “in charge of port security” if the “Arab-owned took over management of operations at some U.S. ports.” Only 25% said knowing that the “U.S. Coast Guard and Customers and Border Protection officials would continue to be in charge of port security” made them more likely to support “allowing the United Arab Emirates company to manage U.S. ports.”

The Fox Poll showed that only 24% of the respondents thought the United Arab Emirates had “proven itself a strong U.S. ally in the war against terrorism.” At the same time, 60% said opposition to the port deal “is based on bias against Arabs,” and 42% said the political opposition to the port deal is “due more to political grandstanding in an election year” than to “serious concerns about homeland security.”

The Fox Poll also showed that, despite their concerns about the purchase by DP World, 54% said they thought “the United Arab Emirates company will be managing some” U.S. ports “a year from now.”

An ABC News/Washington Post Poll in early March also reported strong opposition to the ports deal. A total of 70% said they felt “strongly” or “somewhat” that a “company owned by the government of a nation called the United Arab Emirates” should not be allowed to manage “six U.S. ports.”

Of those opposed to the sale, 71% said they did not “think any foreign company should manage a U.S. port.” The question did not indicate that the U.S. ports were already being managed by the U.K. company.

A nearly identical finding, based on another national sample of registered voters also in early March, found 68% of the respondents disapproved of the Dubai Ports World purchase. The study was conducted by Washington survey firm, The Winston Group, for an organization called New Model National Brand.

The most extensive questioning on the controversy was undertaken by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. Between March 8 and 12 of 2006, Pew constructed a questionnaire for a national sample of 1,405 adults that included 13 questions on the proposed purchase by DP World. Not all respondents were asked each question, as multiple forms were used.

Pew found that 73% of the sample disapproved of allowing “a company from the United Arab Emirates” to “run six shipping ports in the United States.” Of those opposed, 11% said it was because they
did not “think Arab companies should be operating U.S. ports,” while 83% said it was “mainly because” they did not “think any foreign companies should be operating U.S. ports.”

Only 33% of the respondents said they were “very” or “somewhat” confident “that the U.S. government has thoroughly checked out the possible security risks of letting an Arab company run U.S. ports.” Only 32% correctly said that the six ports were currently being operated by a “foreign country.”

The political nature of the conflict was evident in responses to three questions posed by Pew. Of the respondents, 61% knew that President George W. Bush favors “allowing this Arab company to run these shipping ports.” And 76% said that Congress, rather than President Bush “should make the final decision on this issue.”

Of those who disapproved of the deal, 35% said they would “definitely vote against” their local representative in the upcoming November election if that representative supported the sale, while only 8% of those in favor of the deal said they “would definitely vote against” their representative if that representative opposed it.

When told “this company said it would transfer all operations of U.S. ports to an American company,” 46% of the respondents said they found this to be a “satisfactory solution,” while 38% did not. And only 24% said that “Congress made too much of this situation,” while 58% said Congress’s response was “appropriate.”

At the same time, the respondents expressed concerns about the consequences of the controversy. Fifth-eight percent said they were “very” or “somewhat” concerned “that America may have angered important allies in the Middle East by opposing this deal.”

Pew asked respondents if they happened “to know if this Arab company would or would not have been in charge of security at the ports.” While 38% correctly said DP World would not have been in charge of security, 14% said it would and 48% didn’t know or refused to answer.

On March 10, the NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll asked another version of the question on approval of the DP World deal. This was after the announcement of the decision to transfer operations for the six ports to an American company. The poll read a list of “actions and positions that George W. Bush and his administration have taken over the past few years.” Included was “allowing a United Arab Emirates
company to manage operations at several U.S. port terminals.” The poll of the national adult sample found that 75% were either “somewhat” or “strongly” opposed.

From March 12 to 14, National Public Radio (NPR) fielded a survey of likely voters nationally that included several questions on the DP World controversy. Half of the sample was asked to volunteer explanations for the decision of the “Bush administration” to approve “a government-owned country from the United Arab Emirates operating six American ports.” Of the respondents, 24% said it was for economic reasons, 16% said it was to show the Arab world that the U.S. is not against it, 12% said it was because of Bush’s ties to oil companies, Arab companies, or big business, and 11% said it was because Bush is incompetent. Half of the sample was asked a closed-ended question about “why President Bush approved” the deal. Among the five listed options, 29% said it was because Bush was “trying to strengthen relations with allies.”

A Fox News Poll in the middle of March told the national sample of registered voters that “a company owned by the United Arab Emirates has agreed to give up a deal to run some ports in the United States.” The respondents were asked if they thought “the United States is safer today because an Arab country is not running some U.S. ports, or less safe because a relationship with an ally may be damaged.” Of the registered voters, 44% said the U.S. was safer, while 33% chose the “less safe” option.

The final archived poll on the topic was fielded with likely voters in late August of 2006 by Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research for Democracy Corps, a non-profit organization associated with progressive causes. The question was very complicated, and made a reference to the port deal in the context of other Bush administration activities. The responses seemed to suggest, however, that a majority of the respondents felt the Dubai Ports World deal and others had left doubts with the voters about the Republican “record on national security.”

**Media Use and Response to the Dubai Ports World Story**

The reviewed surveys suggest strong opposition of the U.S. public to the Dubai Ports World purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. that did not decrease over time (Chart 1). In general, the polls suggest Americans were uncomfortable with foreign ownership of port management companies, and that they did not understand that the six ports in question were already
operated by a foreign company. The respondents seemed to understand that President Bush was in favor of the sale. The data suggested significant negative implications for Republicans and others who stood with the President on the decision.

The poll data and the content data analyzed above suggest at least some correspondence between the story line in the media and public opinion. Certainly some of the coverage was quite negative, and that coverage could have shaped the public opinion. There is little to suggest that the public had a very complete image of the United Arab Emirates before the controversy.

Because two of the polls conducted during the period of the controversy contained questions about attention to news about the controversy, it is possible to examine the relationship between the level of reported attention to the news and attitudes and beliefs about it.

In February 28-March 1 Gallup, in its poll for CNN and USAToday of a sample of national adults, asked respondents if they had been “following the news about the proposed sale of cargo operations at several major U.S. seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates.” Pew, in its March 8-12 survey, also of adults nationally, asked how closely respondents had been following news stories on “the debate over an Arab-owned company possibly running U.S. ports.” (Because the Pew question did not reference the United Arab Emirates, this question did not show up in the initial search.) Neither question identified the news source used by the respondent to follow the story, so it is not possible to compare respondents based on the sources, but both showed high levels of interest in the story (Chart 2).

The Roper Center holds the raw data files for these two surveys. They were downloaded and subjected to secondary analysis. The key question was whether respondents who followed the story in the media reflected the dominant story line and were more critical than those not attentive to the media about the DP World deal.

The Gallup data show only a weak, negative relationship between reported attention to the DP World story and support for the sale. The gamma is -.22. As Table 1 shows, this reflects the tendency for exposure to lead both to higher levels of opposition and, to a lesser degree, to higher levels of support as well. Table 2, which simplifies the responses to the question on support, shows this even more clearly (Chart 3). The small number of respondents who were not sure of the level of exposure cloud the picture.
It seems likely they were not paying close attention to the story, based on their responses to the question on support for the sale. Of those who reported giving little attention to the port sale story, opposition stood at 38.0%. Among those who reported following the story very closely, opposition stood at 71.5%. But support grew from 8.0% among those who did not follow the story closely to 23.9%, among those who followed it closely. Those without an opinion decreased from 54.0% among those who did not follow the story to 4.5% among those who reported following it very closely.

Table 3 provides an elaboration on these findings. Among Republicans, exposure to the DP World purchase story had no relationship to either support or opposition to the purchase, but among Democrats exposure was more strongly related to opposition Chart 4). Among Independents, exposure was slightly related to opposition. This is true whether those leaning Republican and those leaning Democratic are included with the Independents or not. Party affiliation and support for President Bush are highly correlated. (With leaners allocate, the gamma is .85; without allocation, the correlation is .78.) As Table 3 shows, for those who disapprove of the job Bush has done as president, exposure to the DP World story led to opposition to the purchase, while, among those who approve of the job President Bush has done, exposure is unrelated to opinion on the purchase.

Among those who think the U.S. should trust Arab and Muslim allies of the U.S.–a category that certainly should include the United Arab Emirates–the same as other allies, exposure was unrelated to attitude on the DP World purchase. Among those who said the U.S. should trust Arab and Muslim allies less, exposure was negatively related to support for the purchase. Education level of the respondents made a difference as well, though the difference was not overwhelming. Opposition to the purchase was somewhat more negatively related to exposure among those low in education than among those high in education.

Clearly, then, the effects of self-reported exposure to the story in the media were influenced by initial partisan orientations and attitudes toward Arabs and Muslims. Further analysis showed, however, that self-reported exposure was not associated with partisan attitudes. Republicans and Democrats reported the same levels of exposure. Similarly, trust in Arab an Muslim countries was not related to party affiliation. Education was associated with exposure, with the highly educated more likely to report following
the story. And education was associated weakly with trust of Arab and Muslim countries, with the better educated more likely to say these allies should be trusted the same as others.

An examination of the relationship between self-reported exposure to the DP World story and support for the purchase using the Pew March 8-12 survey replicated the finding from the Gallup Poll. Exposure led to both more support and more opposition, with the gamma being only -.15 (Table 4, Chart 3). The relationship was .08 among Republicans, -.40 among Democrats, and -.22 among Independents (Table 5, Chart 4). The correlations within groups classified according to their support of President Bush and their level of education largely match those from the Gallup survey.

The Pew survey contained three questions that measure how well the respondents understood key aspects of the DP World controversy. The questions were: (1) Do you happen to know if these ports are currently operated by an American company or a foreign country? (Correct: foreign); (2) Do you happen to know if this Arab company would or would not have been in charge of security at the ports? (Correct: would not); and (3) Do you happen to know if President Bush favored or opposed allowing this Arab company to run these shipping ports? (Correct: favored). These three items were summed to form a knowledge index.

Table 6 shows that the exposure measure was correlated .56 with knowledge. The relationship gives every indication of being linear (Chart 5). The relationship also is not affected by party affiliation (Table 7). Republicans, Independents and Democrats all learned equally well from attention to the story, if the small number of respondents who were not sure about their level of attention to the story is excluded (Chart 6).

Overall, there is a weak relationship between knowledge about the DP World issue and approval of it, with those higher in knowledge more likely to be supportive than those low in knowledge (Table 8). The gamma coefficient is .23. But that overall correlation masks the partisan nature of the relationship. As Table 9 shows, the relationship is strongest for Republicans, and almost not existent for Democrats (Chart 7). For Republicans, the gamma coefficient is .37, while it is a weak .15 for Independents and only .06 for Democrats.
So while learning from exposure to the media about the DP World issue does not have a partisan base (persons learn equally regardless of party), the attitudinal consequence of that acquired knowledge is strongly constrained by party. The more the Republicans knew about the issue, the more supportive they were of the sale. Democrats with higher levels of knowledge were no different from Democrats without that knowledge.

In sum, these findings indicate that it was not the coverage of the attempt by DP World to purchase the UK ports firm that influenced, in and of itself, public opinion, which was overwhelmingly negative. Rather, the partisan attitudes of the voters determined if exposure produced a negative effect. If the respondents were Democrats and critical of President George Bush, increased exposure to the media fare led them to be more critical of the purchase. For Republicans, exposure did not matter. Also, initial negative attitudes toward Arabs and Muslims made a difference. If the respondent was negative in advance, exposure led to increased opposition to the sale. Otherwise, exposure did not matter.

This general relationship, which exists in both data sets, is explained by the analysis of the Pew data. Exposure to the media coverage of the DP World proposed purchase led to increased knowledge and understanding of the issues involved, and party did not influence that learning. But the knowledge itself was predictive of support for the sale only among Republicans. In other words, partisan attitudes determined how the information was interpreted.

Conclusions

This paper began with three questions:

What was the image of the U.A.E. in the American media during the DP World controversy and what were the frames in which this image was presented?

What is known about American public opinion regarding this controversy and toward the United Arab Emirates?

Is there a relationship between exposure to the American media and the attitudes regarding the port controversy and toward U.A.E? Which factors and variables affect this relationship?

U.S. public opinion about the United Arab Emirates was not examined in publicly released and archived data files prior to the controversy over the DP World controversy, so it is not possible to know the
National Image of the U.A.E. before the controversy. It seems likely, however, that the image was poorly formed. For that reason, the coverage of the DP World story had the potential to shape U.S. public opinion regarding the U.A.E.

The story, as it unfolded in the U.S. media, had a strong political frame. It was discussed as a story in which Congress and President George W. Bush disagreed, and a story with significant potential political ramifications. The story was told in roughly the same way by the print media and by television. No differences between the broadcast and cable and satellite media were in evidence.

The public response to the story of the potential purchase of the U.K. firm controlling port management by DP World was largely negative. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents were opposed to the sale across the period of the controversy, based on a variety of polls by different survey organizations.

Only a slight relationship existed between attention to the DP Worlds story in the media and attitude toward the sale, with those more attentive being a bit less likely to support the sale. But this simple relationship hides striking partisan differences. Among Republicans, attention to the media is unrelated to support for the sale, while among Independents and, particularly, among Democrats, attention to the sale story was negatively related to support. Those Independents and Democrats who paid the most amount of attention were the least likely to support the sale.

As one would expect, given the literature on learning from the media, those persons who paid the most attention to the DP Worlds story in the media were the ones who were most knowledgeable about it. They could better answer correctly questions that tested their knowledge of the details of the sale. This was equally true for Republicans, Independents and Democrats.

Knowledge, however, was related to support for the DP World sale among Republicans and, to a slight degree, among Independents, but not among Democrats.

None of these relationships is controlling. While Republicans learn from the attention to the media coverage of the DP World story, and that knowledge leads to support, the raw exposure is not related to support for the purchase. While Democrats also learn from the exposure, and that exposure is negatively related to support for the DP World purchase, the knowledge is unrelated to the support to the DP World
sale. Enough unexplained variance remains, in other words, for the relationships to be less than fully consistent internally.

This study sheds some light on media coverage of an important chapter in the relationship of the United States and the United Arab Emirates. The analysis showed that little is known about the image of this important U.S. ally in the United States. The assumption is that had that image of the U.A.E. been more complete, the controversy over the DP World purchase could have played out differently.

Support for this view is shown in Chart 8. Here Gallup asked respondents if they think the U.S. government should or should not allow companies from different countries to own cargo operations at U.S. ports. This is exactly what DP Ports was attempting to purchase, and Gallup found considerable support for the purchase of port operations by companies from Great Britain, which generally enjoys a very positive image in the U.S. Support for ownership by a French company, however, was considerably lower. Following behind was Arab Countries Friendly to the U.S. Presumably this would include the U.A.E. The least amount of support exists for purchase by Chinese companies. This is roughly consistent with expectations based on presumed country image.

This study is limited in a number of ways. Obviously, the measures used are those available for secondary analysis. Single measures had to be used of all of the key variables used in the correlational analysis. The measure of attention to the story in the media was particularly weak, as it does not indicate which media the respondent used to attend to the story. For this reason, it is not possible to differentiate among the effects of the media, thought the content analysis had shown that differences do exist. The exposure measure, in sum, is kind of an average across an uneven lot. Similarly, the knowledge measures are limited. They certainly only touch on a few parts of the complexity of the story.

Nonetheless, the data are interesting in that they showed the complex nature of the impact of the media on public opinion and the key role played by partisan attitudes. National image of a country is important, the data seem to suggest, and stories in the media can play a role in shaping that image. But the prior partisan attitudes of the respondents—particularly in a highly charged political environment such as existed at the time of the DP World proposed purchase—greatly influence the nature of that media influence.
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Appendix 1. Poll Entries for United Arab Emirates
Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut (Search date: 10/26/2007)

CBS News Poll [February, 2006]

Question: As you may know, the Bush Administration has agreed to let a company from the United Arab Emirates run six shipping ports in the US (United States), including ports in New York and New Orleans, that are now being run by a British company. Critics of the plan say that allowing a company from an Arab country to operate US shipping ports is dangerous to national security. The Bush Administration says security will be protected by the US. Do you think the US should or should not let a United Arab Emirates company operate US shipping ports?

21% Should
70 Should not
9 Don't know/No answer


Democracy Corps Poll [February, 2006]

Question: Let me read you a series of statements that could be used to describe Republicans in Washington. For each statement, please tell me whether this description, if accurate, raises very serious doubts, serious doubts, minor doubts or no real doubts in your own mind about Republicans in Washington....The Bush administration has allowed a company in the United Arab Emirates, a country that has a poor record of helping the U.S. (United States) in the war on terror, to assume control of ports in six American cities.

Subpopulation: Asked of Form F half sample

35% Very serious doubts
28 Serious doubts
16 Minor doubts
19 No real doubts
3 Don't know/Refused

Methodology: Conducted by Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, February 23, 2006-February 27, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national likely voters sample of 1135. National likely voters are registered voters who voted in the 2004 presidential election/weren't registered/ineligible/too young to vote and said they are probably or almost certain to vote in the 2006 election.
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Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll [February, 2006]

Question: Now turning your attention to an issue in the news. As you may know, a Dubai state owned company in the United Arab Emirates has made a deal to buy a British company that supervises port shipping operations in some major cities in the US (United States). Opponents of the deal say that the September 11th (2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon) hijackers used Dubai as a transit point, and they say that the security of US ports could be weakened if a Dubai company was in charge of operations there. Supporters of the deal point out that the United States Coast Guard and Customs would continue to handle port security and that Dubai is a strong ally in the US war on terror. How about you? Do you support or oppose allowing the Dubai-based company to oversee shipping operations at US ports, or haven't you heard enough about that yet to say? (If Support/Oppose, ask:) Do you support/oppose that strongly, or only somewhat?

8% Support strongly
8 Support somewhat
12 Oppose somewhat
47 Oppose strongly
18 Haven't heard enough to say
7 Don't know

Methodology: Conducted by Los Angeles Times, February 25, 2006-March 1, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 1273.

Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll [February, 2006]

Now turning your attention to an issue in the news. As you may know, a Dubai state owned company in the United Arab Emirates has made a deal to buy a British company that supervises port shipping operations in some major cities in the US. Opponents of the deal say that the September 11th, 2001 hijackers used Dubai as a transit point, and they say that the security of US ports could be weakened if a Dubai company was in charge of operations there. Supporters of the deal point out that the United States Coast Guard and Customs would continue to handle port security and that Dubai is a strong ally in the US war on terror. How about you? Do you support or oppose allowing the Dubai-based company to oversee shipping operations at US ports, or haven't you heard enough about that yet to say? (If Support/Oppose, ask:) Do you support/oppose that strongly, or only somewhat?

Question Note: * = less than .5%.

8 Support strongly
10 Support somewhat
11 Oppose somewhat
46 Oppose strongly
18% Haven't heard enough
7 Not sure
* Refused

Methodology: Conducted by Los Angeles Times, February 25, 2006-March 5, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 2563.
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Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll [February, 2006]

Question: How closely have you been following the news about the proposed sale of cargo operations at several major U.S. (United States) seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates--very closely, somewhat closely, not too closely, or not at all?

Question Note: * = less than .5%.

36% Very closely
37 Somewhat closely
14 Not too closely
12 Not at all
* No opinion

Question: Do you favor or oppose this proposed sale (of cargo operations at several major United States seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates)?

17% Favor
66 Oppose
17 No opinion

Question: (If Favor/Oppose, ask:) Do you favor or oppose it strongly or only moderately?

5% Favor strongly
12 Favor only moderately
45 Oppose strongly
21 Oppose only moderately
17 No opinion

Question: Is this proposed sale (of cargo operations at several major United States seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates) went through, do you think it would create a major threat to U.S. security, a minor threat, or no threat at all?

39% Major threat
36 Minor threat
16 No threat at all
9 No opinion

Question: Just your best guess, do you think the proposed sale of the U.S. (United States) seaport operations to the United Arab Emirates company is controversial mainly--because of discrimination against Arabs, or mainly because it is a deal that is not in the best interest of the United States?

22% Discrimination against Arabs
69 Not in best interest of United States
9 No opinion

Methodology: Conducted by Gallup Organization, February 28, 2006-March 1, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 1020.
FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll [February, 2006]

Question: Do you think the United Arab Emirates is a strong ally of the United States in the war against terrorism or not?

27% Yes
49 No
24 Don't know

Question: As you may know, there has been some public debate about a United Arab Emirates-owned company called Dubai Ports World taking over commercial management of some US (United States) ports. From what you've heard and read, do you support or oppose allowing a United Arab Emirates company to manage operations at some US ports?

17% Support
69 Oppose
6 Depends (Vol.)
7 Don't know

Question: How concerned are you that having a United Arab Emirates-owned company manage (United States) port operations will jeopardize the security of the United States?...Very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned, not at all concerned.

47% Very concerned
30 Somewhat concerned
12 Not very concerned
7 Not at all concerned
5 Don't know

Question: As far as you know, if the Arab-owned company took over management of operations at some US (United States) ports, who would be in charge of security at the ports--the United States or the United Arab Emirates company?

63% US
22 United Arab Emirates co.
4 Both (Vol.)
11 Don't know

Question: In fact, the US Coast Guard and Customs and Border Protection officials would continue to be in charge or port security, even if a foreign-owned company managed the (United States) port operations. Does knowing this make you more likely to support allowing the United Arab Emirates-company to manage US ports, more likely to oppose, or does it not make any difference to you?

25% More likely to support
34 More likely to oppose
36 No difference
4 Don't know
Question: Critics of the port deal point out that some of the 9/11 (September 11, 2001, the date of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon) hijackers were citizens of the United Arab Emirates and say it is too risky to allow the country to manage US (United States) ports. Proponents say since 9/11, the United Arab Emirates has proven itself to be a strong US ally in the war against terrorism, and it is important to maintain a good relationship with the country. Who do you agree with more?...Those who think it is too risky because it is uncertain whether the Arab country can be trusted. Those who say the United Arab Emirates has proven itself a strong US ally in the war against terrorism.

58% Too risky
24 Proven ally
10 Depends (Vol.)
8 Don't know

Question: How much of the opposition to the port deal (a United Arab Emirates-owned company taking over some United States ports) do you think is based on bias against Arabs--a lot, some, but not a lot, not much, or hardly any at all?

38% A lot
32 Some
11 Not much
13 Hardly any
7 Don't know

Question: Do you think the political opposition to the port deal (a United Arab Emirates-owned company taking over some United States ports) is due more to serious concerns about homeland security or, due more to political grandstanding in an election year?

36% Serious concerns
42 Political grandstanding
14 Combination (Vol.)
8 Don't know

Question: A year from now, do you think the United Arab Emirates company will or will not be managing some ports in the United States?

54% Will
32 Will not
14 Don't know

Methodology: Conducted by Opinion Dynamics, February 28, 2006-March 1, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national registered voters sample of 900.
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ABC News/Washington Post Poll [March, 2006]

Question: As you may know, a company owned by the government of a nation called the United Arab Emirates is in a merger deal that will give it management of six US (United States) ports. Do you think this company should or should not be allowed to manage these ports? (If Should/Should not, ask:) Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

8% Should strongly
15 Should somewhat
17 Should not somewhat
53 Should not strongly
7 No opinion

Question: Do you feel that way (the company owned by the government of a nation called the United Arab Emirates should not be allowed to manage six US ports) mainly because you don't think any foreign company should manage a US (United States) port, or mainly because you don't think a company owned by the United Arab Emirates should manage a US port?

Subpopulation: Asked of those who said the company owned by the government of a nation called the United Arab Emirates should not be allowed to manage six US ports (70%)

71% No foreign company should manage ports
24 No UAE company should manage ports
4 Other (Vol.)
1 No opinion

Methodology: Conducted by ABC News/Washington Post, March 2, 2006-March 5, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 1000. Interviews were conducted by TNS Intersearch.

New Models National Brand Poll [March, 2006]

Question: Do you approve or disapprove of sale of six US (United States) port operations to Dubai Ports World, a company based in the United Arab Emirates?

20% Approve
68 Disapprove
13 Don't know/Refused

Methodology: Conducted by Winston Group, March 4, 2006-March 5, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national registered voters sample of 1000.

Pew News Interest Index Poll [March, 2006]

Question: As you may know, recently a company from the United Arab Emirates made a deal to run six shipping ports in the United States. Would you approve or disapprove of the government allowing this company to operate U.S. ports?

14% Approve
73 Disapprove
13 Don't know/Refused
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Question: Are you against this mainly because you don’t think Arab companies should be operating U.S. ports, or mainly because you don’t think any foreign companies should be operating U.S. ports?

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only of those who disapprove of the port deal

11% Don’t think Arab companies should be operating U.S. ports
83 Don’t think any foreign companies should be operating U.S. ports
4 Neither/Other reason (Vol.)
2 Don’t know/Refused

Question: How confident are you that the U.S. government has thoroughly checked out the possible security risks of letting an Arab company run U.S. ports?...Very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, not at all confident.

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only

12% Very confident
21 Somewhat confident
29 Not too confident
35 Not at all confident
4 Don’t know/Refused

Question: Do you happen to know if these ports are currently operated by an American company or a foreign company?

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only

15% American company
32 Foreign company
52 Don’t know/Refused

Question: Do you happen to know if President (George W.) Bush favors or opposes allowing this Arab company to run these shipping ports?

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only

61% Favors
6 Opposes
1 He hasn’t taken a position (Vol.)
32 Don’t know/Refused
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Question. Who do you think should make the final decision on this issue?...President (George W.) Bush, Congress

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only

13%  President Bush
76  Congress
3  Both (Vol.)
4  Neither/Other (Vol.)
4  Don’t know/Refused

Question: Congress may vote on this issue in the coming weeks. If the member from your district supports allowing this company to run U.S. ports, would you definitely vote against this person, would it be one among many factors you would consider, or would it not matter much to you in the election this November (2006)?

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only of those who disapprove of the port deal

35%  Definitely vote against
47  One among many factors
13  Would not matter much
2  Won't vote (Vol.)
4  Don't know/Refused

Question: Congress may vote on this issue in the coming weeks. If the member from your district opposes allowing this company to run U.S. ports, would you definitely vote against this person, would it be one among many factors you would consider, or would it not matter much to you in the election this November (2006)?

Subpopulation: Asked March 8-9 only of those who approve of the port deal

8%  Definitely vote against
52  One among many factors
34  Would not matter much
3  Won’t vote (Vol.)
4  Don’t know/Refused

Question: On Thursday (March 9, 2006), this company said it would transfer all operations of U.S. (United States) ports to an American company. In your view, is this a satisfactory solution to the issue, or not?

Subpopulation: Asked March 10-12, 2006 only

46%  Satisfactory
38  Not satisfactory
16  Don't know/Refused
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Question: Do you think that Congress made too much of this situation, or was Congress' response appropriate?

Subpopulation: Asked March 10-12, 2006 only

24% Made too much of it
58 Response was appropriate
18 Don't know/Refused

Question: Who in Congress do you think showed better judgment on this issue? Republican leaders in Congress, or Democratic leaders in Congress

Subpopulation: Asked March 10-12, 2006 only

20% Republican leaders in Congress
30 Democratic leaders in Congress
10 Both (Vol.)
9 Neither (Vol.)
31 Don't know/Refused

Question: How concerned are you, if at all, that America may have angered important allies in the Middle East by opposing this deal? Very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, not at all concerned.

Subpopulation: Asked March 10-12, 2006 only

24% Very concerned
34 Somewhat concerned
19 Not too concerned
19 Not at all concerned
4 Don't know/Refused

Question: Do you happen to know if this Arab company would or would not have been in charge of security at the ports?

14% Would
38 Would not
48 Don't know/Refused

Appendix 1. Poll Entries for United Arab Emirates
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**NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll [March, 2006]**

*Question:* I'm going to read you a number of actions and positions that George W. Bush and his administration have taken over the past few years. For each one, please tell me whether you strongly support that action or position, somewhat support it, somewhat oppose it, or strongly oppose it.)...Allowing a United Arab Emirates company to manage operations at several U.S. (United States) port terminals

Subpopulation: Asked of Form A half sample

- 7% Strongly support
- 13 Somewhat support
- 20 Somewhat oppose
- 55 Strongly oppose
- 5 Not sure

Methodology: Conducted by Hart and McInturff Research Companies, March 10, 2006-March 13, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 1005.

**NPR Poll [March, 2006]**

*Question:* As you know, the Bush Administration approved a government-owned company from the United Arab Emirates operating six American ports. Why do you think the Bush administration approved that?

Subpopulation: Asked of Form C half sample

Question Note: Adds to more than 100% due to multiple responses.

- 24% Economic reasons/Money/Profit
- 16 Show the Arab world that we are not against them/Support an ally
- 12 Ties to oil companies/Arab businesses/Big corporations
- 11 Bush is incompetent/Not smart
- 9 Private deal/Did not involve government
- 5 Shouldn't have opposed it/Company has good record
- 3 Must have had his reasons/Trust him
- 6 Other (Vol.)
- 26 Don't know
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Question: As you know, President (George W.) Bush approved a government-owned company from the United Arab Emirates operating six American ports. Which of the following best explains why President Bush approved that?...Trying to strengthen relations with allies, homeland security experts said there is no threat, most interested in helping big global corporations, mishandling many big issues, not paying enough attention to homeland security.

Subpopulation: Asked of Form D half sample

29% Trying to strengthen relations with allies
17 Homeland security experts said there is no threat
16 Most interested in helping big global corporations
16 Mishandling many big issues
12 Not paying enough attention to homeland security
3 Other (Vol.)
7 Don't know/Refused

Question: Now I am going to read you two different viewpoints on America’s national security and after I read them please tell me which statement comes closest to your own opinion....The Democrat says, the President (George W. Bush) is asleep at the switch. He is more concerned with the needs of global corporations than he is with American security and needs. President Bush defended turning over operations of American ports to a United Arab Emirates company and has failed to strengthen homeland security. He went to India and said the outsourcing of American jobs is good for both economies. And the Bush administration has stopped imposing penalties on American companies that employ illegal immigrants. The Democrat says, it’s time to put America’s security first. Or The Republican says that in a world after September 11th (2001, the date of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon), President (George W.) Bush is right in saying we must build close relations with countries that support us in the war on terror and we must compete globally in the new economy that is driven by technology. If we fail to recognize the global technological nature of the new economy, countries like China and India will leave us behind. The economy is changing and we need to cut regulations and improve education to keep America the best place to create jobs. The Republican says we must work with other countries to win the war on terror and strengthen our economy. Which statement comes closer to your own point of view, the Democratic statement or the Republican statement? (If Democrat/Republican, ask:) Is that the Democratic/Republican statement strongly or somewhat?

Subpopulation: Asked of Form E half sample

40% Democrat strongly
12 Democrat not so strongly
9 Republican not so strongly
33 Republican strongly
6 Less likely
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Question: Now I am going to read you two different viewpoints on America's national security and after I read them please tell me which statement comes closest to your own opinion....The Democrat says, the President (George W. Bush) is asleep at the switch. He is more concerned with the needs of global corporations than he is with American security and needs. President Bush defended turning over operations of American ports to a United Arab Emirates company and has failed to strengthen homeland security. He went to India and said the outsourcing of American jobs is good for both economies. And the Bush administration has stopped imposing penalties on American companies that employ illegal immigrants. The Democrat says, it's time to put America's security first. Or The Republican says that we are independent of President Bush on important issues like the ports deal, outsourcing of jobs, and illegal immigration. It was wrong to turn the security of the ports over to a company from Dubai and the Republicans voted to stop it. We also need to cut regulations to make it easier to keep jobs in America, and we need much stronger laws against illegal immigrants to protect our national security. The Republican says the best way to protect America's security is to protect our ports and borders from people who may do us harm. Which statement comes closer to your own point of view, the Democratic statement or the Republican statement? (IF Democratic/Republican, ask:) Is the Democratic/Republican view strongly or somewhat?

Subpopulation: Asked of Form F half sample

39% Democrat strongly  
12 Democrat not so strongly  
12 Republican not so strongly  
31 Republican strongly  
7 less likely

Question: Now I am going to read you two different viewpoints on America's port security and after I read them please tell me which statement comes closest to your own opinion....The Democrat says, it is good for America's security that the recent ports deal fell through, but there is still much more that needs to be done to secure our ports. Currently less than 6 percent of the containers entering our ports are inspected and more than 30 percent of our port terminals are owned by foreign companies. In order to protect Americans, we need to expand our container inspection and implement much stricter security measures at our ports and borders. Or The Republican says, we were opposed to President (George W.) Bush's decision to approve the ports deal and thanks to our hard fought efforts, a company from the United Arab Emirates will no longer be taking over control of US (United States) ports. While stopping this deal was a major success, we recognize that more needs to be done and will work to ensure that all future transactions involving our ports are in the best interest of America's national security. Which statement comes closer to your own point of view, the Democratic statement of the Republican statement? (If Democratic/Republican, ask:) Is that Democratic/Republican statement strongly or not so strongly?

Subpopulation: Asked of Form C half sample

47% Democrat strongly  
16 Democrat not so strongly  
10 Republican not so strongly  
20 Republican strongly  
7 Less likely
Appendix 1. Poll Entries for United Arab Emirates
Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut (Search date: 10/26/2007)

Methodology: Conducted by Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research/Public Opinon Strategies, March 12, 2006-March 14, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national likely voters sample of 800. National likely voters are registered voters who voted in the 2004 presidential election/weren't registered/ineligible/too young to vote and said they are probably or almost certain to vote in the 2006 election.

FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll [March, 2006]

Question: A company owned by the United Arab Emirates has agreed to give up a deal to run some ports in the United States. Do you think the United States is safer today because an Arab country is not running some U.S. ports, or less safe because a relationship with an ally may be damaged?

44% Safer
33  Less safe
23  Don't know

Methodology: Conducted by Opinion Dynamics, March 14, 2006-March 15, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national registered voters sample of 900.

Democracy Corps Poll [August, 2006]

Question: Let me read some things a Democratic candidate for Congress says about the Republican record on national security. For each one, please tell me if that statement, if accurate, raises very serious doubts, serious doubts, minor doubts or no real doubts in your own mind about the Republican record on national security.)...Republicans put the interests of big business ahead of our national security. They tried to sell six major American ports to a company owned by the United Arab Emirates, and gave millions in no-bid contracts to Halliburton, even as they blocked a pay raise for our soldiers in Iraq.

Subpopulation: Asked of Form A half sample

27% Very serious doubts
29  Serious doubts
18  Minor doubts
22  No real doubts
5    Don't know/Refused

Methodology: Conducted by Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, August 23, 2006-August 27, 2006 and based on telephone interviews with a national likely voters sample of 1000. National likely voters are registered voters who voted in the 2004 presidential election/weren't registered/ineligible/too young to vote, and they said they are probably or almost certain to vote in the 2006 election.
Table 1. Support for DP World Purchase by Attention to DP World Sale (Gallup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for Port Sale</th>
<th>Question: How closely have you been following the news about the proposed sale of cargo operations at several major U.S. seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not closely at all</td>
<td>Not too closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>N 19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 19.0%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>N 19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 19.0%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>N 54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 54.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N 100</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question asked immediately following question on news about the proposed sale.

Gamma= -.22; Approx. Sig. = .00

Table 2. Support for DP World Purchase by Attention to DP World Sale, Simplified (Gallup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for Port Sale</th>
<th>Question: How closely have you been following the news about the proposed sale of cargo operations at several major U.S. seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not closely at all</td>
<td>Not too closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>N 38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 38.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>N 54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 54.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>N 8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 8.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N 100</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question asked immediately following question on news about the proposed sale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: In politics, as of today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, or an Independent?</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: As of today, do you lean more to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans and Independents Leaning Republican</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents not leaning</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats and Independents Leaning Democratic</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president?</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Which comes closer to your view about Arab and Muslim countries that are allies of the United States?</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. should trust them less than its other allies</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. should trust them the same as any other ally</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: What is the last grade or class that you completed in school?</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate or Less</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Approval of U.S. Government Allowing DP World Purchase (Pew)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval of Government Allowing Sale</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all closely</td>
<td>Not too closely</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*March 8-9 wording: The possibility that an Arab-owned company might be allowed to run U.S. ports.

**March 8-9 wording: As you may know, a company from the United Arab Emirates has made a deal to run six shipping ports in the United States. Do you…

Gamma= -.15; Approx. Sig. = .00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: In politics, as of today, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate or Less</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question: What is the last grade or class that you completed in school?**
Table 6. Knowledge about DP World Purchase by Attention (Pew)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions: Do you happen to know if these ports are currently operated by an American company or a foreign country? (right: foreign); Do you happen to know if this Arab company would or would not have been in charge of security at the ports? (right: would not); Do you happen to know if President Bush favored or opposed allowing this Arab company to run these shipping ports? (right: favored).</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Not at all closely</td>
<td>Not too closely</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Fairly closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = .56; Approx. Sig. = .00
Chart 1. Opposition to Port Deal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll</th>
<th>Percent Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS News Feb. 22-26</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Feb. 25-Mar. 1</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallup/CNN/USA Today Feb. 28-Mar. 1</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Feb. 28-Mar. 1</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC/Washington Post Mar. 2-5</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Models National Brand Mar. 4-5</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pew News Interest Poll Mar. 8-12</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC/Wall Street Journal Mar 10-13</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2. Attention to Port Story

Gallup/CNN/USA Today Feb. 28-Mar. 1

Pew News Interest Poll Mar. 8-12
Chart 3. Attitude Toward Sale by Attention

Gallup: Do you favor or oppose this proposed sale (of cargo operations at several major U.S. Seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates)?

Pew: Would you approve or disapprove of the government allowing this company to operate U.S. ports?
Chart 4. Attitude by Attention by Party

Gallup: Do you favor or oppose this proposed sale (of cargo operations at several major U.S. Seaports to a company from the United Arab Emirates)?

Pew: Would you approve or disapprove of the government allowing this company to operate U.S. ports?
Chart 5. Knowledge about Sale by Attention
Chart 6. Knowledge about Sale by Attention and by Party
Chart 7. Disapproval of Port Sale by Knowledge and by Party
Chart 8. Approval of Countries

Question: Do you think the federal government should--or should not--allow companies from each of the following countries to own cargo operations at U.S. Seaports (Rotated) (Gallup)

- Great Britain: 70.5%
- France: 45.4%
- China: 31.3%
- Arab Countries Friendly to U.S.: 39.5%