



The grave of Harriet Tubman at Fort Hill Cemetery in Auburn, New York. Tubman's second husband was Nelson Davis, a Civil War veteran, also buried in the cemetery.

## The 2012 *Underground Railroad Free Press* Survey of the International Underground Railroad Community

Commissioned and reported by  
*Underground Railroad Free Press*

June 2012



## Contents

I. Summary of Survey Results .....	3
II. Background of the 2012 Underground Railroad Survey	
Survey Population and Sample .....	3
Sub-Samples.....	4
Administration of the Survey .....	4
III. Resulting Degrees of Confidence in This Survey	
Reduction of Error Through the Sampling Fraction.....	4
Random Error in Survey Statistics .....	4
Confidence Intervals For Survey Statistics .....	4
IV. Survey Results	
Format of Presentation of Responses.....	5
Comparisons of 2007 Through 2012 Survey Results.....	5
Panel A- The Underground Railroad Community's Knowledge and Status .....	6
Panel B- Environment of the Underground Railroad Community .....	7
Panel C- Your Opinions on <i>Underground Railroad Free Press</i> .....	8
Panel D- <i>Free Press</i> Readership.....	11
Panel E- Contemporary Underground Railroad Institutions .....	12
Panel F- Underground Railroad Community Demographics .....	14
Appendices	
Appendix One- Survey Welcome and Thank You .....	16
Appendix Two- Results from Questions 8 and 9 .....	17
Appendix Three- Interpreting Survey Results.....	20
Appendix Four- Reduction of Sampling Error Through the Sampling Fraction .....	22

## I. Summary of Survey Results

The 2012 Survey of the International Underground Railroad Community reveals continued recovery of Underground Railroad organizations from the Great Recession. In 2012, more organizations have become involved in Underground Railroad work, most new ones without a budget yet. The median annual budget of responding organizations, while still modest, nearly doubled from 2011 to the highest recorded in four surveys. Five of every six Underground Railroad organizations report growth or stability in annual revenues.

The 2012 survey saw a jump in the professional seniority of respondents with many more CEOs participating in the survey, and a significant increase in the general public doing so. Year to year, the *Free Press* surveys are also trending westward and southward in the makeup of respondents. All three of these changes are probably attributable to the changing composition of *Free Press* subscribers and readers as readership grows and spreads geographically and beyond the core Underground Railroad community to the general public. Constant since 2007 are the international Underground Railroad community's self-rating of Underground Railroad knowledge and its experience visiting Underground Railroad sites.

Respondents' mean familiarity with the eleven most prominent Underground Railroad institutions is barely 4 on a one-to-ten scale, with no organization having a mean familiarity above 7.3. All mentioned Underground Railroad organizations but *Free Press*, the National Park Service Network to Freedom and York University's Tubman Center (new to the survey) fell in familiarity from 2011 to 2012. Respondents evaluate the effectiveness of the same institutions in promoting and building awareness of contemporary Underground Railroad matters as middling overall, with a mean rating of 5.4 on the ten-point scale. The only two rated as above average in effectiveness were *Underground Railroad Free Press* and the Network to Freedom. However, in part these lower ratings are due to the heavy influx since the 2011 survey of new *Free Press* readers, many of whom are in effect just being introduced to the Underground Railroad and its community.

As *Free Press* readership grows, proportions reading all or most issues has dropped from 83 percent in 2010 to 67 percent in 2012. More than two in every five survey respondents forward *Free Press* to at least one other person, with some forwarding to over a thousand. This has boosted readership beyond 60,000 per issue.

We thank 2012 survey respondents for the highest ratings ever received by *Free Press* on all seven *Free Press* rating questions. We are also gratified with respondents' prospective use of our recently launched *Free Press* Books.

## II. Background of the 2012 Underground Railroad Survey

### Survey Population and Sample

All of the nearly 3,500 individuals and organizations on the *Underground Railroad Free Press* subscriber list as of May, 2012, were invited by email to participate in the survey. *Free Press*'s email list comprises a very broad international cross-section of Underground Railroad site owners, descendants, elected and appointed officials and their staff, other public-sector employees, Underground Railroad program executives, employees and volunteers, researchers, writers, enthusiasts and many others not directly involved but interested in the Underground Railroad.

With survey invitees consisting mainly of those with a special interest in the Underground Railroad, the *Free Press* surveys are not surveys of the public but of an affinity group especially interested in Underground Railroad matters and should be regarded as such when interpreting results. For example, more than three-fourths of this survey's respondents have visited an Underground Railroad site, a proportion bound to be far higher than for the general population.

The 2012 survey was announced to *Free Press* readers by an advance notice in the May 15, 2012, issue of *Underground Railroad Free Press*. The invitation to participate in the 2012 Under-

ground Railroad Survey was emailed on May 30, 2012, and followed up by reinvitation on June 7. The resulting sample size was 201. Subscribers receiving the email invitations to take the survey were invited to ask others to participate with the resulting sample including 25 non-subscribers.

### Sub-Samples

Survey results were not disaggregated into sub-samples in the 2012 survey.

### Administration of the Survey

The survey was administered by a 33-question instrument at the web site of *Underground Railroad Free Press's* online survey administration vendor, SurveyMonkey.com, from May 30 to June 15, 2012. Survey data were analyzed by proprietary survey analysis software provided by *Free Press's* survey research vendor, Michael Strategic Analysis, and customized for this survey. Data were further analyzed through personal inspection by a well-qualified statistical analyst. There were no difficulties encountered in collecting, tabulating, analyzing or reporting survey data.

## III. Resulting Degrees of Confidence in This Survey

### Reduction of Error Through the Sampling Fraction

When a significant fraction of a population is sampled, random error from sampling is reduced. In the extreme, when an entire population is sampled, i. e., when a census is taken, random error is reduced to zero. In the 2012 Underground Railroad Survey, error was reduced in this fashion in by 2.8 percent. Please see the appendices for a discussion of error reduction from this effect.

### Random Error in Survey Statistics

Taking into account the reduction in random error because of this survey's sampling fraction, worst-case random error for survey proportions in which the entire sample responded is  $\pm 6.7$  percent. Random error is greater for questions to which the full sample did not respond. Random error levels in this survey may generally be regarded as comfortable in interpreting survey results.

### Confidence Intervals For Survey Statistics

#### For Proportions

---

Comparisons of confidence intervals for proportions in the 2011 survey involving the full sample are shown as follows. The largest possibility for error involving proportions occurs when a proportion is 50 percent, for example if, in a yes-or-no question, half answered yes, half no.

If the proportion of respondents answering a question a certain way is:	Then the 99% confidence interval for this proportion is:	And the 95% confidence interval for this proportion is:
5%	1.1% to 8.9%	2.1% to 7.9%
50%	41.2% to 58.8%	43.3% to 56.7%

#### Using Proportions in The Survey

Generally, proportions from the survey may be used with reasonable confidence and taken at face value. Comparisons of proportions across two questions in the survey can be made with less confidence and should be more cautiously interpreted.

#### For Means

---

The confidence interval for a mean depends on the variance of the data from which the mean was calculated, that is, how scattered the data were about their mean. Most questions in the present survey involve proportions but some involve means from the one-to-ten Likert Scale used for ratings or from other measures.

The minimum random error for any question involving a mean in this survey is from question 19 asking respondents for their overall rating of *Free Press* as an Underground Railroad news publi-

ation. With 95-percent confidence, the resulting mean was  $8.80 \pm 0.26$  rating points on the one-to-ten Likert Scale used, a range from 8.54 to 9.06. In other words, we can be 95-percent confident that the true rating is not less than 8.54 nor higher than 9.06, a narrow range permitting high confidence in the measured mean rating.

The maximum random error for any question involving a mean in this survey is from question 28 asking how effective respondents believe the University of Louisville's Underground Railroad Institute is in promoting and building awareness of the Underground Railroad. Here we have a 95-percent confidence interval of  $3.91 \pm 0.76$  on the one-to-ten Likert Scale, a range from 3.15 to 4.67. Here, we can be 95-percent confident that the true one-to-ten-scale rating of effectiveness of this program is not less than 3.15 nor more than 4.67, a range, even though the broadest, which provides a fairly confident mean.

Using Means in The Survey

Means from this survey may be used with reasonable confidence and usually taken at face value though with caution in some cases. The same caveats as apply for proportions generally apply for means from the survey.

IV. Survey Results

Survey questions as asked online are shown verbatim in *italics* below.

Format of Presentation of Responses

For Frequency Distributions

For questions whose responses result in frequency distributions of proportions, summary statistics are presented as proportions in the following format.

	<u>Proportion</u>
Answer Choice 1	%
— — —	%
Answer Choice n	%

For Measures of Central Tendency

For questions whose responses result in the three measures of central tendency — the mean, median and mode — summary statistics are presented in the following format. See the appendices here for a refresher on mean, median, mode and other statistical interpretations.

	<u>Measure</u>
Mean	n.n
Median	n
Mode	n

How to Interpret Ratings From a One-to-Ten Likert Scale

The following interpretation of a one-to-ten Likert Scale may be used to interpret survey ratings using this scale. "Average" appears twice since mean and median of a one-to-ten scale are 5.5.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Meaning</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
10	Highest possible	5	Average
9	Very high	4	Below average
8	High	3	Low
7	Above average	2	Very low
6	Average	1	Lowest possible

Comparisons of 2007 Through 2012 Survey Results

Several questions in the 2012 survey were carried forward from previous surveys permitting year-



to-year tracking and trend analysis. In such instances below, results and trends are provided for the six years in which these surveys have been conducted.

**Panel A- The Underground Railroad Community's Knowledge and Status**

**Question 1**

*For purposes of useful year-to-year tracking of trends, some questions are repeated in Underground Railroad Free Press surveys each year as are this and the next several questions. On the one-to-ten scale following, where one is unaware and ten is expert knowledge, how would you rate your overall knowledge of the Underground Railroad? In this and following questions, if you are not familiar with the topic of a question, please mark "Unfamiliar" rather than skipping the question.*

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Mean	6.9	6.6	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.4
Median	7	7	7	7	7	7
Mode	8	8	7	7	7	7

**Question 2**

*Please check as many as three of the following which you regard as your primary recent sources of information on the Underground Railroad.*

Note: In surveys through 2010, respondents had only one answer choice to this question. Since 2010 they made as many choices as desired. Therefore columns in the following table total to 100 percent previous to 2011 but greater than 100 percent since 2011. This change permits knowing what proportion of respondents use a particular source whether or not it is their primary source.

Source	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Books on the Underground Railroad	58.7%	68.1%	24.3%	24.2%	25.0%	24.4%
<i>Underground Railroad Free Press</i>	56.6%	35.6%	17.9%	14.8%	13.6%	13.0%
Academic Underground Railroad publications	54.6%	56.9%	20.4%	19.7%	20.4%	20.2%
Internet searches	42.3%	46.3%	20.4%	17.7%	18.6%	17.6%
Network to Freedom <i>Conductor</i> newsletter	10.7%	7.9%	4.0%	7.4%	4.7%	6.5%
Underground Railroad Freedom Center e-newsletter	8.2%	8.3%	4.0%	3.4%	4.7%	1.5%
Other [Respondents entered a response]	25.0%	38.9%	8.2%	10.8%	11.4%	11.5%

"Other" responses above included, in rank order, respondents' own research, newspapers, primary Underground Railroad sources, local individuals and historians, and museums.

**Market Shares of Underground Railroad News Publications**

On a day-to-day basis, respondents use books, *Free Press*, academic publications, and the Internet most often as sources of information on the Underground Railroad, especially true of researchers, writers and university faculty. Among the three news publications above regularly operating in 2012, frequency distributions of their readership normalized to include just these three publications are as follows. Below, the index for a publication other than *Underground Railroad Free Press* indicates a publication's readership as a fraction of *Underground Railroad Free Press* readership.

Publisher	2012		2011		2010		2009		2008		2007	
	Market Share	Index	Market Share	Index	Market Share	Index	Market Share	Index	Market Share	Index	Market Share	Index
Free Press	75.0%	100	66.9%	100	67.0%	100	53.6%	100	55.0%	100	49.2%	100
Network to Freedom	14.2%	19	14.8%	22	14.8%	22	26.8%	50	18.9%	34	24.6%	50
Freedom Center	10.9%	15	15.6%	23	14.8%	22	12.4%	23	5.8%	11	5.7%	12

**Question 3**

*Have you ever visited an Underground Railroad safe-house or route?*

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Yes	78.4%	82.2%	82.3%	83.5%	76.3%	73.6%
No	21.6%	17.8%	17.7%	16.5%	23.7%	26.4%

**Question 4**

*Other than pleasure or professional reading, how long have you been actively involved with Underground Railroad matters? [Answer choices were in five-year spans starting with 1-5 years.]*

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Mean	13.2 years	11.9 years	12.5 years	12.0 years	11.5 years	10.7 years
Median	9.8 years	7.4 years	7.9 years	7.2 years	8.0 years	7.0 years
Mode	1-5 years	6-10 years	6-10 years	1-5 years	6-10 years	1-5 years

**Summary On Underground Railroad Knowledge and Status**

The international Underground Railroad community's self-rating of Underground Railroad knowledge and its experience visiting Underground Railroad sites has held very constant since 2007.

**Panel B- Environment of the Underground Railroad Community**

**Question 5**

*Are you directly involved with an Underground Railroad site, organization or program? If you are involved as a volunteer, answer yes here.*

Yes .....	46.1%
No .....	53.9%

**Question 6**

*In which of the following ranges is your Underground Railroad organization's or site's current annual budget? If your organization or site has both operating expenditures and capital expenditures, include both.*

Budget	2012	2011	2010	2009
No budget	56.3%	42.7%	56.7%	33.9%
Up to \$10,000	14.1%	15.6%	7.8%	25.4%
\$10,001 to \$25,000	7.0%	11.5%	5.6%	6.8%
\$25,001 to \$50,000	3.9%	4.2%	6.7%	8.5%
\$50,001 to \$100,000	3.9%	14.6%	5.6%	10.2%
\$100,001 to \$250,000	4.7%	6.3%	11.1%	5.1%
\$250,001 to \$500,000	4.7%	4.2%	3.3%	0.0%
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
More than \$1,000,000	3.1%	1.0%	3.3%	6.8%

  

	2012	2011	2010	2009
Mean	\$17,266	\$21,094	\$6,333	\$9,434
Median	\$8,881	\$4,679	\$0	\$6,060
Mode	No budget	No budget	No budget	No budget

Signups at Lynx over the past year or so have been mostly newer organizations. In some measure this explains why a higher proportion of responding organizations in the 2012 survey indicate not having a budget, and the lower mean budget in 2012. The higher 2012 median budget indicates that those with budgets had higher budgets in 2012 than in 2011 on the whole.

### Question 7

Which of the following best describes the change in your Underground Railroad organization's revenues from 2010 to last year?

Growth Rate	2012	2011	2010	2009
Strong growth	1.8%	3.2%	1.4%	7.4%
Modest growth	18.2%	28.4%	4.3%	22.2%
Neither growing nor declining	62.7%	54.7%	44.3%	44.4%
Modest decline	11.8%	10.5%	35.7%	11.1%
Steeper decline	5.5%	3.2%	14.3%	14.8%

### Question 8

If you could recommend only one Underground Railroad safe-house or route for others to visit, which site would it be?

See below.

### Question 9

In a keyword or two, what would you say is special about the site you chose in the question above?

Responses to questions 8 and 9 are summarized together in Appendix Two of this report. The list there offers a nice choice of Underground Railroad sites to visit.

### Summary on the Underground Railroad Environment

The 2012 survey reveals continued recovery of Underground Railroad organizations from the Great Recession. In 2012, there are more organizations involved in Underground Railroad work. Their median annual budget, while still in a modest four figures, nearly doubled from 2011 to the highest level recorded in four surveys. Five of every six report stability or growth in annual revenues.

### Panel C- Your Opinions on Underground Railroad Free Press

#### Question 10

We very much value your opinions on Underground Railroad Free Press and its programs to help us improve both. We would like your opinion on these. The first is Lynx, a free comprehensive international listing of contemporary Underground Railroad organizations which serves as the central registry of Underground Railroad organizations. Lynx now lists over 120 Underground Railroad organizations at the Free Press web site at [urrFreePress.com](http://urrFreePress.com). On a one-to-ten scale where one is least important and ten is most, how important do you believe it is to the international Underground Railroad community to have a central registry?

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Mean	9.0	8.2	6.6	8.0	8.2
Median	10	9	6.5 <sup>1</sup>	9	8.5
Mode	10	10	5	9	10

#### Question 11

If you would like your or some other organization listed on Lynx, please provide the name, web address and brief description of the organization in the box below.

<sup>1</sup> A median ending in .5 may occur when there is an even number of responses with as many at one rating and above as at the next lower rating and below. Here, for example, there were 73 ratings of 7 or above, and 73 of 6 or below yielding the median of 6.5 even though 6.5 was not an answer choice.



The 35 organizations submitted not already listed at Lynx were added to Lynx at the *Free Press* website bringing the total number of listed Underground Railroad organizations to over 130. One of the new listings is the Tula Museum in Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles.

#### Question 12

*Free Press also operates Datebook, a free comprehensive international calendar of events of Underground Railroad organizations at [urrFreePress.com](http://urrFreePress.com). On a one-to-ten scale where one is least important and ten is most, how important do you believe it is to the international Underground Railroad community to have a central event calendar?*

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Mean	8.7	8.2	6.6	8.0	8.2
Median	9	9	6.5	9	8.5
Mode	10	10	5	9	10

#### Question 13

*If you would like your or some other organization's upcoming event listed at Datebook, please provide the name of the sponsoring organization, an event description, venue, dates and contact email address in the box below.*

The 11 submitted events were added to Datebook at the *Free Press* website.

#### Question 14

*Free Press awards annual prizes for leadership, preservation and advancement of knowledge to deserving individuals and organizations in the international Underground Railroad community, the community's top honors. (To submit a nomination for one of the prizes, visit the *Free Press* web site.) On a one-to-ten scale where one is least important and ten is most, how important do you believe it is to the international Underground Railroad community to award annual prizes for outstanding Underground Railroad work?*

	2012	2011	2010
Mean	8.3	7.9	8.1
Median	9	8	8
Mode	10	10	10

#### Question 15

*In 2012, Underground Railroad Free Press launched *Free Press Books*, a new publishing arm which provides a more viable outlet than offered by other publishers for authors of books and shorter publications on the Underground Railroad and related topics. Which of the following probability ranges do you feel is how likely you are or your organization is to explore publication through *Free Press Books* in the next five years?*

Probability	Frequency
0%	17.2%
1-20%	21.6%
21-40%	14.2%
41-60%	18.7%
61-80%	9.7%
81-99%	9.7%
100%	9.0%
Mean	49.4%
Median	35.8%
Mode	1-20%

**Question 16**

Where one is worst and ten is best, please provide a rating of the overall relevance of topics reported in Underground Railroad Free Press.

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Mean	8.5	8.1	7.8	7.3	7.7
Median	9	8	8	8	8
Mode	9	9	8	8	10

**Question 17**

Where one is worst and ten is best, please provide a rating of how well topics are reported in Underground Railroad Free Press.

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Mean	8.6	8.0	7.8	7.4	7.5
Median	9	8	8	8	8
Mode	9	9	8	9	10

**Question 18**

Most Free Press articles are brief summaries of a third of a page pointing the reader to websites or print publications with more information on the topic. Our longer articles run up to a full page or more. Generally speaking, which would you rather see in Free Press?

Short articles pointing to more information .....	54.3%
Longer articles providing a digest of a topic .....	32.1%
Lengthier articles fully covering a topic.....	13.6%

**Question 19**

Where one is worst and ten is best, please provide an overall rating of Underground Railroad Free Press as a news publication.

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Mean	8.8	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.1	7.8
Median	9	8	8	8	8	8
Mode	9	10	8	8	8	10

**Question 20**

Where one is worst and ten is best, please provide an overall rating of Underground Railroad Free Press in terms of the usefulness of its programs to the international Underground Railroad community. Programs include the Free Press Prizes, Lynx, Datebook, the annual surveys, archives, advertising and advocacy.

	2012	2011	2010
Mean	8.4	8.0	7.8
Median	9	8	8
Mode	9	10	9

**Question 21**

In a few words, what would you suggest be changed or added to Free Press programs to improve their usefulness to the international Underground Railroad community?

Only one in five respondents answered this question. Of the 39 who did, 21 recommended that Free Press be kept as is. Other recommendations included expanding content of the newsletter, Free Press promotion of youth programs, helping sites owners verify them and get grants to do site work, and use of online social media to promote Underground Railroad Free Press.

**Question 22**

*In a few words, what would you suggest be changed or added to the Free Press newsletter to improve it?*

Of 41 responses, 19 recommended that *Free Press* be kept as is. Other recommendations included more short articles, more long articles, more in-depth articles, more breaking news, first-hand reports on site visits, live hyperlinks in the newsletter, and easier ways to publicize for advertisers. One respondent suggestion was implemented with the next *Free Press* issue in July 2012: revamping the format of the publication.

**Question 23**

*If there are officials, colleagues, family members, friends or others who you would like to receive Underground Railroad Free Press, please enter their email addresses in the box below and we will be sure that they begin receiving Underground Railroad Free Press with the current issue.*

The many email addresses provided have been added to the *Underground Railroad Free Press* subscription list. We are grateful to survey participants for providing these and helping *Free Press* to reach a broader audience.

**Summary of Opinions on Underground Railroad Free Press**

We thank 2012 survey respondents for the highest ratings ever received by *Free Press* on all seven *Free Press* rating questions which scored a range of mean ratings from 8.3 to 8.8, and six of seven modal ratings of 10. We were also gratified with the prospective use of our recently launched *Free Press* Books.

**Panel D- Free Press Readership**

**Question 24**

*Underground Railroad Free Press is distributed bimonthly by email notice containing a link to the current issue. Have you ever received an email notice announcing an issue of Free Press?*

	2012	2011	2010
Yes	83.0%	63.3%	79.7%
No	17.0%	36.7%	20.3%

The invitation to take the survey was sent only to subscribers. Respondents who are not subscribers were invited by subscribers to take the survey and comprise those who have not received announcements of new issues of *Free Press*.

**Question 25**

*If you receive email notices when new issues of Underground Railroad Free Press are published or if someone forwards the notices to you, please answer this question. How often do you read Underground Railroad Free Press?*

Reading Frequency	2012	2011	2010
Each issue	37.0%	43.6%	60.7%
Most issues	30.4%	35.0%	23.0%
About half the time	18.1%	11.1%	11.5%
Once in a while	10.1%	10.3%	4.9%
Never	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%

**Question 26**

*Free Press readers often let colleagues, friends, family or others know when a new Free Press issue becomes available or readers often forward the Free Press email notice to others. Nonsubscribers might be notified by having an issue forwarded to them by email, provided to them in print or*

being provided the Internet link to the issue. Which of the following choices is your best estimate of how many others you notify when *Underground Railroad Free Press* issues become available or to whom you distribute *Free Press* or email the link to the latest issue?

	2012	2011	2010
Mean	41.7	34.8	71.7
Median	1	1	2
Mode	0	0	0

Of the 2012 survey's 201 respondents, 87, or 43 percent, say that they forward *Free Press* issues to at least one other person. There are two subscribers just from 2012 survey respondents who report that they each invite 1,000 or more others to read *Free Press*. Another six invite between 100 and 999 with each issue. (Whoever you are, we very much thank you!) The 87 respondents who forward issues do so to an approximate total of 3,600 other readers for the mean of 41 above. On a *pro rata* basis over *Free Press*'s 3,485 subscribers, this translates to approximately 63,000 total readers as of June 2012 assuming the same forwarding behavior among nonrespondents as respondents. Of the total of estimated readers, six percent are subscribers, the rest those who subscribers invite to read *Free Press*. In other words, about 18 people read each "copy" on the average. What has not been estimated yet is how many non-subscriber readers then invite others to read *Free Press*. Some do, so readership could actually be somewhere in excess of 63,000.

**Summary on Underground Railroad Free Press Readership**

As readership broadens to the general public, proportions of readers reading each issue or most issues has dropped from 83 percent in 2010 to 67 percent in 2012. More than two of five survey respondents forward *Free Press* to at least one other person, with some forwarding to over a thousand. This boosts readership to over 60,000 per issue.

**Panel E- Contemporary Underground Railroad Institutions**

**Question 27**

Where one is least and ten is most, how familiar would you say you are with the following modern Underground Railroad institutions?

	Annual Mean Ratings						2011-12 Change
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	
<i>Underground Railroad Free Press</i>	7.3	7.2	7.4	5.8	4.7	4.4	~
National Park Service Network to Freedom	6.7	7.0	6.4	7.0	5.8	6.3	~
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center	5.7	6.5	5.4	4.3	4.7	4.5	↓
Smithsonian Museum of African-American History and Culture	4.6	5.3	3.7	3.7	x	x	↓
Yale University's Gilder-Lehrman Center	3.7	5.3	4.1	3.3	NR	NR	↓
The Menare Foundation	3.3	4.7	3.4	3.3	3.2	2.7	↓
Google's MapMuse Underground Railroad map	3.2	4.1	3.2	3.0	2.6	2.7	↓
Swarthmore College's Friends Historical Library	3.1	4.9	3.0	3.2	NR	NR	↓
York University's Tubman Center	3.0	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	~
US Department of Education Underground Railroad program	3.0	4.7	3.1	NR	NR	NR	↓
University of Louisville's Underground Railroad Institute	2.2	3.5	2.4	x	x	x	↓
Mean Familiarity	4.2	5.3	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.8	↓

**Legend**

NR = not rated in a given year

x = organization did not exist in a given year

~ = no statistically significant change in mean rating of familiarity from 2010 to 2011

## Question 28

That completes questions on your familiarity with today's Underground Railroad organizations. Now, please give us your ratings on the effectiveness of these same organizations. Where one is least and ten is most, how effective in promoting and building awareness of contemporary Underground Railroad matters would you say is each of the following Underground Railroad institutions?

Note: The wording of this question through 2011 asked respondents to rate the importance rather than the effectiveness of the institutions. This accounts for the across-the-board lower ratings in 2012. That is, respondents rate the institutions' effectiveness lower than their importance.

	Annual Mean Ratings					
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
<i>Underground Railroad Free Press</i>	7.5	8.0	8.4	7.6	7.1	6.6
National Park Service Network to Freedom	7.0	8.2	8.3	8.3	7.6	8.1
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center	6.4	8.0	8.0	7.2	7.0	6.4
Smithsonian Museum of African-American History and Culture	5.9	8.1	8.0	8.1	x	x
Yale University's Gilder-Lehrman Center	5.8	8.0	7.6	7.3	NR	NR
Google's MapMuse Underground Railroad map	5.1	7.6	6.6	6.9	6.1	6.5
US Department of Education Underground Railroad program	4.8	7.9	7.2	NR	NR	NR
York University's Tubman Center	4.6	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Swarthmore College's Friends Historical Library	4.5	7.4	6.7	7.0	NR	NR
The Menare Foundation	4.1	7.6	6.5	6.4	5.7	5.4
University of Louisville's Underground Railroad Institute	3.9	7.1	6.4	x	x	x
Mean Importance	5.4	7.8	7.4	7.3	6.5	6.5

	Annual Indexes					
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
<i>Underground Railroad Free Press</i>	100	95	100	92	93	81
National Park Service Network to Freedom	93	100	100	100	100	100
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center	85	95	99	87	92	79
Smithsonian Museum, African-American History and Culture	79	99	98	98	NR	NR
Yale University's Gilder-Lehrman Center	77	95	93	88	NR	NR
Google's MapMuse Underground Railroad map	68	91	86	83	80	80
US Department of Education Underground Railroad program	64	95	92	NR	NR	NR
York University's Tubman Center	61	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Swarthmore College's Friends Historical Library	60	90	86	84	NR	NR
The Menare Foundation	55	91	89	77	75	67
University of Louisville's Underground Railroad Institute	52	89	85	x	x	x
Mean Index	67	94	93	88	85	81

### Conclusions on Contemporary Underground Railroad Institutions

Mean familiarity with the eleven most prominent Underground Railroad institutions is barely 4 on the 10-point scale, with no organization having familiarity above 7.3. All mentioned Underground Railroad organizations but *Free Press*, the Network to Freedom and York University's Tubman Center (new to the survey) fell in familiarity from 2011 to 2012. Respondents evaluate the effectiveness of the same institutions in promoting and building awareness of contemporary Underground Railroad matters as middling overall, with a mean rating of 5.4. The only two rated as above average were *Underground Railroad Free Press* and the National Park Service's Network to Freedom.

## Panel F- Underground Railroad Community Demographics

### Question 29

The following demographic questions are important in being able to analyze how the knowledge, attitudes and practices of different groups of respondents might vary on issues regarding the Underground Railroad. Again, you are taking this survey anonymously. In which of the following categories is your age?

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Mean	56.9 years	56.8 years	56.6 years	53.8 years	52.2 years	48.3 years
Median	63.0 years	58.9 years	63.2 years	59.6 years	58.2 years	55.4 years
Mode	Sixties	Sixties	Sixties	Sixties	Fifties	Sixties

### Question 30

Which is your gender?

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Female	56.1%	60.4%	57.5%	59.3%	59.6%	60.0%
Male	43.9%	39.6%	42.5%	40.7%	40.4%	40.0%

### Question 31

Please indicate which of the following types of Underground Railroad involvement describe your involvement. If you are involved in more than one way, please check each way you are involved.

	2012	2011
1. Descendant of freedom seeker, conductor, safe-house operator or abolitionist	3.4%	7.0%
2. Elected public official	0.7%	0.6%
3. Staff of elected public official	0.0%	0.0%
4. Staff of other public official	0.7%	0.3%
5. Public-sector Underground Railroad program operator, employee or volunteer	2.8%	5.1%
6. Federal government employee but not 2, 3 or 4	2.1%	2.9%
7. State or local government employee but not 2, 3 or 4	6.9%	9.3%
8. Underground Railroad site owner or site operator	4.1%	3.5%
9. Private-sector program operator, employee or volunteer including nonprofits but not 7	14.5%	12.5%
10. Donor to Underground Railroad programs or employee or volunteer of donor	6.9%	13.1%
11. University or college faculty	11.0%	9.0%
12. Grade school, middle school or high school faculty	4.1%	3.8%
13. Writer or researcher	22.1%	20.5%
14. None of the above but interested in the Underground Railroad	20.7%	12.5%

The 2012 distribution of roles differs significantly from 2011's in that respondents uninvolved but interested in the Underground Railroad comprise nearly twice the proportion as in 2011.

In broader categories of involvement consolidated from above, we have the following distribution of roles in the international Underground Railroad community.

	2012	2011	2010	2009
Private-sector Underground Railroad involvement including donors	25.5%	29.0%	28.6%	31.3%
Writers and researchers	22.1%	20.5%	23.6%	17.4%
General public interested in the Underground Railroad	20.7%	12.5%	5.6%	19.8%
Educators	15.1%	12.8%	11.8%	4.6%
Public-sector involvement in the Underground Railroad	13.2%	18.3%	18.0%	19.2%
Descendants of Underground Railroad figures	3.4%	7.0%	12.4%	8.4%
Totals	100%	>100%	100%	100%



**Question 32**

Which one of the following occupational title levels best describes your primary position in employment whether or not your employment involves the Underground Railroad? If you are retired, please select the title which best describes the highest position which you occupied before retiring.

Title	2012	2011
CEO/Chairman/board of directors/Administrator/Executive Director/General Manager	28.0%	18.0%
Analyst/Accountant/Professional/Staff officer [but not corporate officer]	14.4%	19.5%
Supervisor/Coordinator	12.0%	16.5%
Manager	12.0%	15.0%
Associate or Assistant Director/Associate or Assistant Professor	12.0%	12.8%
Full Professor	9.6%	7.5%
COO/President/Vice President/ Associate or Assistant Administrator or General Manager	4.0%	3.8%
Clerical staff	3.2%	5.3%
CFO/Controller/Treasurer [not board director]/Staff-level director [not board director]	3.2%	0.0%
Student	1.6%	1.5%

The 2012 distribution of respondent titles has half again as many chief executive officers as 2011.

**Question 33**

In the box below, please type the Postal Service's two-letter abbreviation of the name of the state in which you work, for example, RI for Rhode Island. For respondents working outside the United States, please indicate your country of work. For retired respondents, please indicate your state or country of primary residence.

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
United States respondents	97.2%	97.6%	96.2%	97.5%	96.6%	99.0%
Canadian respondents	2.1%	1.8%	3.8%	2.5%	3.4%	1.0%
Respondents from other countries (Curaçao)	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

The distribution of respondents within the United States is:

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Northeast	41.6%	44.5%	42.1%	34.2%	46.1%	26.9%
Mid-Atlantic	21.9%	28.7%	32.9%	36.7%	31.5%	40.4%
Midwest	14.6%	9.8%	11.8%	19.0%	9.0%	8.7%
South	13.1%	7.9%	9.2%	7.6%	7.9%	19.2%
West	8.8%	6.7%	3.9%	2.5%	2.2%	4.8%

**Conclusions on Respondent Demographics**

The 2012 survey saw a jump in the professional seniority of respondents with many more CEOs taking the survey, and a significant increase in members of the general public. Year to year, the Free Press surveys are also trending westward and southward in the makeup of respondents. All three of these changes are probably attributable to the changing composition of Free Press subscribers and readers as readership grows and spreads geographically.

## Appendix One Survey Welcome and Thank You

### Part I- Welcome

Thank you for taking four or five minutes of your time to complete the 2012 *Underground Railroad Free Press* Survey which you are taking anonymously. Your input will be of great value to the international Underground Railroad community to which survey results will be provided by *Free Press* which sponsors these annual surveys. Your input will also help *Free Press* in shaping its future content and programs. You will be privy to full downloadable survey results when they are posted on our website in July. A summary of results will appear in the July issue of *Free Press*. Thank you again.

We are grateful to the chief executive officers and staff of several Underground Railroad organizations, and to *Free Press* subscribers who suggested useful questions which appear in the 2012 survey.

### Part II- The Survey

Part II consisted of the survey's questions shown in section IV of this report.

### Part III- Thank You

Thank you very much for taking your time to complete this survey. Results will be summarized in the July, 2012, issue of *Underground Railroad Free Press*, shown in downloadable detail on our website and provided in print to elected and appointed officials and the chief executive officers of major Underground Railroad organizations. Survey results will also be used to improve *Underground Railroad Free Press* and align its content and programs with suggestions offered by survey respondents.

## Appendix Two

## Results from Questions 8 and 9

Question 8	Question 9
Allegheny portage railroad	Recently discovered addition to Underground Railroad sites
Any and all	Learning history
Baltimore, Maryland to Buxton, Ontario	Authentic
Bucktown store, Maryland	History, animated narrator
Cartland House in Lee, New Hampshire	Documentation
Cassopolis, Michigan	My ancestors lived here in 19th century
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, Maryland	Discussion about whether or not it was used by escaping slaves
Christiana Underground Railroad Center, Pennsylvania	Best example of abolitionist's uprising
Church in Savannah, Georgia	The way slaves hid themselves in the church.
Cincinnati	Interactive
Clermont County, Ohio, Freedom Trail	Well organized
Columbia, Pennsylvania	Beautiful, historic crossroad.
Cooling Springs Farm, Maryland	Meaningful
Cooling Springs Farm, Maryland	Interesting family & in county I study
Cooling Springs Farm, Maryland	It's owned by a good friend
Darby, Pennsylvania	Hotbed of antislavery from mid 1700s
Dobbin House, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania	Authenticity
Downtown Brooklyn, New York	Location
Duffield Street, Weeksville, Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, New York	Interesting
Elmira, New York	Involvement with the Underground Railroad & Civil War
Emmanuel Parish Church, Cumberland, Maryland	It's mine!
Emmart Pierpont Safe House	When you hear the story you can feel the courage and determination of those in the Underground Railroad
Emmart-Pierpont Safe-house, Baltimore County, Maryland	The safe-house in Baltimore County has been unknown since the slavery era.
George and Rebecca Barnes Mansion, Syracuse, New York	Testament to Freedom
Gerrit Smith Estate National Historic Landmark	Dedication to education outreach and preserving historical heritage
Gerrit Smith Estate National Historic Landmark	Pivotal in regional and national significance
Gerrit Smith Estate National Historic Landmark	Enthusiasm of volunteers
Gerrit Smith Estate National Historic Landmark	Integrity of landscape and power of people who came.
Gerrit Smith Estate National Historic Landmark, New York	Gerrit Smith
Gettysburg area / McAllister Mills	Exceptional documentation & primary sources
Guilford County, North Carolina & Guilford College	Levi Coffin's birthplace
Harriet Tubman Byway, Maryland	The route and what you see on the route

Historic Blue Bell Inn on Cobbs Creek, Pennsylvania	Site of George Washington's personal investigations
Hudson-Champlain Corridor of New York and Vermont	Nearby
Indiana Freedom Trail	Only state Underground Railroad tour
Jermaine Loguen	King of Underground Railroad
John Brown House	Setting, interpretation, surprise
John Parker House in Ripley, Ohio	Born a slave to freedom warrior
John Parker House in Ripley, Ohio	Black agency
John Parker House in Ripley, Ohio	Authentic, vivid, real (especially if you've read his book)
John Rankin and John Parker homes in Ripley	Fantastic events happened both places
Johnson House, Germantown, Pennsylvania	Dedication of the staff
Lebanon, Delaware	Family connection
Levi Coffin house, Indiana	History
Levi Coffin house, Indiana	Authentic with a richly documented history
Levi Coffin house, Indiana	Much of the original furnishing including his buggy with hidden compartment under the floor
Levi Coffin house, Indiana	Historical importance of the Coffins
Lima, Pennsylvania	Near my hometown.
Maryland to Delaware route	
Maryland Underground Railroad sires	Heard about from the one who introduced me to <i>Free Press</i>
Maysville, Kentucky	Mr. Jerry Gore, and his knowledge, kindness and passion for his history
Maysville, Kentucky	In my home area
Maysville, Kentucky	The knowledge of Mr. Jerry Gore
Maysville, Kentucky	The site dates 1834
Maysville, Mason County, Kentucky	Tours of the area
Metropolitan AME. Church of Washington, D. C.	The center-city site
Meyers Residency in Albany, New York	Developed by dedicated volunteers
Moncure Conway home, Stafford County, Virginia	Strong advocacy
Montgomery County, Maryland hike	You get to feel some of what it might have been like.
Montrose, Pennsylvania	Spirit
Most Southern Ontario sites	Nathaniel Dett Chapel, Niagara Falls, Canada
Nathan and Mary Johnson House	Frederick Douglass's first free home
National Park Service Network to Freedom Trail	Helps the public understand their resistance
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center	Excellent overview, good narratives
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center	National and local stories
National Underground Railroad Freedom Center	Enlightening
National Underground Railroad Museum, Maysville, Kentucky	Hands on, not political--just facts, director engages kids
New Castle Courthouse Museum, Delaware	Imprisonment of Hawkins family. Garrett & Hunn trial

Niagara Freedom Trail Niagara-on-the-Lake, Canada North Farmington, New York	Spectacular location Role of Canada, cluster of sites Well documented in the press at the time it was operating Location
North Star Underground Railroad Museum, Ausable Chasm, New York Owen Lovejoy House, Princeton, Illinois Parker Home, Ripley, Ohio	Verifiable It was the home of a daring black Underground Railroad conductor. Illustrates the interracial cooperation of the Underground Railroad Actual site Well preserved Close to Chicago so people can experience it Its place in history and its location Overlooking the Ohio River Potential to interpret Underground Railroad movement origins Well interpreted story Historical context and support network Route and Quaker involvement Near DC, strong push for preservation & heritage tourism
Parker House/Rankin House, Ripley, Ohio	Home of Lincoln's Secretary of State Achievement of freedom Unusual and documented site Its close proximity Accessible, appealing Represents regional Underground Railroad network in western New York Period building, décor Relatively unrecognized but historically significant
Peru, Indiana Plymouth Church, Brooklyn Heights, New York Princeton, Illinois	
Rankin House, Ripley, Ohio Ripley, Ohio Riverfront-Columbia, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania	
Rochester, New York Rochester, New York Sandy Spring, Maryland Sandy Spring, Maryland	
Seward House in Auburn, New York St. Catherines, Ontario Stephen and Harriet Myers House Albany, New York Stephen and Harriet Myers House Albany, New York Steven Keese Smith (Stafford/Perusse) home The 1816 Farmington, New York Meetinghouse Museum	
The Barnard House, Kennett Square, Pennsylvania The Gregory Parsons Inn, Troy, Pennsylvania	
The Harriet Tubman Byway in Dorchester and Caroline Counties, Maryland	It lays out the landscape of Tubman and other slaves of the Eastern Shore which hasn't changed a lot since Tubman's time. It is well documented.
The Harriet Tubman Byway in Dorchester and Caroline Counties, Maryland Thomas Garrett Toronto to Windsor, Canada Towns along US Route 68 in Ohio from Ripley, Ohio to Lake Erie Tubman home, Auburn, New York Tuoro synagogue W. E. B. Dubois Historical Landmark Western Ontario Wright house, Pennsylvania	Quaker preservation Underscores the Canadian involvement The role of FPOC Interesting place Actually inside a house of worship  Moving experience Location

## Appendix Three Interpreting Survey Results

### Margins of Error

Statistically, there are three general levels of accuracy attainable from surveys.

#### Small Samples

The least accurate sample is what is referred to as a small sample which involves samples of less than 30. Small-sample analysis requires looser tools of analysis, sacrifices flexibility through use of these tools and results in the least confident conclusions. Small-sample analysis was not used for this survey.

#### Large Samples

At sample sizes of 30 and beyond, different, less sacrificing statistical tools are used for analysis yielding less error and higher confidence in results. The 2011 survey sample is a large sample.

#### Optimal Samples

Generally, a total sample size of 384 is necessary for a survey in order to guarantee never more than five percent error in the worst case, no matter the proportion examined. The worst case for error for a sample proportion occurs for a sample proportion of fifty percent, error for other proportions being less.

### Measures of Central Tendency

We find it useful to refresh readers of survey reports on the three measures of central tendency of a series of data — the mean, the median and the mode. These three measures of central tendency are the most basic of summary statistics and among the most useful and most often used.

#### Mean

The mean is the same as an average and is the sum of the observations in a data series divided by the number of observations. For example, a basketball player's scoring average is calculated by adding all the points he or she has scored in a season and then dividing by the number of games played.

#### Median

The median is the middle observation of a ranked data series, and has as many observations above it as below it in the ranking. The median of the series 5, 50, 500, 5000, 50000 is 500 which has two observations on either side of it. The median of the series 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3 is 1 which has three observations on either side of it. A median can sometimes be expressed as a fractional number which was not an actual observed number in a data series, for example, 8.5. While respondents in a one-to-ten Likert Scale choice in this survey had no choice of a rating of 8.5, this value as a median could result when there were equally many responses with a rating of 8 or below as 9 or above.

#### The Mode

The mode of a data series is the observation that occurs most often in the series. In the second series above, the mode, is 1. The first series above has no mode as no one observation occurs most often. When data are categorized, the modal category is the one containing the highest number of observations. A bimodal distribution is one in which two observations tie for being most frequent.



### Caution In Using Pooled Results

For some questions in this survey, pooling of results could lead to misleading interpretations, masking otherwise well-defined results of different groups of respondents. The experiences of the groups, and therefore their respective knowledge, attitudes and practices, can vary significantly and attempting to draw conclusions based on their mix of different experiences might sometimes be unwarranted.

As an exaggerated example, if a survey were conducted in Ottawa and Miami on knowledge, attitudes and practices regarding snow blowers, pooling the two very different sets of results would not reflect the experiences of either group and would be utterly misleading in drawing any conclusions on snow blowers.

In the 2011 Underground Railroad Survey, differences between, for example, Underground Railroad researchers versus program operators or site owners could be blurred when their results are pooled, and pooled results might be misleading to the user if subjected to unsupported interpretations. Therefore, depending on the question, caution is urged in taking interpretations of pooled results too far.

## Appendix Four

### Reduction of Sampling Error Through the Sampling Fraction

Let  $n$  equal a sample size and  $N$  equal the size of the population from which the sample is drawn. When the sampling fraction,  $n/N$ , is more than five percent, random sampling error begins to be appreciably reduced and therefore a smaller sample size to insure no more than a given percentage error,  $e$ , becomes possible. Then, the Finite Population Multiplier, FPM, reduces the standard error of a sampling statistic such as a mean or proportion as follows:

$$\text{FPM} = \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}$$

$$\text{Error reduction} = 1 - \text{FPM}$$

For example, a survey of 105 of 1,655 property owners in a community for an agency of a state government involved the following population and sample sizes. In this case, random error from sampling was reduced as follows:

- ✚  $n = 105$
- ✚  $N = 1,655$
- ✚  $n/N = .063$

Thus, 6.3 percent of the population was sampled. While it is possible that the sample included more than one response from the same parcel, we still have 105 responses from 1,655 parcels.

Then, using the formula above, the finite population multiplier,  $\text{FPM} = .968$  and error is reduced by the complement of this, or 3.2 percent, not a very significant amount.

In another example, exactly half of the *Fortune* 500 companies responded to a survey. In this case,

- ✚  $n = 250$
- ✚  $N = 500$
- ✚  $n/N = .500$

and the finite population multiplier is  $.707$  leading to a 29.3 percent reduction in random error from sampling, an appreciable amount.