

Evaluation of Intelligent Design Poll of Lab Scientists and NM Universities
Marshall Berman
August 11, 2003

The following abbreviations are used:

- IDnet-NM: refers to statements made by Joe Renick, Executive Director of IDnet-NM in a public release sent to all members of the New Mexico State Board of Education.
- Zogby: refers to responses from Zogby International to questions asked by the American Institute of Physics regarding the IDnet-NM surveys.
- MB: refers to analyses of the survey, and information gathered by Marshall Berman in polling scientists from Sandia National Laboratories, Los Alamos National Laboratory, the University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, and New Mexico Tech

Poll of National Labs and Universities

- IDnet-NM: “The scientific poll was based on the response to an online survey sent to approximately 16,000 employees of Sandia and Los Alamos National Labs and 500 science and engineering faculty members at the University of New Mexico, New Mexico Tech, and New Mexico State University.”
- MB: There are about 16,000 total employees at SNL and LANL, less than half of whom might be called scientists and engineers. IDnet-NM did **NOT** send the survey to all of the labs staff. Furthermore, treating all the employees as scientists (as they do later in their letter) would be false. And even if all the employees were surveyed – which they were not – the return rate would be an insignificant 1.4%.
- MB: Using the information available from two NM science organizations, I requested survey data from several hundred scientists at SNL, LANL, UNM, NMSU, and NMT. 61 direct responses were received and 81 indirect (from responders polling their own colleagues and peers). Of these 142 responses, 137 (96%) never received the ID poll. Not a single Sandia scientist or employee acknowledged **receiving** the survey. One LANL scientist received the e-mail survey and replied in opposition to ID; one other LANL engineer was said to have received the survey (indirect). Two people from NMSU and one from UNM said they received the survey and replied negatively. So of the five scientists who received the survey, all of them opposed ID. Yet IDnet-NM reports an ID approval rate of 76-79% for “NM scientists” and 45-61% for “NM Universities.”
- Zogby: “Here is the methodology information for the Intelligent Design survey work we have done: We were provided with an email file of addresses at the University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, and the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, plus emails for the Los Alamos and Sandia laboratories.”
- MB: So it is quite clear that IDnet-NM selected the people to be polled and provided those email addresses to Zogby. We have no information as to how those people were selected.
- Zogby: “Zogby International emailed an invitation to participate in an on-line survey by accessing a secure section of our website via passcode. During the period June 26-July 9, 2003 we received 402 completed surveys, giving a margin of error of +/-5%.”
- IDnet-NM: “Two-hundred forty-eight scientists responded as follows: 103 scientists at Sandia National Labs, 114 scientists at Los Alamos National Labs, and 31 at the universities.
- MB: 103+114+31 = 248 responses reported by IDnet-NM. Zogby says they received 402 surveys. What happened to the other 154 responses?

Poll Questions

- IDnet-NM: “Two questions were asked in each of the two New Mexico polls.
1. *Regarding teaching the theory of evolution, which of the following two statements comes closer to your own opinion? **Statement A:** Biology teachers should teach only Darwin's theory of evolution and the scientific evidence that supports it. **Statement B:** Biology teachers should teach Darwin's theory of evolution, but also the scientific evidence against it.*
 2. *Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement: "When Darwin's theory of evolution is taught in school, students should also be able to learn about the scientific evidence that points to an intelligent design of life."*
- MB: Neither question defines Intelligent Design as a theory, nor are capital letters used in the second question; but the answers are reported as though they referred to support for Intelligent Design – capitalized.
- Question 1: In the absence of any knowledge of what Intelligent Design means, or how the modern theory of evolution entails much more than Darwin understood in 1859, perhaps most people, including scientists, might be inclined to favor Statement B. Also, the question says “scientific evidence against it,” when no such **scientific** evidence has been provided by the ID advocates, nor does it exist.
- Question 2: Almost all religious people believe that the world was created by God, including many scientists, and most mainstream religions. A positive answer to Question 2 is likely to simply indicate the religious beliefs of the responders. In contrast, most mainstream religions see no problem in reconciling evolution with religion. Scientists may accept the idea of a "designer" as a matter of faith or belief, but faith and belief have no place in science in the absence of material evidence.

The representative of the American Institute of Physics concludes: “From my personal analysis of the data, and also the analysis by the AIP statistics office, the Zogby poll is worthless, primarily due to the low response rate. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the data correspond to the groups to whom they are attributed. On top of this, the questions are sufficiently ambiguous or leading that the interpretation given by IDnet is not appropriate.”

The conclusions stated by IDnet-NM are not supported by the poll, the poll is falsely portrayed, statistically insignificant, highly biased, and presents a completely false picture of the views of National Labs and university scientists.