**[Appendices for Jacobs/Mettler]**

**Appendix A. Panel Study**

The US Public Policy Study now includes three waves, collected in September and October of 2010, 2012, and 2014, respectively. Each wave consisted of a telephone survey of approximately 22 minutes in which respondents were asked the identical questions. The survey has been sponsored by and funded equally by Cornell University (in part with a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Investigator Award) and the University of Minnesota.

The third wave survey was conducted in English by Abt SRBI, New York, NY, with assistance with data collection from Directions in Research, San Diego, CA. The majority of completed interviews were panel cases that were interviewed in previous waves. In total, 79% (828 out of 1054) of cases sampled that completed the 2012 interview (many of whom had also taken part in 2010) completed Wave 3, and 39% (132 out of 340) of cases sampled that completed only the 2010 interview completed the Wave 3 interview. Overall, 69% (960 out of 1394) of panelists from prior waves sampled completed the Wave 3 interview. More importantly for the purposes of analysis in this paper, the actual number of people who completed both waves 1 and 3 is 792, 66% of the original participants, and it is this group that is used for multivariate analyses. A total of 660 people completed all three waves (55% of the original group), and we use them in analyses elsewhere.

In 2014, the survey was in the field from September 8, 2014 to November 3, 2014, using a 40 call design contacting respondents on both landlines and cell phones as provided by the respondent during their original 2010 baseline or 2012 follow up survey. Contact information was confirmed or updated by utilizing Accurint services, a product of LexisNexis Risk Solutions and TargetSmart. In order to maximize the response rate a series of letters and monetary incentives were used as a means of follow up communication and remuneration.

First, a pre-notification letter was sent which included a $2 bill and a post-incentive offer that matched the post incentive amount paid during the 2012 interview. For respondents who did not complete the 2012 interview, a post incentive of $10 was offered in the pre-notification letter. Next, a non-contact or refusal letter with a $20 post incentive offer was sent to non-respondents who had not been contacted or refused to take the survey. Finally, an end game letter was sent to non-responders with a post incentive offer of $100.

**Appendix B. Structural Equation Models for Figures 1 and 2**

**Impact on Access and Overall Evaluations of the Health Reform Bill**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Independent Variables (all 2014 unless otherwise noted)* | **Direct effects on the assessment of the ACA’s impact on Access** | **Direct effects on the overall evaluation of the health care bill** | **Indirect effects on the overall evaluation of the health care bill** | **Total effects on the overall evaluation of the health care bill** |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Effect of health care law on US as a whole | .06 | .46\*\* | .01 | .46\*\* |
| View of ACA Impact on coverage of subsidies to help pay for insurance, for self and family | .3\*\* | -.08+ | .03+ | -.06 |
| View of ACA Impact on help to seniors to pay for prescription drugs, for self and family | .06+ | .01 | .01 | .02 |
| **Insurance Conditiona** |  |  |  |  |
| Uninsured in 2010, insured in 2014 | .06 | 0 | .01 | 0 |
| Insured in 2010 and uninsured in 2014 | -.00 | -.05\* | 0 | -.05\* |
| Uninsured in both 2010 and 2014 | -.09\* | -.12\* | -.01+ | -.13\*\* |
| Party Identification  (Coded toward Strong Democrat) | .02 | .18\*\* | .03 | .18\*\* |
| Trust in Government | -.03 | .1\*\* | .01 | .1\*\* |
| View of ACA Impact on Access to Health Insurance or Medical Care 2014 (Coded toward more impact) |  | .09\* | 0 | .09\* |
| Lagged Effect of 2010 View of ACA Impact on Access to Health Insurance or Medical Care (Coded toward more impact) | .16\* | 0 | .01+ | .01 |
| Lagged Effect of 2010 Evaluation of the Health Reform Bill (Coded toward favorable) | .02 | .22\*\* | 0 | .22\*\* |
| Gender (higher value is assigned to female) | .05 | 0 | 0 | .01 |
| Race (non-white) | -.02 | .08+ | 0 | .08 |
| Income (less than 35,000 annually) | .04 | -.01 | 0 | -.0 |
| Year of birth (younger) | -.07 | -.05 | -.01 | -.06 |
| Education (higher) | -.11+ | .05 | -.01 | .04 |
| Political Knowledge (higher) | -.04 | .01 | 0 | .01 |
| Constant |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 792 |  |  |  |
| Adjusted R2 | .78 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| +p<.10, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01.  Results obtained using structural equation modeling based on maximum likelihood estimation, with standardized coefficients. ACA Support is a 9-point interval variable, while Impact of Increased Access is a 5-point ordinal variable. All variables measured in 2014 unless otherwise noted. Exact question wording is in the Appendix. Note: The sum of direct effects and indirect effects do not equal total effects in all cases due to rounding errors.  Source: US Public Policy Study, Wave 1-3.  **a** The excluded reference category is insured in 2010 and 2014. |

**Effect of ACA on Taxes Respondent Pays and Overall Evaluations of the Health Reform Bill**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Independent Variables (all 2014 unless otherwise noted)* | **Direct effects on perceptions of taxes R pays** | **Direct effects on the overall evaluation of the health care bill** | **Indirect effects on the overall evaluation of the health care bill** | **Total effects on the overall evaluation of the health care bill** |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Effect of health care law on US as a whole | .18\* | .46\*\* | .01 | .47\*\* |
| View of ACA Impact on coverage of subsidies to help pay for insurance, for self and family | -.07 | -.05 | 0 | -.05 |
| View of ACA Impact on help to seniors to pay for prescription drugs, for self and family | .01 | .02 | 0 | .02 |
| **Insurance Conditiona** |  |  |  |  |
| Uninsured in 2010, insured in 2014 | -.02 | .01 | 0 | .01 |
| Insured in 2010 and uninsured in 2014 | -.03 | -.05\* | 0 | -.05\* |
| Uninsured in both 2010 and 2014 | .05 | -.13\*\* | 0 | -.13\*\* |
| Party Identification  (Coded toward Strong Democrat) | .16\* | .17\*\* | .01 | .18\*\* |
| Trust in Government | .17\*\* | .09\*\* | .01 | .1\*\* |
| View of ACA Impact on Taxes R Pays 2014 (Coded toward no impact or decreased) |  | -.05 | 0 | -.05 |
| Lagged Effect of 2010 View of ACA Impact on Taxes R Pays (Coded toward no impact or decreased) | .21\*\* | -.02 | .01 | -.01 |
| Lagged Effect of 2010 Evaluation of the Health Reform Bill (Coded toward favorable) | .02 | .22\*\* | 0 | .22\*\* |
| Gender (higher value is assigned to female) | -.03 | .01 | 0 | .01 |
| Race (non-white) | -.02 | .08+ | 0 | .08+ |
| Income (less than 35,000 annually) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Year of birth (younger) | -.05 | -.06 | 0 | -.06 |
| Education (higher) | -.03 | .04 | 0 | .04 |
| Political Knowledge (higher) | .17\*\* | 0 | .01 | .01 |
| Constant |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 792 |  |  |  |
| Adjusted R2 | .73 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| +p<.10, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01.  Results obtained using structural equation modeling based on maximum likelihood estimation, with standardized coefficients. ACA Support is a 9-point interval variable, while Effect of New Health Law on Taxes R Pays is a 3-point ordinal variable. All variables measured in 2014 unless otherwise noted. Exact question wording is in the Appendix. Note: The sum of direct effects and indirect effects do not equal total effects in all cases due to rounding errors.  Source: US Public Policy Study, Wave 1-3.  **a** The excluded reference category is insured in 2010 and 2014. |