Appendices for

Rumors and Health Care Reform:
Experiments in Political Misinformation

Table of Contents

CONDITION 1 DEATH PANEL RUMOR ONLY

Health Care Reform: Will There Be Death Panels?

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that the bills contain provisions that would make it mandatory that "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform: Will There Be Death Panels?

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that the bills contain provisions that would make it mandatory that "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

However, a close examination of the bill by non-partisan organizations reveals that the controversial proposals are not death panels at all. They are nothing more than a provision that allows Medicare to pay for voluntary counseling.

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the provision. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care. John Rother, executive vice president of AARP, the seniors' lobby, repeatedly has declared the "death panel" rumors false.

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that the bills contain provisions that would make it mandatory that "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

However, a close examination of the bill by non-partisan organizations reveals that the controversial proposals are not death panels at all. They are nothing more than a provision that allows Medicare to pay for voluntary counseling.

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the provision. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care. John Rother, executive vice president of AARP, the seniors' lobby, repeatedly has declared the "death panel" rumors false.

The new provision is similar to a proposal in the last Congress to cover an end-of-life planning consultation. That bill was co-sponsored by three Republicans, including John Isakson, a Republican Senator from Georgia.

Speaking about the end of life provisions, Senator Isakson has said, "It's voluntary. Every state in America has an end of life directive or durable power of attorney provision… someone said Sarah

Palin's web site had talked about the House bill having death panels on it where people would be euthanized. How someone could take an end of life directive or a living will as that is nuts."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that the bills contain provisions that would make it mandatory that "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

However, a close examination of the bill by non-partisan organizations reveals that the controversial proposals are not death panels at all. They are nothing more than a provision that allows Medicare to pay for voluntary counseling.

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the provision. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care. John Rother, executive vice president of AARP, the seniors' lobby, repeatedly has declared the "death panel" rumors false.

The Democratic Congressman who wrote the now-famous provision in the House health care bill has responded as well.

Speaking about the end of life provisions, Democrat Earl Blumenauer of Georgia has said the measure "would merely allow Medicare to pay doctors for voluntary counseling sessions that address

6

end-of-life issues…[the existence of death panels is] a blatant lie, and everybody who has checked it agrees."

APPENDIX B: FULL RESULTS MAY 2010 SSI STUDY

TABLE B1:

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON DEATH PANEL RUMOR BELIEF, MAY 2010

Full Sample

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	43%	46%	54%	56%	55%
Accept Rumor	24	24	17	20	17
Not Sure	34	30	29	25	28
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=1,593; $\chi^2(8)$=21.20 Pr=0.01

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.600).
   b. Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.012), Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.003), and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.007).
   c. Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.055).
   d. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.043), and from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.048).
   e. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.356), or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.901)
   f. Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.605).

Attentive Sample

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	47%	46%	57%	63%	56%
Accept Rumor	21	21	16	14	18
Not Sure	33	34	28	22	26
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=874; $\chi^2(8)$=15.54 Pr=0.05

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.981), Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.170), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.190).

    b.   Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.006).

    c.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.147) or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.156).

    d.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.006).

    e.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.392), or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.836).

    f.   Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.378).

TABLE B3:

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF BY PARTISANSHIP, MAY 2010

<u>Attentive Sample</u>
Democrats

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	68%	67%	68%	85%	78%
Accept Rumor	5	5	7	3	10
Not Sure	28	28	25	13	12
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=367; $\chi^2(8)$=14.42 Pr=0.07

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

 a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.997) or from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.746).
 b. Control is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.051).
 c. Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.042).
 d. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (0.775).
 e. Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.059) and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.052).
 f. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is marginally statistically distinguishable from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.060)
 g. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.138)
 h. Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.231).

Republicans

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	50%	25%	39%	61%	49%
Accept Rumor	22	33	28	27	19
Not Sure	28	42	33	12	32
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=334; $\chi^2(8)$=24.32 Pr=0.002

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

 a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.431) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.799).
 b. Control is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.056).
 c. Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.020).
 d. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (0.326).
 e. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.000) and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.018).
 f. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is statistically significantly diffferent from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.006)
 g. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.348)

h.   Rumor + Republican Correction is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.012).

TABLE B4:
EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON DEATH PANEL RUMOR BELIEF BY PARTISANSHIP, MAY 2010

<u>Attentive Sample</u>

Democrats

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	72%	70%	74%	86%	67%
Accept Rumor	9	5	5	1	8
Not Sure	18	25	21	13	25
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=366; $\chi^2(8)$=10.40 Pr=0.238

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.404), Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.490), from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.627).

    b.   Control is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.058).

    c.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (0.858) or Rumor + Democratic Correction (0.705).

    d.   Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.089).

    e.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.178) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.536).

    f.   Rumor + Republican Correction is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.024).

Republicans

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	24%	20%	33%	44%	44%
Accept Rumor	36	44	33	27	24
Not Sure	40	36	33	29	32
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=334; $\chi^2(8)$=16.32 Pr=0.038

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.685), Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.458).

    b.   Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.033) and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.030).

    c.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.259).

    d.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.014) and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.009).

    e.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.452) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.375).

    f.   Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.908).

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON HEALTH CARE POLICY OPINION, MAY 2010

Full Sample

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Support	49%	42%	43%	46%	43%
Oppose	51	58	57	54	57
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=1596; $\chi^2(4)$=4.00 Pr=0.406

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.090).

    b.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.150), Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.437), and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.124).

    c.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.800), Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.364), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.881).

    d.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.512) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.919).

    e.   Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.450).

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON DEATH PANEL RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME, MAY 2010

Wave 1

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	51%	43%	58%	63%	58%
Accept Rumor	19	22	16	13	18
Not Sure	30	34	26	23	24
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=696; $\chi^2(8)=13.33$ Pr=0.10

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.436), Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.500), Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.113), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.426).

    b.   Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.057).

    c.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.005), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.048).

    d.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.663) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.797).

    e.   Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.552).

Wave 2

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Reject Rumor	56%	45%	58%	58%	58%
Accept Rumor	18	20	16	21	22
Not Sure	25	35	26	21	20
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=696; $\chi^2(8)=12.54$ Pr=0.13

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.124), Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.911), Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.632), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.479).

    b.   Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.100).

    c.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.021), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.013).

    d.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.480) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.332).

    e.   Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.963).

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON HEALTH CARE POLICY OPINION OVER TIME, MAY 2010

Wave 1

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Support	52%	38%	43%	49%	39%
Oppose	48	62	57	51	61
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=696; $\chi^2(4)$=9.03 Pr=0.06

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.015) and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.024).

    b.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.106) or Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.559).

    c.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.384), or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.793).

    d.   Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.063).

    e.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.307) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.527).

    f.   Rumor + Republican Correction is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.097).

Wave 2

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correction	Rumor+ Republican Correction	Rumor+ Democratic Correction
Support	54%	40%	41%	46%	38%
Oppose	46	60	59	54	62
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=696; $\chi^2(4)$=9.12 Pr=0.06

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Control is statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.024), Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.027) and Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.009).

    b.   Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.195).

    c.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction (p=0.906), Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.316) or Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.797).

    d.   Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Republican Correction (p=0.362) or from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.698).

    e.   Rumor + Republican Correction is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Democratic Correction (p=0.193).

TABLE B8:
EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME, MAY 2010, WAVE 1
(TABLE 3)

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correct	Rumor+ Rep	Rumor+ Dem
Rumor Only	0.054				
Rumor + Correction	0.99	0.057			
Rumor + Rep	0.069	0.000	0.072		
Rumor +Dem	0.185	0.004	0.188	0.435	

Note: Each cell entry contains a p-value from a chi-squared test of pairwise comparisons between two of the five experimental conditions. Each test compares the distribution of responses for the experimental condition listed in the row against the experimental condition in the corresponding column.

	Control	Rumor Only	Rumor+ Correct	Rumor+ Rep	Rumor+ Dem
Rumor Only	0.064				
Rumor + Correction	0.598	0.401			
Rumor + Rep	0.583	0.043	0.395		
Rumor +Dem	0.127	0.087	0.240	0.486	

Note: Each cell entry contains a p-value from a chi-squared test of pairwise comparisons between two of the five experimental conditions. Each test compares the distribution of responses for the experimental condition listed in the row against the experimental condition in the corresponding column.

A Note on Tables B10(1) and B10(2)

For each difference-in-difference regression in Tables B10(1) and B10(2), I first subsetted the data to two treatment conditions, a condition for which I wished to estimate the interaction effect, and a reference condition. These two conditions are defined in the varying column titles. The treatment of interest was coded into a variable Treatment (varying actual names, as given in the rows of the tables), taking a value of 1 if the individual was in the condition of interest, and 0 if in the control condition.

I then generated a dummy variable "Wave" which was equal to 0 if the observation was in the first wave of the survey, and 1 if in the second wave. This gives a "long panel", where each observation occupies two rows: one for the initial wave and one for the follow-up wave. The outcome variable for each row was thus the response to the Euthanasia rumor question in either the first or second wave. Of course, Treatment does not vary across the waves.

I then generated an interaction variable, defined as Wave*Treatment, and implemented a simple difference in differences regression as:

$$\text{Euthanasia}\_i = a + B1*\text{Treatment}\_i + B2*\text{Wave}\_i + B3*\text{Wave}\_i*\text{Treatment}\_i + e\_i$$

With standard errors clustered by individual.

The purpose of this model is to explore how the effect of Treatment varies over time; that is, how does the effect of treatment change between the initial measurement and the wave 2 measurement. As such, the coefficient of interest is specifically B3, which captures the interaction between treatment effect and time/wave. If B3 were equal to precisely zero, then there would be no differential treatment effect over time. In other words, if B3 is zero, treatment effects are constant over time. While the coefficients are rarely statistically significant (though they are close to conventional levels, being just above 0.1 in most cases), the coefficients tend to be negative, and quite far from zero. This suggests that the effect of treatment attenuates in the second wave, consistent with the pairwise correlations.

TABLE B10 (1):
DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES REGRESSIONS FOR CHANGE OVER TIME IN EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF

	Control v. Rumor Only	Control v. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction	Control v. Rumor + Republican Correction	Control v. Democratic Correction
Rumor Only	-0.103**			
	(0.0449)			
wave	-0.00403	0.0429*	0.0536*	0.0536*
	(0.0278)	(0.0235)	(0.0316)	(0.0324)
Rumor Only *Wave	0.00403			
	(0.0386)			
Rumor + Correction		0.000862		
		(0.0424)		
Rumor + Correction *Wave		-0.0429		
		(0.0357)		
Rumor + Republican			0.0437	
			(0.0430)	
Rumor + Republican *Wave			-0.0536	
			(0.0414)	
Rumor + Democratic				-0.0170
				(0.0446)
Rumor + Democratic *Wave				-0.0536
				(0.0420)
Constant	0.379***	0.275***	0.232***	0.293***
	(0.0336)	(0.0302)	(0.0310)	(0.0333)
Observations	538	570	570	570
R-squared	0.019	0.003	0.003	0.006

Clustered Standard Errors in Parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES REGRESSIONS FOR CHANGE OVER TIME IN EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF

	Rumor Only v. Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction	Rumor Only v. Rumor + Republican Correction	Rumor Only v. Rumor + Democratic Correction	Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction vs. Rumor + Republican Correction	Rumor + Nonpartisan Correction vs. Rumor + Democratic Correction	Rumor + Republican Correction v. Rumor + Democratic Correction
Rumor Only						
Wave	0.0429*	0.0536*	0.0536*	0.0536*	0.0536*	0.0536*
	(0.0235)	(0.0316)	(0.0324)	(0.0316)	(0.0324)	(0.0324)
Rumor Only *Wave						
Rumor + Correction	0.104**					
	(0.0451)					
Rumor + Correction *Wave	-0.0469					
	(0.0364)					
Rumor + Republican		0.147***		0.0429		
		(0.0457)		(0.0433)		
Rumor + Republican *Wave		-0.0576		-0.0107		
		(0.0420)		(0.0394)		
Rumor + Democratic			0.0862*		-0.0179	-0.0607
			(0.0473)		(0.0449)	(0.0455)
Rumor + Democratic *Wave			-0.0576		-0.0107	0
			(0.0427)		(0.0400)	(0.0452)
Constant	0.275***	0.232***	0.293***	0.232***	0.293***	0.293***
	(0.0302)	(0.0310)	(0.0333)	(0.0310)	(0.0333)	(0.0333)
Observations	528	528	528	560	560	560
R-squared	0.014	0.027	0.008	0.007	0.005	0.011

Clustered Standard Errors in Parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

APPENDIX C: SCREENER QUESTION WORDING

Screener 1
Before we proceed, we have a question about how you're feeling.

Recent research on decision making shows that choices are affected by context. Differences in how people feel, their previous knowledge and experiment, and their environment can affect choices. To help us understand how people make decisions, we are interested in information about you. Specifically, we are interested in whether you actually take the time to read the directions: if not, some results may not tell us very much about decision making in the real world. To show that you have read the instructions, please ignore the question about how you are feeling and instead check only the "none of the above" option as your answer. Thank you very much.

Please check all words that describe how you are currently feeling.

Interested
Distressed
Excited
Upset
Strong
Guilty
Scared
Hostile
Enthusiastic
Proud
Irritable
Alert
Ashamed
Inspired
Nervous
Determined
Attentive
Jittery
Active
Afraid
None of the above

Screener 2
We would like to get a sense of your general preferences.

Most modern theories of decision making recognize that decisions do not take place in a vacuum. Individual preferences and knowledge, along with situational variables can greatly impact the decision process. To demonstrate that you've read this much, just go ahead and select both red and green among the alternatives below, no matter what your favorite color is. Yes, ignore the question and below and select both of those options.

What is your favorite color?
White
Black
Red
Pink
Green
Blue

Death Panel Rumor
Do you think the changes to the health care system have that have been enacted by Congress and the Obama administration create "death panels" which have the authority to determine whether or not a gravely ill or injured person should receive health care based on their "level of productivity in society?"
Yes
No
Not sure

Euthanasia Rumor
Do you think the changes to the health care system have that have been enacted by Congress and the Obama administration require elderly patients to meet with government officials to discuss "end of life" options including euthanasia?
Yes
No
Not sure

Support for Health Care Reform
Overall, given what you know about them, would you say you support or oppose the changes to the health care system that have been enacted by Congress and the Obama administration?
Support
Oppose

APPENDIX D: JULY 2010 YOUGOV RESULTS

Study Description: The treatments were identical to those used in Experiment 2 (though in the July 2010 experiment, I had a control condition). In addition to the corrective strategy treatment, I had a two condition timing treatment that varied when the rumor and policy support questions were asked. Excluding the control condition (where respondents were asked the questions as part of the initial survey), half the respondents answered the questions immediately following the experimental treatments, and the other half were not asked the questions during the first survey, but were recontacted several days after the experiment and given the rumor and policy items. I introduced the timing condition to directly test the expectations regarding fluency from the Schwarz work; my hypothesis was that respondents in the rumor and correction condition would be less likely than respondents in the correction only condition to reject the rumor and this gap would grow over time.

In the Appendix, I present the results from this study. As expected, the "correction only" condition yielded the highest level of rumor rejection. Moreover, the "rumor only" and "rumor and correction" conditions yield very similar levels of rumor rejection. Replicating Schwarz's counterintuitive findings, directly contradicting the rumor head-on is a less effective strategy than simply stating the truth. However, contrary to my expectations, the rates of rumor rejection in the "rumor and correction" condition did not fall over time (at least not for the full sample). On the other hand, disaggregating the data by partisanship yields results more in line with my expectations. It appears that the treatments worked in similar ways for both Democrats and Republicans when rumor rejection was measured immediately after the treatment. However, among Republicans the rates of rumor acceptance in the "rumor and correction" condition did increase over time, approaching the levels in the "rumor only" condition.

CONDITION 1 DEATH PANEL RUMOR ONLY

Health Care Reform: Will There Be Death Panels?

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that the bills contain provisions that would make it mandatory that "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform: Will There Be Death Panels?

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the bills. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care.

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

The new provision is similar to a proposal in the last Congress to cover an end-of-life planning consultation. That bill was co-sponsored by three Republicans, including John Isakson, a Republican Senator from Georgia.

Speaking about the end of life provisions, Senator Isakson has said, "It's voluntary. Every state in America has an end of life directive or durable power of attorney provision… someone said Sarah Palin's web site had talked about the House bill having death panels on it where people would be euthanized. How someone could take an end of life directive or a living will as that is nuts."

CONDITION 3 DEATH PANEL RUMOR AND CORRECTION

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that the bills contain provisions that would make it mandatory that "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

However, a close examination of the bill by non-partisan organizations reveals that the controversial proposals are not death panels at all. They are nothing more than a provision that allows Medicare to pay for voluntary counseling.

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the bills. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care.

The new provision is similar to a proposal in the last Congress to cover an end-of-life planning consultation. That bill was co-sponsored by three Republicans, including John Isakson, a Republican Senator from Georgia.

Speaking about the end of life provisions, Senator Isakson has said, "It's voluntary. Every state in America has an end of life directive or durable power of attorney provision… someone said Sarah

Palin's web site had talked about the House bill having death panels on it where people would be euthanized. How someone could take an end of life directive or a living will as that is nuts."

TABLE D1:
EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF, JULY 2010

Immediate Post Test

	Control	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Reject Rumor	47%	43%	56%	47%
Accept Rumor	27	32	20	31
Not Sure	26	25	24	22
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=1,249; $\chi^2(6)=8.160$ Pr=0.227

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
  a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.465), Correction Only (p=0.109), or Rumor + Correction (p=0.523).
  b. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.042).
  c. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.806).
  d. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.102).

Delayed Post Test

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Reject Rumor	41%	57%	51%
Accept Rumor	30	19	32
Not Sure	29	24	17
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=450; $\chi^2(6)=16.274$ Pr=0.012

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
  a. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.011) and Rumor + Correction (p=0.028).
  b. Correction Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (0.021).

TABLE D2:
EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON HEALTH CARE POLICY OPINION, JULY 2010

Immediate Post Test

	Control	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Support	47%	47%	52%	44%
Oppose	53	53	48	56
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=1249; $\chi^2(6)$=15.26 Pr=0.004

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who support or oppose the ACA. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.979), Correction Only (p=0.285), or Rumor + Correction (p=0.407).
   b. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.421) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.506).
   c. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.144).

Delayed Post Test

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Support	43%	53%	53%
Oppose	57	47	47
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=450; $\chi^2(8)$=4.00 Pr=0.135

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents support or oppose the ACA. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.083) and Rumor + Correction (p=0.083).
   b. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.990).

TABLE D3:

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF BY PARTISANSHIP, JULY 2010

Immediate Post Test
Democrats

	Control	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Reject Rumor	68%	63%	75%	71%
Accept Rumor	10	11	13	12
Not Sure	22	25	13	17
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=568; $\chi^2(6)$=5.249 Pr=0.512

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.736), Correction Only (p=0.176), or Rumor + Correction (p=0.567).

    b. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.156) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.487).

    c. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.783).

Republicans

	Control	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Reject Rumor	28%	23%	38%	27%
Accept Rumor	45	56	30	49
Not Sure	27	21	32	24
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=510; $\chi^2(6)$=9.461 Pr=0.149

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a. Control is marginally statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.077).

    b. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.269) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.829).

    c. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.013).

    d. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.719).

    e. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.101).

Delayed Post Test
Democrats

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Reject Rumor	62%	74%	73%
Accept Rumor	14	8	12
Not Sure	24	18	15
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=220; $\chi^2(6)$=3.62 Pr=0.459

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
    a.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.295) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.328).
    b.   Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.678).

Republicans

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Reject Rumor	13%	39%	25%
Accept Rumor	50	32	63
Not Sure	37	29	12
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=166; $\chi^2(6)$=19.439 Pr=0.001

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
    a.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.009) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.009).
    b.   Correction Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.003).

Immediate Post Test

Democrats

	Control	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Support	85%	87%	90%	85%
Oppose	15	13	10	15
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=568; $\chi^2(8)$=1.361 Pr=0.715

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.660), Correction Only (p=0.283), or Rumor + Correction (p=0.883).
   b. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.596) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.649).
   c. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.330).

Republicans

	Control	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Support	7%	6%	5%	5%
Oppose	93	94	95	95
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=510; $\chi^2(8)$=0.549 Pr=0.908

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Control is not statistically significantly different from Rumor Only (p=0.878), Correction Only (p=0.570), or Rumor + Correction (p=0.590).
   b. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.730) or Rumor + Correction (p=0.748).
   c. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.983).

Delayed Post Test

Democrats

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Support	78%	93%	84%
Oppose	22	7	16
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=220; $\chi^2(8)$=6.467 Pr=0.039

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who support or oppose the ACA. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.010).
   b. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.424).
   c. Correction Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.071).

Republicans

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Support	2%	8%	12%
Oppose	98	92	88
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=166; $\chi^2(8)$=3.688 Pr=0.158

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who support or oppose the ACA. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).
   a. Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.050).
   b. Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.144). Rumor + Correction (p=0.328).
   c. Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.532).

CONDITION 1 DEATH PANEL RUMOR ONLY

Health Care Reform: Will There Be Death Panels?

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that "Congress would make it mandatory — absolutely require — that every five years people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform: Will There Be Death Panels?

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

CONDITION 2 DEATH PANEL CORRECTION ONLY

Health Care Reform: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the bills. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care.

Health Care Reform: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

The new provision is similar to a proposal in the last Congress to cover an end-of-life planning consultation. That bill was co-sponsored by three Republicans, including John Isakson, a Republican Senator from Georgia.

Speaking about the end of life provisions, Senator Isakson has said, "It's voluntary. Every state in America has an end of life directive or durable power of attorney provision."

CONDITION 3 DEATH PANEL RUMOR AND CORRECTION

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

By JONATHAN G. PRATT
Published: November 15, 2009

WASHINGTON, DC – With health care reform in full swing, politicians and citizen groups are taking a close look at the provisions in the Affordable Health Care for America Act (H.R. 3962) and the accompanying Medicare Physician Payment Reform Act (H.R. 3961).

Discussion has focused on whether Congress intends to establish "death panels" to determine whether or not seniors can get access to end-of-life medical care. Some have speculated that these panels will force the elderly and ailing into accepting minimal end-of-life care to reduce health care costs. Concerns have been raised that hospitals will be forced to withhold treatments simply because they are costly, even if they extend the life of the patient. Now talking heads and politicians are getting into the act.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lieutenant Governor of New York State has warned that "Congress would make it mandatory — absolutely require — that every five years people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

Health Care Reform and Death Panels: Setting the Record Straight

(continued)

Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, chimed into the debate as well at a town-hall meeting, telling a questioner, "You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

However, a close examination of the bill by non-partisan organizations reveals that the controversial proposals are not death panels at all. They are nothing more than a provision that allows Medicare to pay for voluntary counseling.

The American Medical Association and the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization support the bills. For years, federal laws and policies have encouraged Americans to think ahead about end-of-life decisions.

The bills allow Medicare to pay doctors to provide information about living wills, pain medication, and hospice care.

The new provision is similar to a proposal in the last Congress to cover an end-of-life planning consultation. That bill was co-sponsored by three Republicans, including John Isakson, a Republican Senator from Georgia.

Speaking about the end of life provisions, Senator Isakson has said, "It's voluntary. Every state in America has an end of life directive or durable power of attorney provision."

APPENDIX F: OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2010 CCES LONG RECALL QUESTIONS

We are interested in learning what people can remember from what they read about politics. Think back to the article you just read.

A. Can you identify who said the following quote?

"You have every right to fear…[You] should not have a government-run plan to decide when to pull the plug on Grandma."

   1. Senator Chuck Grassley
   2. Betsy McCaughey
   3. Senator John Isakson
   4. Lou Dobbs

B. Can you identify who said the following quote?

The health care reform bill requires "people in Medicare have a required counseling session that will tell them how to end their life sooner."

   1. Senator Chuck Grassley
   2. Betsy McCaughey
   3. Senator John Isakson
   4. Lou Dobbs

TABLE G1:

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON DEATH PANEL RUMOR BELIEF, OCTOBER 2010

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor+ Correction
Reject Rumor	45%	52%	55%
Accept Rumor	35	28	23
Not Sure	20	20	22
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=1000; $\chi^2(4)$=13.56 Pr=0.01

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.126).

    b.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.001).

    c.   Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.281).

Wave 1

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor+ Correction
Reject Rumor	47%	53%	58%
Accept Rumor	33	27	22
Not Sure	20	20	20
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=837; $\chi^2(4)$=8.56 Pr=0.07

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Rumor Only is not statistically significantly different from Correction Only (0.240).
    b.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.013).
    c.   Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.484).

Wave 2

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor+ Correction
Reject Rumor	44%	54%	54%
Accept Rumor	35	30	27
Not Sure	21	17	19
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=834; $\chi^2(4)$=8.52 Pr=0.07

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (0.034).
    b.   Rumor Only is marginally statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.067).
    c.   Correction Only is not statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.762).

EFFECT OF RUMOR REHEARSAL ON DEATH PANEL RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2010

<u>Wave 1</u>

	Rumor Only		Rumor + Correction	
	Short Recall	Long Recall	Short Recall	Long Recall
Reject Rumor	53%	41%	61%	53%
Accept Rumor	30	36	19	26
Not Sure	17	23	20	21
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=288; $\chi^2(2)$=4.03 Pr=0.13   N=285 $\chi^2(2)$=1.37 Pr=0.31

<u>Wave 2</u>

	Rumor Only		Rumor + Correction	
	Short Recall	Long Recall	Short Recall	Long Recall
Reject Rumor	46%	41%	55%	54%
Accept Rumor	30	40	26	28
Not Sure	24	19	19	18
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=288; $\chi^2(2)$=3.18 Pr=0.20   N=285 $\chi^2(2)$=0.14 Pr=0.93

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON HEALTH CARE REFORM OPINION, OCTOBER 2010

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor+ Correction
Support	35%	48%	48%
Oppose	65	52	52
Total	100%	100%	100%

N=999; $\chi^2(4)$=14.08 Pr=0.00

Note: The top three rows present the percentage of respondents who reject, accept, or are unsure about each rumor. This is presented for each condition (represented by the column).

    a.   Rumor Only is statistically significantly different from Correction Only (p=0.001) and Rumor + Correction (p=0.001).

    b.   Correction Only is statistically significantly different from Rumor + Correction (p=0.003).

Death Panel

	Rumor Only		Rumor + Correction	
	Irrelevant Recall	Long Recall	Irrelevant Recall	Long Recall
Reject Rumor	50%	39%	59%	52%
Accept Rumor	33	38	21	24
Not Sure	17	23	20	24
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

$N=350; \chi^2(2)=4.60$ Pr=0.10 $\qquad$ $N=342 \chi^2(2)=1.74$ Pr=0.42

EFFECT OF RUMOR REHEARSAL ON HEALTH CARE REFORM OPINION, OCTOBER 2010

	Rumor Only		*Rumor + Correction*	
	Short Recall	Long Recall	Short Recall	Long Recall
Support	39%	32%	49%	46%
Oppose	61	68	51	54
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

N=350; $\chi^2(1)$=1.87 Pr=0.17   N=342 $\chi^2(1)$=0.42 Pr=0.52

EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF, OCTOBER 2010 (TABLE 4)

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Correction Only	0.169		
Rumor + Correction	0.003	0.297	

Note: Each cell entry contains a p-value from a chi-squared test of pairwise comparisons between two of the three experimental conditions. Each test compares the distribution of responses for the experimental condition listed in the row against the experimental condition in the corresponding column.

TABLE G8:
EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2010, WAVE 1 (TABLE 5)

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Correction Only	0.191		
Rumor + Correction	0.001	0.133	

Note: Each cell entry contains a p-value from a chi-squared test of pairwise comparisons between two of the 3 experimental conditions. Each test compares the distribution of responses for the experimental condition listed in the row against the experimental condition in the corresponding column.

TABLE G9:
EFFECT OF TREATMENTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2010, WAVE 2 (TABLE 5)

	Rumor Only	Correction Only	Rumor + Correction
Correction Only	0.219		
Rumor + Correction	0.150	0.733	

Note: Each cell entry contains a p-value from a chi-squared test of pairwise comparisons between two of the 3 experimental conditions. Each test compares the distribution of responses for the experimental condition listed in the row against the experimental condition in the corresponding column.

TABLE G10:
DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES OF EFFECTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2010, WAVE 2

	Rumor Only v. Correction Only	Rumor Only v. Rumor + Correction	Correction Only v. Rumor + Correction
Correction Only	0.0567		
	(0.0357)		
Wave	0.0257	0.0603**	0.0603**
	(0.0267)	(0.0244)	(0.0244)
Correction Only *Wave	-0.0261		
	(0.0356)		
Rumor + Correction		0.121***	0.0644*
		(0.0340)	(0.0347)
Rumor + Correction *Wave		-0.0606*	-0.0346
		(0.0339)	(0.0362)
Constant	0.342***	0.277***	0.277***
	(0.0257)	(0.0234)	(0.0234)
Observations	1,101	1,147	1,090
R-squared	0.003	0.015	0.007

Clustered Standard Errors in Parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

TABLE G11:

DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES OF EFFECTS ON EUTHANASIA RUMOR BELIEF OVER TIME FOR VARYING RECALL CONDITIONS, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2010, WAVE 2

	Rumor Only Condition	Rumor + Correction Condition
Long Recall	0.0905*	0.0254
	(0.0493)	(0.0468)
Wave	0.00959	0.0393
	(0.0318)	(0.0300)
Long Recall *Wave	-0.0197	0.0417
	(0.0471)	(0.0487)
Constant	0.352***	0.264***
	(0.0353)	(0.0331)
Observations	579	568
R-squared	0.009	0.010

Clustered Standard Errors in Parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

The exact instructions given to the coders are listed below. A single coder classified the 52 stories aired on the nightly newscasts from July 1 2009 until December 31, 2011 that mentioned the term "death panel/" (a full list of the networks and airdates is also listed below). A second coder classified a subset of the stories to check for inter-coder agreement. The two coders agreed on 72 percent of the classifications.

Coding Instructions

Please follow these procedures when coding the stories

1. <u>Find the term</u>: Use the "find" option in Word (Ctrl+F) to locate the phrase "death panel."

2. <u>Read the story</u>: Read the entire news story in which the phrase "death panel" is used, paying close attention to the passages in which this phrase appears as well as the surrounding passages. Note that oftentimes speakers will refer to death panels without explicitly using the phrase, or occasionally they'll use another phrase like "death boards."

3. <u>Highlight each mention of "death panel"</u>: Highlight the name of the speaker as well as the passage in which the speaker makes reference to death panels.

4. <u>Code each mention of "death panel" in a story</u>: You should highlight according to the color scheme below. Based on the highlighting of passages you do within each story, these stories will be sorted into one or more of the following categories: Rumor Only, Rumor and Democratic Correction, Rumor and Republican Correction, Rumor and Journalist Correction, Rumor and Non-Partisan Correction, Metaphorical, and Other Mention.

5. <u>Rules and definitions for highlighting:</u>

   a. Rumor only = light blue.
      i. Definition: two conditions must be met for a passage to be coded as Rumor Only.
         1. Any speaker: a) uses the phrase "death panels" in a context related to the Affordable Care Act; OR b) uses a similar phrase such as "death boards" in a context related to the Affordable Care Act; OR c) describes a rumor that the ACA would empower a small group of bureaucrats to determine whether or not a gravely ill or injured person should receive medical treatment.
         2. The death panel rumor (which can appear in forms a, b, or c) is not corrected at any point in the passage.

Definition of "Correction": any time there is a correction of the death panel rumor it can, but need not, be explicit. Correction for our purposes includes denial of the rumor, speech about the rumor in a derisive or dismissive tone, or anything else indicating that the rumor of death panels is not to be taken seriously. So, a correction might be as obvious as "the now-debunked death panel theory" or "the myth of so-called death panels" but can also be more subtle (e.g. implied in the tone of the speaker).

b. Rumor and Democratic correction = yellow.
    i. Definition: A speaker affiliated with the Democratic Party in an official capacity (e.g. Congressman, Senator, White House Press Secretary, official of party national committee, or current strategist/consultant) corrects the death panel rumor.
    ii. Note that those who used to be officially affiliated with the Democratic Party but now serve as regular analysts or anchors (like George Stephanopoulos) are coded as journalists.
    iii. If a journalist quotes or summarizes a correction made by a Democratic official, then the correction should be attributed to this Democratic official (the original source).

c. Rumor and republican correction = green.
    i. Definition: A speaker affiliated with the Republican Party in an official capacity corrects the death panel rumor.
    ii. The same rules for party "affiliation" as those outlined with regard to Rumor and Democratic correction apply here.
    iii. If a journalist quotes or summarizes a correction made by a Republican official, then the correction should be attributed to this Republican official (the original source).

d. Rumor and journalist correction = red.
    i. Definition: A journalist, such as the anchor of a news program or a regular analyst or commentator on a roundtable discussion show, corrects the death panel rumor.
    ii. A journalist correction only counts as such if it is the journalist himself/herself (or on behalf of the network) making the correction. Again, if the speaker is merely summarizing what someone else said, the correction should be attributed to the original source.

e. Rumor and non-partisan correction = pink.
    i. Definition: A speaker unaffiliated with either of the two major parties, who also cannot properly be described as a journalist, corrects the death panel rumor.

f. Metaphorical = teal

       i.   Definition: Any speaker uses the term death panel as a metaphor or in a context that's not immediately related to the health care debate. "Immediate relation" can be defined as having anything to do with the Affordable Care Act.

   g.   Other Mentions = <mark style="background-color:purple">purple</mark>.

       i.   Definition: The categories above are meant to capture all mentions of death panels. However, if a particular mention does not fit in any of these categories, code it as Other Mentions.

6. <u>Code the entire story:</u> Scroll back up to the title of the broadcast script and beneath the line beginning with **"Show"** (in most broadcast script titles this should be the last centered line) create a new line and identify the experimental category of the entire story by referring to the passages you highlighted.

   <u>Categorizing a Transcript as Rumor Only</u>: A story is to be classified as Rumor Only **if the only highlighting in the entire transcript is light blue, if the only highlighting is light blue and teal, or if the only highlighting is light blue and purple.**

   More specifically, the story is coded as Rumor Only if the death panel rumor is mentioned but there are no corrections made anywhere in the transcript. The light blue highlighting is to be ignored if there is yellow/green/red/pink highlighting anywhere in the story.

   <u>Categorizing a Transcript as Rumor and Correction:</u> If there is yellow/green/red/pink highlighting in your transcript, you will classify the transcript as Rumor and Democratic/Republican/Journalist/Non-Partisan Correction.

   As was mentioned above, each story may have more than one code. So if there is both yellow and red highlighting in the story, the transcript will be classified as both Rumor and Democratic Correction and Rumor and Journalist Correction. If there is red, green, and pink highlighting in the story, the transcript will be classified as: Rumor and Journalist Correction, Rumor and Republican Correction, and Rumor and Non-Partisan Correction.

   If there is blue and pink highlighting in the story, the transcript will be classified as Rumor and Non-Partisan Correction only. **Again, a transcript is coded as Rumor Only only if no correction of any kind is made in the story.**

   <u>Categorizing a Transcript as Metaphorical</u>: If there is only teal highlighting in your transcript, you will classify the transcript as Metaphorical.

   <u>Categorizing a Transcript as Other Mentions:</u> If there is only purple highlighting in your transcript, you will classify the transcript as Other Mentions.

   <u>Follow the format below:</u>

Experimental Category: Rumor only (Katrina vanden Heuvel) or, if there is more than one category: Experimental Category: Rumor and Republican Correction (Chris Christie) and Rumor and Democratic correction (Senator John Kerry).

Note that for each category you should record the name of the speaker in parentheses. If two different speakers from the same category mention death panels, it should be coded as such: Rumor and Journalist correction (George Stephanopoulos, Paul Begala).

List of Stories

Network	Broadcast Date
ABC	6/1/2011
ABC	9/15/2009
ABC	8/23/2009
ABC	8/19/2009
ABC	8/16/2009
ABC	8/11/2009
ABC	8/10/2009
ABC	8/9/2009
ABC	8/8/2009
NBC	3/21/2010
NBC	9/9/2009
NBC	9/4/2009
NBC	8/22/2009
NBC	8/19/2009
NBC	8/15/2009
NBC	8/11/2009
NBC	8/9/2009
NBC	8/8/2009
CBS	8/16/2009
CBS	8/15/2009
CBS	8/13/2009
CNN	8/3/2011
CNN	1/7/2011
CNN	4/18/2010
CNN	3/16/2010
CNN	2/26/2010
CNN	12/21/2009
CNN	12/20/2009
CNN	11/3/2009
CNN	10/26/2009
CNN	10/1/2009
CNN	9/10/2009
CNN	9/10/2009
CNN	9/9/2009
CNN	8/21/2009
CNN	8/20/2009

CNN	8/20/2009
CNN	8/20/2009
CNN	8/18/2009
CNN	8/17/2009
FOX	1/5/2011
FOX	1/2/2011
FOX	12/27/2010
FOX	12/27/2010
FOX	9/13/2009
FOX	8/23/2009
FOX	8/23/2009
FOX	8/23/2009
FOX	8/22/2009
FOX	8/15/2009
FOX	8/14/2009
FOX	8/11/2009