Appendix Figures

Figure A1. Mean (SE) trust in a number of healthcare actors by partisanship. Pairwise comparisons between Democrats and Republicans (or between Democrats and all other respondents) are significant at the 5% level or better. The exception is health insurance companies, where the comparison is significant only between Democrats and Independents. Source: YouGov survey, July 2023.
Figure A2. Percentage of participants who rated each healthcare actor’s performance as “Excellent” or “Very good” by partisanship. Source: YouGov 2022 and 2023 surveys.
Competence Advice
Policy makers should follow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party affiliation</th>
<th>Medical Research Scientists</th>
<th>Public Health Experts</th>
<th>Medical Research Scientists</th>
<th>Public Health Experts</th>
<th>Medical Research Scientists</th>
<th>Public Health Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1. Percentage of participants who indicated they are very or somewhat confident in each actor’s competence, advice, and in the appropriateness of having policymakers follow their guidance. For the policymaker item, the 5-point scale was from “Strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”, thus the table shows the percentage of participants who at least agreed with the statement that policymakers should follow medical research scientists’ and public health experts’ advice, respectively. All pairwise comparisons between Democrats and everyone else are statistically significant ($p < .001$). Source YouGov 2023 survey.
Figure A3. Beliefs about other professions’ hard-working habits compared to doctors, by partisanship. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A4. Beliefs about whether other professions can be trusted compared to doctors, by partisanship. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A5. Beliefs about whether other professions are caring compared to doctors, by partisanship. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A6. Beliefs about whether other professions are interested in gaining prestige compared to doctors, by partisanship. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A7. Beliefs about whether other professions are interested in becoming wealthier compared to doctors, by partisanship. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A8. Beliefs about whether other professions are interested in helping others compared to doctors, by partisanship. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A9. Beliefs about other professions’ hard-working habits compared to doctors, by COVID-19 vaccination status. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A10. Beliefs about whether other professions can be trusted compared to doctors, by COVID-19 vaccination status. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A11. Beliefs about whether other professions are caring compared to doctors, by COVID-19 vaccination status. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A12. Beliefs about whether other professions are interested in gaining prestige compared to doctors, by COVID-19 vaccination status. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A13. Beliefs about whether other professions are interested in becoming wealthier compared to doctors, by COVID-19 vaccination status. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A14. Beliefs about whether other professions are interested in helping others compared to doctors, by COVID-19 vaccination status. The plot shows linear regression coefficients with standard errors. Each dependent variable was recoded to range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Source: 2023 YouGov survey.
Figure A15. Mean (SE) support for a hypothetical healthcare cost control proposal in a survey experiment partitioned by partisanship. Source: 2023 YouGov sample.
Figure A16. Mean (SE) support for a hypothetical healthcare cost control proposal in a survey experiment partitioned by COVID-19 vaccination status. Source: 2023 YouGov sample.
Table A2. Regressions generating Figure 4, “Beliefs about other professions’ motivations and abilities compared to doctors.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work harder</th>
<th>Interested in helping</th>
<th>Interested in wealth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Coef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>(0.12) ***</td>
<td>-1.07 (0.11) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>(0.13) ***</td>
<td>-0.36 (0.11) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Members</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>(0.12) ***</td>
<td>-1.60 (0.12) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>(0.08) ***</td>
<td>3.12 (0.07) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interested in prestige</th>
<th>Care about me</th>
<th>Can be trusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Coef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>(0.12) ***</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Members</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>(0.13) ***</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>(0.10) ***</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Linear regressions with standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$
Table A3. Regression generating Figure 5, “Support for a hypothetical healthcare cost control proposal”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for proposal</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMA oppose</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D support, R oppose</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R support, D oppose</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipartisan support</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipartisan commission</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA &amp; D support</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA oppose &amp; D support</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA &amp; R support</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA oppose &amp; R support</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA &amp; D &amp; R support</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA oppose, D &amp; R support</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA &amp; bipartisan commission support</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMA oppose, bipartisan commission</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Linear regressions with standard errors in parentheses. *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1
Survey Instruments

*Full survey instrument: 2022 survey*

**Survey on Public Opinion on Evidence-Based Medicine and Physician Leadership**

**Consent language**

You are invited to participate in a research study on politics and public affairs that will take approximately ____ to ____ minutes. You will be asked to answer some questions about yourself and your views on public affairs. You will not be paid to participate.

This survey is designed to understand public opinion regarding health care and other public policy matters. The study authors are not medical doctors, and you should not make any personal health decisions based on the information presented here.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may skip any question or choose to end your participation at any time. Refusing to participate will involve no penalty. No identifying information about you will be collected, and all of your responses and choices will be kept anonymous and confidential. Your individual responses to each question are being collected by academic researchers. There are no known or anticipated risks to you for participating. Although this study will not benefit you personally, we hope that our results will add to the knowledge about voter mobilization, political participation, political behavior, and social and political attitudes.

If you have any concerns about this study, you may contact the investigator, Alessandro Del Ponte (alessandro.delponte@yale.edu). If you would like to talk with someone other than the researcher to discuss problems or concerns, to discuss situations in the event that a member of the research team is not available, or to discuss your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Yale University Human Subjects Committee, 203-785-4688, human.subjects@yale.edu. Additional information is available at [https://your.yale.edu/research-support/human-research/research-participants/rights-research-participant](https://your.yale.edu/research-support/human-research/research-participants/rights-research-participant)

By clicking the advance button on this page, you acknowledge that you have read this consent form and agree to participate in the study.

**Attention check**

We'd like to know how you feel about local news coverage. Please read this short article. On the next page, we will ask you a few questions about your reactions to this article.

**MAN ARRESTED FOR STRING OF BANK THEFTS**
Columbus Police have arrested a man they say gave his driver's license to a teller at a bank he was robbing.

According to court documents, Bryan Simon is accused of robbing four Central Ohio banks between October 3 and November 5, 2018.

During a robbery on November 5 at the Huntington Bank, the sheriff's office says Simon was tricked into giving the teller his drivers' license.

According to court documents, Simon approached the counter and presented a demand note for money that said "I have a gun." The teller gave Simon about $500, which he took.

Documents say Simon then told the teller he wanted more money. The teller told him a driver's license was required to use the machine to get out more cash. Simon reportedly then gave the teller his license to swipe through the machine and then left the bank with about $1,000 in additional cash, but without his ID.

Detectives arrested him later that day at the address listed on his ID.

[Q1] {single}

- How much money did Simon allegedly steal?
  - About $500
  - About $1,500
  - About $25,000
  - About 1 million dollars
  - None of the above

[Q2] {single}

- How was Simon identified by police for the crime he allegedly committed?
  - A police officer recognized him
  - From video surveillance
  - Because he left his ID
  - He turned himself in
  - None of the above

Covariates beyond the YouGov demographics delivery

[Q3] {single}

- How would you describe the community where you currently live?
  - Urban
[Q4] {single}

- Which of the following four statements comes closest to your own view about your current health insurance coverage? (PLEASE READ ALL 4 STATEMENTS COMPLETELY BEFORE SELECTING A RESPONSE.)
  - My health insurance is good and I feel well-protected when it comes to my health care needs.
  - My health insurance is adequate, but I worry that I might have health care needs that it won’t pay for.
  - My health insurance is inadequate, and I feel very worried about my health care needs not being paid for.
  - I don’t have health insurance.
  - Don't know

[Q5] {single}

- In general, how would you rate your overall health?
  - Poor
  - Fair
  - Good
  - Very good
  - Excellent

**Confidence in medical research scientists**

[Q6] {single}

- How much confidence do you have that medical research scientists are competent?
  - A great deal
  - A fair amount
  - Not too much
  - No confidence at all

[Q7] {single}

- How much confidence do you have that medical research scientists’ advice to policymakers is in the best interests of the public?
  - A great deal
  - A fair amount
  - Not too much
  - No confidence at all

[Q8] {single}
• Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement “Policymakers should follow medical research scientists’ advice about public policy.”
  o Strongly agree
  o Somewhat agree
  o Neither agree nor disagree
  o Somewhat disagree
  o Strongly disagree

Trust-related questions—from previous studies

[Special instructions: randomize the order of these two questions]

[Q9] {single}
  • Who would you trust the most to determine whether new treatments and technologies provide better results than current treatments? [randomize order of options]
    o University scientists
    o A panel of doctors
    o A panel of doctors and citizens
    o A commission of business leaders
    o An independent government agency

[Q10] {single}
  • Who would you trust the least to determine whether new treatments and technologies provide better results than current treatments? [randomize order of options]
    o University scientists
    o A panel of doctors
    o A panel of doctors and citizens
    o A commission of business leaders
    o An independent government agency

Trust-related questions—new questions

[Q11] {single}
  • How has the Covid-19 pandemic impacted your level of trust in the doctor you’ve seen the most?
    o Increased Trust
    o Decreased Trust
    o Trust Remained the Same
Here is a list of actors in the US health care system. Please rate the performance of each actor during the Covid-19 pandemic. [Randomize Order]

1. Medical doctors
2. Nurses
3. Medical research scientists
4. Pharmaceutical companies
5. Health insurance companies
6. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
7. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
8. Your state public health agency

- Excellent
- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

**Views on medicine and medical care – from previous studies**

Here are statements about medicine and medical treatments. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with these statements.

**Columns:**

- Agree strongly
- Agree somewhat
- Disagree somewhat
- Disagree strongly

1. If a medical procedure is very expensive, it is likely to be highly effective.
2. The most recent medical innovations are more effective than treatments that were introduced 10 or 20 years ago.
3. If your doctor tells you there are two equally effective treatments that your insurance will pay for completely—even though one is more expensive than the other—you would prefer the more expensive one because it is probably better.
4. Drug companies commonly keep cures for serious medical conditions like cancer and heart disease secret from the public to protect the profits they get from their current products.
5. Modern medicine can cure almost any illness for people who have access to the most advanced technology and treatment.
6. When I hear about the results of a new medical study I don’t believe them because medical studies often contradict one another.
7. If a treatment only helps some patients who get it, your doctor knows whether you will be among those for whom the treatment is effective.

**CER questions—from previous studies**

[Q14] {single}

- For many medical conditions, doctors use different kinds of treatments, and there is no scientific agreement on which is best. For example, a patient may be experiencing a particular type of pain and it is unclear whether the best treatment is a drug, physical therapy, or surgery.

Over the past 15 years, there has been discussion about the need for more research to determine which treatments are most effective for which patients. This is sometimes called comparative effectiveness research.

Would you support or oppose government funding of research on the effectiveness of different medical treatments?

- Strongly oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat support

[Q15] {grid}

Here are a number of ways evidence from comparative effectiveness research could be used. To what extent would you support or oppose using comparative effectiveness research to:

1. Provide information about whether a given treatment works better than alternative ways of treating patients with the same condition.
2. Create warning labels for treatments that are not supported by strong scientific evidence.
3. Determine whether Medicare and private insurance companies will cover new treatments that have just become available.
4. Determine whether Medicare and private insurance companies will cover old treatments that doctors have used for some time.
5. Provide information to Congress, doctors, and patients about whether an expensive treatment is worth its cost.
6. Determine what groups of patients should be protected from budget cuts in Medicare and other government health programs.

7. Charge a patient more to get a treatment that research has not shown to be effective, even if the patient's own doctor recommends it.
   - Strongly oppose
   - Somewhat oppose
   - Neither support nor oppose
   - Somewhat support
   - Strongly support

**Familiarity with PCORI and evidence-based medicine – new questions**

[Q16]  

- Here is a list of agencies in the federal government. For each one, please indicate how familiar you are with its activities. [Randomize order]

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
2. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
3. Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI)

Note 1-5 scale (not at all familiar – very familiar)

[Q17]  

**[Special Instructions: The order of the blocks (FOR or AGAINST) should be randomized, along with the order of items within each block.]

Also, randomize whether people get FOR_long + AGAINST_short or FOR_short + AGAINST_long]

- Some people have proposed establishing an outside group to develop national treatment guidelines based on the latest scientific evidence. Doctors would be required to follow these guidelines when they treat patients. The government and insurance companies would refuse to pay for any treatments not supported by the guidelines even if a doctor thinks this treatment is best for their patient.

Here are some arguments people have given FOR requiring doctors to follow treatment guidelines. After each statement, please tell me how convincing the reason is.

   - Very convincing
   - Somewhat convincing
   - Not too convincing
   - Not at all convincing
1. Like everyone else, doctors are affected by economic incentives, even if they don’t realize it. How much money doctors earn sometimes depends on what tests they order and what treatments they perform, and this can lead doctors to give patients unnecessary care or the wrong care.

2. My own doctor is very knowledgeable but many people have doctors who do not practice good medicine. Requiring doctors to follow evidence-based guidelines will improve care for most patients.

3. Doctors typically practice what they learned in medical school. As the years pass, doctors can become increasingly out of touch with the latest scientific findings on what treatments work best.

4. Doctors generally follow the standards of care of their local community. As a result, doctors in a given area may be unaware that better treatment approaches are being used elsewhere in the country.

Here are some arguments people have given AGAINST requiring doctors to follow treatment guidelines. After each statement, please tell me how convincing the reason is.

- Very convincing
- Somewhat convincing
- Not too convincing
- Not at all convincing

1. No outside group should come between doctors and patients in making treatment decisions.
2. If forced to follow guidelines, doctors will be unable to tailor care to the needs of individual patients.
3. Treatment guidelines are vulnerable to abuse and corruption. No one should be trusted with the power to determine standards of medical care for all patients.
4. The government and insurance companies will use treatment guidelines as a way to control costs and ration care.
5. Treatment guidelines cannot keep up with the pace of medical innovation and won't reflect the latest scientific breakthroughs.

1. Doctors are affected by economic incentives and this can lead doctors to provide unnecessary care.
2. Requiring doctors to follow evidence-based guidelines will improve care for most patients.
3. Doctors can become increasingly out of touch with the latest scientific findings on what treatments work best.
4. Doctors in a given area may be unaware that better treatment approaches are being used everywhere.

[AGAINST_long]

1. No outside group should come between doctors and patients in making treatment decisions. Treatment decisions should be solely made by individual doctors and their own patients.
2. If forced to follow treatment guidelines, doctors will be unable to tailor care to the needs of individual patients, even if doctors believe their patients will benefit from personalized care.
3. Treatment guidelines are vulnerable to abuse and corruption by decision makers and lobbyists. No one should be trusted with the power to determine standards for medical care for all patients without distinctions.
4. It is easy to imagine that the government agencies and insurance companies will use the treatment guidelines they issue as a way to control costs and, ultimately, ration the medical services that patients receive.
5. Treatment guidelines reflect the scientific knowledge of a specific time. So, they cannot keep up with the pace of medical innovation, which sometimes occurs at striking speed. Ultimately, treatment guidelines won’t reflect the latest scientific breakthroughs.

Alzheimer’s Drug questions

[Q18] {single}

- Are you aware of the recent preliminary decision by the Medicare program to restrict coverage of a new drug for treating Alzheimer’s disease to patients who are participating in clinical trials?
  - I am very aware of the announcement and details around it.
  - Have just heard about it, but can't recall many details.
  - Not at all.

- The Medicare program has decided to restrict coverage of the new Alzheimer’s drug to patients who are participating in clinical trials, even though the drug is FDA-approved. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about Medicare’s decision:

[Special instructions: Please randomize the order of the following two questions.]
“Medicare’s decision is appropriate because there are significant doubts about whether the benefits of the drug for patients outweigh the safety risks, which include serious side effects according to medical research scientists.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

[Q20] {single}

“Medicare’s decision is appropriate because the price of the drug is high ($28,200/year per patient) given the significant doubts about its health benefits.”

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

(Covid-19) vaccines

[Q21] {single}

- Have you received the COVID-19 vaccine?
  - Yes, got the one-dose vaccine (J&J)
  - Yes, got first dose of a two-dose vaccine (Moderna or Pfizer)
  - Yes, got both doses of a two-dose vaccine (Moderna or Pfizer)
  - Yes, got fully vaccinated plus a booster shot
  - No, have not gotten the vaccine
Full survey instrument: 2023 survey

Survey on Public Opinion on Evidence-Based Medicine and Physician Leadership

Consent language

You are invited to participate in a research study on politics and public affairs that will take approximately 8 minutes. You will be asked to answer some questions about yourself and your views on public affairs. You will not be paid to participate.

This survey is designed to understand public opinion regarding health care and other public policy matters. The study authors are not medical doctors, and you should not make any personal health decisions based on the information presented here.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may skip any question or choose to end your participation at any time. Refusing to participate will involve no penalty. No identifying information about you will be collected, and all of your responses and choices will be kept anonymous and confidential. Your individual responses to each question are being collected by academic researchers. There are no known or anticipated risks to you for participating. Although this study will not benefit you personally, we hope that our results will add to the knowledge about voter mobilization, political participation, political behavior, and social and political attitudes.

If you have any concerns about this study, you may contact the investigator, Alan Gerber (alan.gerber@yale.edu). If you would like to talk with someone other than the researcher to discuss problems or concerns, to discuss situations in the event that a member of the research team is not available, or to discuss your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Yale University Human Subjects Committee, 203-785-4688, human.subjects@yale.edu. Additional information is available at https://your.yale.edu/research-support/human-research/research-participants/rights-research-participant

By clicking the advance button on this page, you acknowledge that you have read this consent form and agree to participate in the study.

Attention check

We'd like to know how you feel about local news coverage. Please read this short article. On the next page, we will ask you a few questions about your reactions to this article.

MAN ARRESTED FOR STRING OF BANK THEFTS

Columbus Police have arrested a man they say gave his driver's license to a teller at a bank he
was robbing.

According to court documents, Bryan Simon is accused of robbing four Central Ohio banks between October 3 and November 5, 2018.

During a robbery on November 5 at the Huntington Bank, the sheriff's office says Simon was tricked into giving the teller his drivers' license.

According to court documents, Simon approached the counter and presented a demand note for money that said "I have a gun." The teller gave Simon about $500, which he took.

Documents say Simon then told the teller he wanted more money. The teller told him a driver's license was required to use the machine to get out more cash. Simon reportedly then gave the teller his license to swipe through the machine and then left the bank with about $1,000 in additional cash, but without his ID.

Detectives arrested him later that day at the address listed on his ID.

[Q1] {single}

- How much money did Simon allegedly steal?
  - About $500
  - About $1,500
  - About $25,000
  - About 1 million dollars
  - None of the above

[Q2] {single}

- How was Simon identified by police for the crime he allegedly committed?
  - A police officer recognized him
  - From video surveillance
  - Because he left his ID
  - He turned himself in
  - None of the above

Covariates beyond the YouGov demographics delivery

[Q3] {single}

- How would you describe the community where you currently live?
  - Urban
  - Suburban
  - Rural
[Q4] {single}

- Which of the following four statements comes closest to your own view about your current health insurance coverage? (PLEASE READ ALL 4 STATEMENTS COMPLETELY BEFORE SELECTING A RESPONSE).
  - My health insurance is good and I feel well-protected when it comes to my health care needs.
  - My health insurance is adequate, but I worry that I might have health care needs that it won’t pay for.
  - My health insurance is inadequate, and I feel very worried about my health care needs not being paid for.
  - I don’t have health insurance.
  - Don't know

[Q5] {single}

- In general, how would you rate your overall health?
  - Poor
  - Fair
  - Good
  - Very good
  - Excellent

AMA and Political Cues Experiment

[Q6] {single}

Special Instructions: The treatments follow a three-by-five design. Please randomly assign respondents to one of fourteen of these fifteen conditions with equal probability. No respondents should be assigned to the TREAT 1 =NONE AND TREAT 2 =NONE condition. Randomize order of TREAT 1 and TREAT 2 if BOTH <> NONE.

A variety of public policies have been proposed to help reduce the amount we spend on health care. Suppose you learned that a proposal was [TREAT 1: NONE / supported by the American Medical Association / opposed by the American Medical Association] [IF TREAT 1 <> NONE AND TREAT 2 <> NONE then “and”] [TREAT 2: NONE / supported by congressional Democrats but opposed by congressional Republicans / supported by congressional Republicans but opposed by congressional Democrats / supported by a bipartisan commission on deficit reduction]. Would this make you more or less likely to support the proposal?

- Much more likely to support
- Somewhat more likely to support
- Neither more nor less likely to support
- Somewhat less likely to support
• Much less likely to support

**Confidence in medical research scientists**

[Q7] {single}

• How much confidence do you have that medical research scientists are competent?
  o A great deal
  o A fair amount
  o Not too much
  o No confidence at all

[Q8] {single}

• How much confidence do you have that medical research scientists’ advice to policymakers is in the best interests of the public?
  o A great deal
  o A fair amount
  o Not too much
  o No confidence at all

[Q9] {single}

• Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Policymakers should follow medical research scientists’ advice about public policy.”
  o Strongly agree
  o Somewhat agree
  o Neither agree nor disagree
  o Somewhat disagree
  o Strongly disagree

**Confidence in public health experts**

[Q10] {single}

• How much confidence do you have that public health experts are competent?
  o A great deal
  o A fair amount
  o Not too much
  o No confidence at all

[Q11] {single}
• How much confidence do you have that public health experts’ advice to policymakers is in the best interests of the public?
  o A great deal
  o A fair amount
  o Not too much
  o No confidence at all

[Q12] {single}

• Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Policymakers should follow public health experts’ advice about public policy.”

  o Strongly agree
  o Somewhat agree
  o Neither agree nor disagree
  o Somewhat disagree
  o Strongly disagree

Trust-related questions—from previous studies

[Special instructions: randomize the order of these two questions]

[Q13] {single}

• Who would you trust the most to determine whether new treatments and technologies provide better results than current treatments? [randomize order of options]
  o University scientists
  o A panel of doctors
  o A panel of doctors and citizens
  o A commission of business leaders
  o An independent government agency

[Q14] {single}

• Who would you trust the least to determine whether new treatments and technologies provide better results than current treatments? [randomize order of options]
  o University scientists
  o A panel of doctors
  o A panel of doctors and citizens
  o A commission of business leaders
  o An independent government agency

Confidence in major US institutions

[Q22] {grid}
Now I am going to read you a list of institutions in American society. Please tell me how much confidence you, yourself, have in each one – a great deal, quite a lot, some or very little.

[randomize order]

- Small business
- The military
- The police
- The medical system
- The church or organized religion
- The public schools
- Organized labor
- Banks
- Large technology companies
- The U.S. Supreme Court
- The president
- Newspapers
- The criminal justice system
- Big business
- Television news
- Congress
  - A great deal
  - Quite a lot
  - Some
  - Very little
  - No opinion

**Trust-and care-related questions**

[Q15] {single}

- How has the Covid-19 pandemic impacted your level of trust in the doctor you’ve seen the most?
  - Increased trust
  - Decreased trust
  - Trust remained the same

[Q16] {single}

- Did the doctor you’ve seen the most encourage you to get a Covid-19 vaccine or to take precautions such as masking or social distancing?
  - Yes
  - No
  - I don’t remember/I don’t know
[Q17] {single}

- Did the doctor you’ve seen the most express any opinions about national or local Covid-19 policies such as lockdowns, school closures, or mask requirements?
  - Yes
  - No
  - I don’t remember/I don’t know

[Q18] {single}

*Special instructions: Only for respondents who said their doctor expressed an opinion*

- Whether or not you expressed your opinion to your doctor at the time, how strongly do you agree or disagree with their views on Covid?
  - Strongly agree
  - Somewhat agree
  - Neither agree nor disagree
  - Somewhat disagree
  - Strongly disagree

[Q19] {grid}

*Special Instructions: [Blank] should be assigned with equal probability to “Doctors” or “Lawyers” or “Public school teachers” or “Members of Congress.” Randomize order of rows.*

How much do you agree with each of the following statements?

*Columns:*

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

*Rows:*

- [Blank] work harder and longer hours than do people in most other jobs.
- [Blank] are interested in helping people.
- Becoming wealthier is important for [Blank].
- [Blank] are mainly interested in gaining greater prestige.
• [Blank] care about people like me.
• [Blank] can be trusted.

[Q20] {grid}

[Special instructions: randomize the order of these nine questions]

• Here is a list of actors in the US health care system. Using the following scale ranging from 0 to 10, where 0 means “No trust at all” and 10 means “Complete trust”, please indicate how much trust you personally have in…?

  9. Medical doctors
  10. Nurses
  11. Medical research scientists
  12. Pharmaceutical companies
  13. Health insurance companies
  14. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
  15. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
  16. Public health experts employed by the federal government
  17. Your state public health agency

[Q21] {grid}

[Special instructions: randomize the order of these nine questions]

• Here is a list of actors in the US health care system. Please rate the performance of each actor during the Covid-19 pandemic. [Randomize Order]

  1. Medical doctors
  2. Nurses
  3. Medical research scientists
  4. Pharmaceutical companies
  5. Health insurance companies
  6. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
  7. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
  8. Public health experts employed by the federal government
  9. Your state public health agency

  ▪ Excellent
  ▪ Very good
  ▪ Good
  ▪ Fair
  ▪ Poor

**Medicare drug negotiation questions**
As you may know, Congress recently gave Medicare the authority to negotiate the prices for certain high-cost drugs. Here are a number of factors that Medicare could take into account when it negotiates drug prices with drug companies. To what extent would you support or oppose having Medicare develop its initial negotiating offer based on the following?

1. The amount the **drug manufacturer** has spent on research and development costs and the extent to which it has recouped these costs
2. The amount the **federal government** has spent on research and development related to the drug
3. The cost of producing and distributing each unit of the drug
4. Whether the drug addresses an unmet medical need for a medical condition that is not adequately addressed by any other therapy
5. Whether the drug would offer clinical benefits for people with disabilities
6. Whether the drug would offer clinical benefits for children
7. Whether the drug would offer clinical benefits for racial minorities
8. Whether the drug would offer clinical benefits for women
9. The price recommended by the drug manufacturer
10. The price recommended by medical research scientists
11. The price recommended by patient groups
12. The price recommended by insurance companies

   - Strongly support
   - Somewhat support
   - Neither support nor oppose
   - Somewhat oppose
   - Strongly oppose

(Covid-19) vaccines

[Q24] {single}

- Have you received the COVID-19 vaccine?
  - Yes, got the one-dose vaccine (J&J)
  - Yes, got first dose of a two-dose vaccine (Moderna or Pfizer)
  - Yes, got both doses of a two-dose vaccine (Moderna or Pfizer)
  - Yes, got fully vaccinated plus at least one booster shot
  - No, have not gotten the vaccine
Balance tests

We performed balance tests for our two survey experiments (beliefs about doctors’ motivations; doctors’ cues). Specifically, for each experiment, we used multinomial logistic regression to assess the association between treatment assignment and the demographic items (age; gender; education; race [White; Black; Hispanic] vaccination status; 2020 turnout; three-point partisanship; household income) on the experimental treatments.

For the first experiment on beliefs about doctors’ motivations, we find no systematic indication of over- or under-sampling. (In the Doctors Treatment, the significant coefficients for Republicans and Blacks are consistent with chance.) For the second experiment about doctors’ cues about a hypothetical healthcare cost control proposal, we find indication that in eight treatments, independents were slightly over- or under-sampled. However, they are not included in the analysis partitioned by partisanship. Also, we find indication that in two treatments, Blacks were under-sampled. We do not find any other evidence of imbalanced treatment assignment. Together, the results indicate that the randomized treatment assignment was successful.

YouGov sample construction

YouGov constructed the samples to be representative of the general population on gender, age, race, and education. For the 2022 survey, YouGov interviewed 1,210 respondents who were matched down to a sample of 750 participants to produce the final data set using propensity score matching (Austin 2008; Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008). This means that YouGov randomly drew from the initial number of respondents to ensure that the final target sample matches the characteristics of the general population on the desired characteristics. YouGov then weighted the matched set of survey respondents to known marginals for the general population of the United States from the 2019 American Community Survey (ACS). For the 2023 survey, YouGov interviewed 928 respondents who were matched down to a sample of 800 participants to produce the final data set. YouGov built the frame for the 2023 survey using the ACS survey, 2020 Current Population Survey (CPS) Voting and Registration supplements, the 2020 National Election Pool (NEP) exit poll, and the 2020 Cooperative Election Surveys. Full question wording of the two surveys is included in the appendix. All the analyses presented below use the weights that YouGov provided with the data sets.