

Appendix A:Supplemental information

Methods, Questionnaire, Design: Modifications of the questionnaire for use in the present study. The first changes were made to allow a telephone interview. We chose to use a telephone interview rather than a written questionnaire partly because many patients with AD who have little or no trouble talking have great trouble writing, and partly because this method provided greater assurances that they were not being aided in their responses. The second changes were made to allow recognition in addition to recall responses. Although patients with AD show more deficits in recall than recognition, it is their recognition deficits which are more specific to their disease (Morris, 1996). The third changes were to simplify the questionnaire slightly to avoid fatiguing and frustrating the patients.

Methods, Questionnaire, Scoring: A brief summary of the scoring of distortions. For the recognition responses, a response was considered a distortion if a different response was chosen by the participant (see Appendix A for the various recognition responses available). For the majority of the recall responses, the data were converted into a recognition response first, and then treated in the same manner as the recognition responses. For example, if a participant first stated she was with “her friends Sally, Joe, and Sam” and later stated she was with “friends,” because both of these responses would be converted into the recognition response “FRIEND,” the response would be scored as correct. If instead she stated she was with her husband at the follow-up interview, this response would be converted into the recognition response “RELATIVE” and would thus be scored as a distortion. The rare exception to these general

rules is that if on the follow-up interview she stated she was with “her friends Sally, Joe, and Burt” (and not Sam) this response would be treated as a distortion because the specifics had been altered.

Results, Responses to emotional questions: Analyses performed to determine whether any patterns were present in the missing responses. A repeated-measures ANOVA examined the presence or absence of responses with time (present versus future) and emotion (sadness, anger, fear, frustration, confusion, shock) as within-subjects variables and group (patients with AD, patients with MCI, & older adults) as a between subjects variable. This analysis revealed a main effect of time [$F(1,63)=9.29$, $MSE=0.137$, $p=.003$], but no effect of group [$F(2,63)<1$] or emotion [$F(5,315)=1.93$, $MSE=0.044$, $p=.089$], and no interactions [Time X Group: $F(2,63)<1$; Time X Emotion: $F(5,315)<1$; Emotion X Group: $F(10,315)=1.13$, $MSE=0.044$, $p=.336$; Time X Emotion X Group: $F(10,315)=1.53$, $MSE=0.059$, $p=.129$]. The effect of time indicates that, not surprisingly, participants were more likely to show difficulty answering questions regarding their future emotional state (48 non-responses or 12%) relative to their current state (16 non-responses or 4%). Since no group differences or interactions were found in the pattern of missing responses, missing emotional intensity data was filled in by using the group average for that result.

Analysis was also performed to determine whether participants noted other emotions they were experiencing or expected to be experiencing in one year (questions 19 and 36). More participants reported that they were experiencing other emotions in the present than predicted that they would be experiencing other emotions in the future, as indicated by an ANOVA which

yielded an effect of time [$F(1,63)=7.85$, $MSE=0.185$, $p=.007$], no effect of group [$F(2,63)=1.85$, $MSE=.263$, $p=.166$], and no interaction [$F(2,63)=2.36$, $MSE=0.185$, $p=.103$].

Appendix B:

9/11 Memory Consortium Questionnaire, Telephone Recognition Version

1) Please describe how you first became aware of the terrorist attack on America.

2) What time was it on the East Coast when you first became aware of the attack?

8:00-10:00AM 10:00-12:00PM 12:00-2:00PM AFTER 2:00PM

3) How did you first learn about it (what was the source of the information)?

TV RADIO INTERNET PERSON

4) Where were you?

HOME WORK OTHER BUILDING IN CAR OUTSIDE

5) What were you doing?

WORKING RECREATIONAL READING WATCHING TV OTHER
ACTIVITY

6) Who else was there?

FRIEND RELATIVE CO-WORKER STRANGER NOBODY

7) How did you feel when you first became aware of the attack?

SAD ANGRY FEARFUL CONFUSED FRUSTRATED SHOCKED

8) Who was the first person with whom you communicated about the attack, and how did he/she feel about it?

SAD ANGRY FEARFUL CONFUSED FRUSTRATED SHOCKED

9) What were you doing immediately before you became aware of the attack?

WORKING RECREATIONAL READING WATCHING TV OTHER
ACTIVITY

10) What did you do immediately after you became aware of the attack?

WATCHED TV LISTENED TO RADIO TALKED TO PEOPLE AROUND
 CALLED SOMEBODY LOOKED AT INTERNET NOTHING

11) Did you suffer any personal losses in the attack? If so, please specify.

FRIEND RELATIVE CO-WORKER ACQUAINTANCE
 FRIEND'S FRIEND/RELATIVE NO

12) Did the attack inconvenience your daily activities in some way? If so, please specify.

EVACUATED COULDN'T TRAVEL OTHER NO

12.1) How well do you think you will remember these details in 3 months?

(not at all)1 2 3 4 5 (perfectly)

12.2) How well do you think you will remember these details in a year?

(not at all)1 2 3 4 5 (perfectly)

For the following questions, I'd like you to tell me about your **CURRENT FEELINGS CONCERNING THE ATTACK**. Please indicate your response by selecting a point between 1 (low) and 5 (high). Note that you may indicate partial numbers (e.g. 3.5)

13) At this moment, how strongly or intensely do you feel **sad** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

14) At this moment, how strongly or intensely do you feel **angry** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

15) At this moment, how strongly or intensely do you feel **fear** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

26) Where was President Bush when the attack occurred?

WASHINGTON CAMP DAVID FLORIDA EUROPE IN AIRFORCE ONE

27) When you first became aware of the attack, what did you think was going on?

TERRORIST ATTACK ACCIDENT BOMB DID NOT BELIEVE IT

DID NOT KNOW

28) Please list the important events that occurred in the attack.

29) Many people think that these are the most salient events that occurred in the attack:

- a) A World Trade Center Tower was hit by a hijacked plane
- b) A second World Trade Center Tower collapsed
- c) A second World Trade Center Tower was hit by a hijacked plane
- d) A hijacked plane crashed outside of Pittsburgh
- e) A World Trade Center Tower collapsed
- f) The Pentagon was hit by a hijacked plane

Please indicate the FIRST event which you became aware of:

Please indicate the LAST event which you became aware of:

Please indicate the FIRST event which actually occurred:

Please indicate the LAST event which actually occurred:

For the following questions, I'd like you to tell me about **HOW YOU THINK YOU'LL FEEL**

ABOUT THE ATTACK ONE YEAR FROM NOW. Please indicate your response by

selecting a point between 1 (low) and 5 (high). Note you may indicate partial numbers (e.g. 3.5)

30) A year from now, how strongly or intensely will you feel **sad** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

31) A year from now, how strongly or intensely will you feel **anger** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

32) A year from now, how strongly or intensely will you feel **fearful** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

33) At this moment, how strongly or intensely do you feel **frustrated** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

34) A year from now, how strongly or intensely will you feel **confused** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

35) A year from now, how strongly or intensely will you feel **shock** about the attack?

(low) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 (high)

36) A year from now, what other emotions might you be experiencing? List and rate their expected intensity:

37) Since the attack please estimate the *percentage* of waking hours you have spent doing the following:

- a. Watching television to get information about the attack _____
- b. Talking to friends/relatives about the attack _____
- c. Listening to radio coverage of the attack _____
- d. Consulting the internet for news about the attack _____
- e. Reading published accounts of the attack _____
- f. Going about your daily activities _____
- g. Trying to help those who were hurt in some manner _____
- h. Walking around to see what you could see _____

i. Other _____

38) What do you think is the likelihood of another terrorist attack in the United States during the time periods listed below? Note that your answer should be between 0 and 100, indicating the percentage chance that an attack is likely to take place.

Next Month	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Next Year	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Next 5 Years	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

39) Briefly, describe what the attack means to you.

40) Briefly, describe what the attack means to New York City.

41) Briefly, describe what the attack means to the United States.

42) What is your greatest concern as a result of the attack?

43) How should the United States respond to the attack?

44) Who do you think is responsible for the attack?

Appendix C:

Modifications to the 9/11 Memory Consortium Coding Manual for use with the

Telephone Recognition Version

Differences present throughout (versus the Coding Manual):

- The presence of a recognition column for each question
- Reason: In order to be able to distinguish between and analyze recall and recognition responses separately.
- Presence of a column coding for response/lack of response for each question
- Reason: We wanted to be able to analyze the number of participants answering each question and also determine how much that contributes to their accuracy scores in the factual questions.

Question 1 (how first became aware of attack)

- Coding manual:
 - 1 column for where. Responses were numerically coded from 0 – 9, with each number representing a different place response.
 - 1 column for how. Responses were coded numerically from 0 – 8, with each number representing a different how response.
 - 23 columns for who. Each column represented a different person. Responses were coded numerically from 0-4, with each number indicating a different role played by the person.
 - 2 columns for when (generic and specific). The generic column was coded numerically from 0-8. The specific column was coded from 0-24. Each number represented a different time response.
 - 2 columns for emotional response (1 primary, 1 secondary). Both columns were numerically coded from 0-7.
 - 2 columns for behavioral response (1 primary, 1 secondary). Both columns were numerically coded from 0-13.
 - 13 columns for # and type of incidents recalled. Each column represented a different type of activity. The number of responses that fit into that type of activity were summed and served as the code.
 - 1 column for overall word length. This was coded by the number of words the subject used in responding to question 1.
- Our coding:
 - 1 column for where. Binary code- 0 if nothing stated, 1 if mentioned.
 - 1 column for how. Binary code- 0 if nothing stated, 1 if mentioned.
 - 1 for who. Binary code- 0 if nothing stated, 1 if mentioned.
 - 1 for when. Binary code- 0 if nothing stated, 1 if mentioned.
 - 4 for emotional response (1 primary content, 1 secondary content, 1 presence of primary, 1 presence of secondary). Content columns were coded by the same

method as is used in the coding manual for the emotional response (numerical codes from 0 – 7). The two presence of response columns were binary- 0 if nothing stated, 1 if there was a response.

- 1 for # of incidents recalled. A numerical tally of the different incidents that the subject recalled.
- 1 for overall word length. This was coded by the number of words the subject used in responding to question 1.
- 1 column for uncertainty. Binary code- 0 if no uncertainty, 1 if the subject showed signs of uncertainty (for example by stating that they didn't know, or saying the word or).
- 1 for presence/absence of a response. Binary- 0 if the subject did respond, 1 if s/he did.
- Reasons for differences: The where, how, who and when columns were scored in a binary fashion in our analysis, as we did not anticipate analyzing the details, and were instead interested in the generic content of subjects' responses. We did not include a column for behavioral response, as the other columns addressed this issue in a manner that was easier to analyze for our purposes. Our coding of the # and type of incidents column was a numerical tally of the total incidents recalled, as opposed to a breakdown by the type of incident, as we did not anticipate using this type of information in the analysis. For this column, the total number of separate details that were mentioned was counted. If the subject said they got a phone call from a friend, that was counted as 2 (1 for the phone call, 1 for the friend). Similarly, if the subject said they were watching TV at a friend's house, a 2 was entered in the incident column. The additional columns were present in order to allow us to address issues that we considered important to our analysis.

Question 2-12

- Coding manual:
 - Question 2: 3 columns (time- 1 generic, 1 specific, 1 predicted accuracy). The generic column was coded from 0-8, the specific column from 0-24, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
 - Question 3: 2 columns (how- 1 recalled, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled column was numerically coded from 0-8, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
 - Question 4: 2 columns (where- 1 recalled, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled column was coded from 0-9, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
 - Question 5: 2 columns (what were you doing- 1 recalled, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled column was coded from 0-9, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
 - Question 6: 2 columns (who else- 1 recalled, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled column was coded from 0-23, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
 - Question 7: 2 columns (primary emotional response- 1 recalled, 1 projected accuracy). The recalled column was coded from 0-7, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
 - Question 8: 3 columns (first communication- 1 recalled- who, 1 recalled emotional response, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled who column was coded

- from 0-23, the recalled emotional response was coded from 0-7, and the projected accuracy column from 0-5.
- Question 9: 2 columns (prior activity- 1 recalled, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled column was coded from 0-9, and the projected accuracy from 0-5.
 - Question 10: 2 columns (post activity- 1 recalled, 1 predicted accuracy). The recalled column was coded from 0-13, and the projected accuracy from 0-5.
 - Question 11: 42 columns (personal losses- 21 for life/injury, 4 for financial, 7 for physical property, 10 for psychological). Each column was coded in a binary fashion- 0 for not stated, 1 for stated.
 - Question 12: 43 columns (inconvenience of daily activities- 6 home/family, 10 business/job, 7 school, 4 travel/commuting, 4 shopping, 5 community, 7 national). Each column was scored in a binary fashion- 0 for not stated, 1 for stated.
 - Our coding:
 - Question 2: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). The first was numerically coded based on the content of the subject's recall response, the second was coded in a binary fashion- 0 if not stated, 1 if stated. The third was numerically coded based on the content of the subject's recognition response, and the fourth was coded in a binary fashion.
 - Question 3: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 4: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 5: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 6: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 7: 6 columns (1 for primary emotional recall response code, 1 for secondary emotional recall response code, 1 for presence of an emotional recall response, 1 for primary emotional recognition response, 1 for secondary emotional recognition response, 1 for presence of an emotional recognition response). The first and second columns were coded numerically based on the content of the subject's recall response, the first based on their primary response, the second on their secondary response. The third was given a binary code- 0 if there was no response, 1 if there was. The fourth, fifth and sixth columns followed this pattern for recognition responses.
 - Question 8.1: 2 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence of a recall response). The first was numerically coded based on content, and the second was binary.
 - Question 8.2: 6 columns (1 for primary emotional recall response code, 1 for secondary emotional recall response code, 1 for presence of an emotional recall response, 1 for primary emotional recognition response, 1 for secondary

- emotional recognition response, 1 for presence of an emotional recognition response). See coding for question 7.
- Question 9: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 10: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 11: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - Question 12: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
 - For questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, we performed a corroboration analysis on the 12 AD subjects and 3 MCI subjects who were with a spouse at the time that they heard about the attack. For these subjects, we added two columns to each of these six questions (1 column for corroborated recall, and 1 for corroborated recognition). Each of these twelve columns was scored in a binary fashion: 1 if the spouse's response agreed with that of the subject, and 0 if not.
 - Reasons for differences:
 - For all questions in this section, we did not have a predicted accuracy column, as that question was not present on our survey.
 - We did not have a separate column for generic v specific time, as we did not plan on analyzing that aspect of subjects' responses.
 - For question 7, we included columns for secondary emotional response, which the coding manual did not.
 - Question 8 was broken up into 2 parts in our coding. 8.1 was for the recall of who else was there (recall only). 8.2 addresses the emotion of that person, and includes columns for primary and secondary response.
 - Questions 11 and 12 were broken up into numerous columns and sections in the coding manual. As we did not anticipate analyzing the details of subjects' responses to these questions, we did not break them up in such a way. Our subjects' responses also did not cover such a wide range as was listed in the coding manual, and did not warrant having that many codes.

Composite columns for 2-12

- Coding manual: not present
- Our coding: There were six columns that were composite scores of 2-12. These columns were additional to what is described in the coding manual. The first was flashbulb recall score, which was a total of the number of items the subject recalled for 2-12 and 27 (the highest possible was 13, as there were two sections of question 8 for which it was possible to have a recall response). The second was flashbulb recall %, which was simply the number in the preceding column divided by 13. The third was flashbulb recall corroboration percentage. This column was an average of the corroborated recall columns for those subjects who were with a spouse at the time

they heard about the attack. The fourth column was flashbulb recognition score, which was the number of recognition responses for questions 2-12, 27, 29.1 and 29.2 (the highest possible was 14, as only one of the parts of question 8 was a recognition question). The fifth was flashbulb recognition %, which was simply the number in the preceding column divided by 14. The sixth was flashbulb recognition corroboration percentage. This column was an average of the corroborated recognition columns for those subjects who were with a spouse at the time they heard about the attack.

- Reasons for differences: Creating composite scores of personal memory related items enabled us to analyze differences in subjects' responses to all questions of this type, as well as analyzing each question separately.

Question 12.1 and 12.2 (predicted 3 and predicted 12 month accuracy)

- Coding manual: not present
- Our coding: 1 column for each question (for response code).
- Reasons for differences: Questions 12.1 and 12.2 were not present in the coding manual.

Questions 13-18 (current emotions)

- Coding manual: 1 column for each question (for response code)
- Our coding: 2 columns for each question (1 for response code, 1 for presence of a response)
- Reasons for differences: There were no differences for the questions in this section (except one difference present throughout, which is addressed at the beginning of these notes).
- Additional coding notes: For emotional questions, we used the group mean for each emotion to replace the blank spaces for subjects who did not respond to that particular question.

Composite scores for current emotions (13-18)

- Coding manual: not present
- Our coding: There were three columns for the subject's pattern of responses to the current emotions questions. One was an average intensity based on responses to the questions they answered. The second was a total for the number of items they responded to, with a highest possible score of 6. The third was a percentage, which was the value in the preceding column divided by 6.
- Reasons for differences: Creating composite scores of current emotion related items enabled us to analyze differences in subjects' responses to all questions of this type, as well as analyzing each question separately.

Question 19 (other current emotions)

- Coding manual: addendum category list with notation of intensity.
- Our coding: 1 column indicating presence or absence of a response.
- Reasons for differences: We were interested in how many subjects from each group responded to this question. Their responses covered a large range, however, and there

was not a lot of overlap with the subjects stating a particular emotion, so we did not analyze their actual responses.

Questions 20 & 21 (media attention & ensuing conversation)

- Coding manual: 1 column for each (response code)
- Our coding: 1 column for each (response code)
- No differences.

Question 22 (# of planes)

- Coding manual: 1 column (numerical response)
- Our coding: 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Reasons for differences: We included a column for in/correct in order to analyze accuracy differences between groups.

Question 23 (which airlines involved and number of planes from each)

- Coding manual: 3 columns (1 for American, 1 for United, 1 for other airlines mentioned).
- Our coding: Question 23 was divided into four parts- one for each plane. Each part had 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Reasons for differences: Dividing it up the way we did made it easier to analyze the data, by enabling us to maximize patients' number of correct responses. For example, many subjects did not know the exact number of planes from American, but correctly stated that American was one of the airlines.

Question 24 (intended flight path of each plane)

- Coding manual: 18 columns (5 for content of departure responses, 5 for content of arrival responses, 5 for content accuracy, 1 for numerical accuracy for departure, 1 for numerical accuracy for arrival, and 1 for total numerical accuracy).
- Our coding: Question 24 was divided into 8 parts- 1 for each departure and 1 for each intended arrival. Each part had 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Reasons for differences: Our coding was essentially the same as the coding manual's. The only differences were that we did not include a fifth column for departure and arrival, and that we coded accuracy based on the second system they mentioned- the numerical accuracy. We did not include the fifth column for departure and arrival because we did not think it was necessary. We did not code responses based on content accuracy because it did not seem to be suitable for subsequent analysis.
- Additional coding notes: If subjects answered CA or West Coast, but would not choose the city when prompted with a recognition task, the response was coded as

incorrect for both recall and recognition. Similarly, if subjects said either SF or LA but would not say which, they were coded as incorrect.

Question 25 (crash cities)

- Coding manual: 11 columns (5 for content, 5 for accuracy, 1 for total accuracy).
 - Our coding: Question 25 was divided into 4 parts- 1 for each crash city. Each part had 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Reasons for differences: We again did not include a fifth column for crash city because we did not think it was necessary. We did include columns for accuracy, but did not include a column for total accuracy, as total accuracy was taken into account at the end of the factual information section.
- Additional coding notes: Western Pennsylvania was considered a correct response as one of the crash sites.

Question 26 (President's location)

- Coding manual: 2 columns (1 state/city, 1 specific locale).
- Our coding: 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Reasons for differences: We did not break the question up into state/city and specific locale as not many of our subjects answered in a specific manner.

Question 27 (first perception)

- Coding manual: 1 column (code for first perception)
- Our coding: 4 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response).
- Reasons for differences: The only differences for this column are the differences mentioned at the beginning of these notes.

Question 28 (important events)

- Coding manual:
 - 1 for 1st WTC building hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 2nd WTC building hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for Pentagon hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for hijacked plane crashes near Pittsburgh. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 1st WTC building collapsed. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.

- 1 for 2nd WTC building collapsed. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
- 1 for total number of important events mentioned. This column's code was the sum of the responses for columns 1-6.
- Our coding: 14 columns.
 - 1 for 1st WTC building hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 2nd WTC building hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for Pentagon hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for hijacked plane crashes near Pittsburgh. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 1st WTC building collapsed. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 2nd WTC building collapsed. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for total number of events in columns 1-6 mentioned. This column's code was the sum of the responses for columns 1-6.
 - 1 for total number of words in the response. The code for this column was a count of the number of words the subject used in his/her response.
 - 1 for presence or absence of a response. Responses were coded 1 if present, 0 if absent.
 - 1 for emotional description. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for any accurate but not specific details mentioned. Coded 1 if subject responded in any nonspecific way that could not be reasonably interpreted as one of the events mentioned in columns 1-6 (such as planes crashed), and 0 if not stated.
 - 1 for mention of people killed. Coded 1 if mentioned, 0 if not stated.
 - 1 for other. Coded 1 if the subject mentioned another event that occurred on 9.11.01 that was not one of the events in columns 1-6 (such as planes were hijacked), and 0 if not stated.
 - 1 for inaccuracies. Coded 1 if the subject responded inaccurately (such as the WTC was bombed), and 0 if not.
- Reasons for differences: We added 7 columns to the coding for this question, because we thought we did not capture the full spectrum of subject's responses with the columns given in the coding manual. By adding the columns that we did, we got a more complete picture of the responses our subjects were making.
 - Additional coding notes: "Tower" was considered a specific answer for the World Trade Center. Building was considered an accurate but not specific response. Crumbling was considered a specific collapse response. One person referred to the World Trade Center being razed, which was included in the columns for World Trade Center collapse, but not for airplanes striking the towers. If it could be reasonably inferred that the subject meant that the plane crashed into the World Trade Center they were given a code of one in that

column. For example, a response of “1st one plane crashed into World Trade Center, then the 2nd hit” would be coded as 1 in both columns, even though they did not explicitly state the World Trade Center for the 2nd plane. Mention of a portion of the pentagon collapsing was coded as a 1 in the pentagon-hit column. Mention of a plane crashing in an open field was not considered specific enough to count as a point for the Pittsburgh crash.

Question 29 (order of events)

- Coding manual:
 - 1 for awareness of a WTC building being hit by a hijacked plane. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which the subject became aware of this event.
 - 1 for awareness of a 2nd WTC building being hit by a hijacked plane. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which the subject became aware of this event.
 - 1 for awareness of the Pentagon being hit by a hijacked plane. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which the subject became aware of this event.
 - 1 for awareness of the crash outside Pittsburgh. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which the subject became aware of this event.
 - 1 for awareness of a WTC building collapsing. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which the subject became aware of this event.
 - 1 for awareness of a 2nd WTC building collapsing. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which the subject became aware of this event.
 - 1 for actual order of a WTC building being hit by a hijacked plane. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which this event was recalled.
 - 1 for actual order of a 2nd WTC building being hit by a hijacked plane. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which this event was recalled.
 - 1 for actual order of the Pentagon being hit by a hijacked plane. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which this event was recalled.
 - 1 for actual order of the crash outside Pittsburgh. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which this event was recalled.
 - 1 for actual order of a WTC building collapsing. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which this event was recalled.
 - 1 for actual order of a 2nd WTC building collapsing. Coded 1-6 based on the order in which this event was recalled.
- Our coding: This question was split up into four parts (first event subject became aware of, last event subject became aware of, first event that actually occurred, and last event that actually occurred). The first two parts had two columns each – 1 for the response code, and 1 for presence or absence of a response. Parts three and four had 3 columns each – the same two columns as in parts one and two, plus an additional column for correct/incorrect. (Note that none of these parts had a column for recall response- this question was recognition only).
- Reasons for differences: The differences in coding for this question are mainly a result of differences in the surveys. Question 29 on our survey asked only for the first event and the last event the subject became aware of and actually occurred. The coding manual codes for a survey in which subjects were asked to indicate the order of all events. Because we were mainly interested in whether or not subjects responded for parts one and two and whether or not the response was correct for parts

three and four, our coding was more efficient for our needs than breaking it up into 6 columns for each part.

Composite columns for 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4

- Coding manual: not present.
- Our coding: There were six columns that served as composite scores of the factual questions. The first was the number of correct recall responses for each subject, over all factual questions. The second was a percentage of correct recall responses, which was the number from the preceding column divided by 18. The third was a percentage of factual recall responses, which was a mean of the recall response columns for 22-26. The fourth was the number of correct recognition responses for each subject. The fifth was a percentage of correct recognition responses, which was the number from the preceding column divided by 20. The sixth was a percentage of factual recognition responses, which was a mean of the recognition response columns for 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.
- Reasons for differences: Creating composite scores of factual related items enabled us to analyze differences in subjects' responses to all questions of this type, as well as analyzing each question separately.

Questions 30 – 35 (future emotions)

- Coding manual: 1 column for each question (for response code)
- Our coding: 2 columns for each question (1 for response code, 1 for presence of a response)
- Reasons for differences: There were no differences for the questions in this section (except one difference present throughout, which is addressed at the beginning of these notes).
- Additional coding notes: For emotional questions, we used the group mean for each emotion to replace the blank spaces for subjects who did not respond to that particular question.

Composite columns for future emotions (30-35)

- Coding manual: not present
- Our coding: There were three columns for the subject's pattern of responses to the current emotions questions. One was an average intensity based on responses to the questions they answered. The second was a total for the number of items they responded to, with a highest possible score of 6. The third was a percentage, which was the value in the preceding column divided by 6.
- Reasons for differences: Creating composite scores of future emotion related items enabled us to analyze differences in subjects' responses to all questions of this type, as well as analyzing each question separately.

Question 36 (other future emotions)

- Coding manual: addendum category list with notation of intensity.
- Our coding: 1 column indicating presence or absence of a response.
- Reasons for differences: We were interested in how many subjects from each group responded to this question. Their responses covered a large range, however, and there

was not a lot of overlap with the subjects stating a particular emotion, so we did not analyze their actual responses.

Question 37 (activity percentage question)

- Coding manual: The code for each of the following columns was the percentage of time stated, if the total of the percentages added up to 100. If not, an adjusted percentage was calculated such that the total of the percentages added up to be 100. This was then entered as the code for that column.
 - Column for watching television to get information about the attack
 - Column for talking to friends/relatives about the attack
 - Column for listening to radio coverage of the attack
 - Column for consulting the internet for news about the attack
 - Column for reading published accounts of the attack
 - Column for going about your daily activities
 - Column for trying to help those who were hurt in some manner
 - Column for walking around to see what you could see
 - Column for other
- Our coding: The code for each of the following columns was the stated percentage of time.
 - Column for watching television to get information about the attack
 - Column for talking to friends/relatives about the attack
 - Column for listening to radio coverage of the attack
 - Column for consulting the internet for news about the attack
 - Column for reading published accounts of the attack
 - Column for going about your daily activities
 - Column for other
 - The column for trying to help those who were hurt in some manner was coded as 1 if stated, 0 if not stated (as most of those who did help did so by a monetary donation, for which amount of time spent is not applicable).
- Reasons for differences: The column for walking around to see what you could see was not included in our coding. It was not a relevant activity for people in this area. We did not adjust percentages for our subjects, as some of the activities could be done simultaneously. We therefore felt that it was more accurate to analyze subjects' actual responses to this question.
- Additional coding notes: If the subject stated hrs/day instead of percentages, we based their answers on a 16-hour day. A response of a couple of hours was assumed to mean 2 hrs. For a range of time (ex. 2-3 hrs), the mean was taken as their response. If a subject gave two different time points for answers, their answers surrounding the first couple of days after the event were the ones coded. One subject said almost 100% for one of the items, which was coded as 100%. All day was coded as 100%.

Question 38 (% chance of another terrorist attack. Note that this is question 37 in the coding manual)

- Coding manual: 3 columns – 1 for each time period (month, year, five years). The code for each column was the stated percentage chance.

- Our coding: 3 columns – 1 for each time period (month, year, five years). The code for each column was the stated percentage chance.
- There were no differences in the coding for this question.
- Additional coding notes: If the subject did not answer in a percentage format, s/he was coded as having no response- the column was left blank.

Question 39 (attack means to you. Question 38 in coding manual)

- Coding manual: 13 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 3 columns for financial/emotional responses, 12 columns for political/social responses, 4 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.
- Our coding: 14 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 4 columns for financial/emotional responses, 13 columns for political/social responses, 5 columns for philosophical/ideological responses.
- Reasons for differences: We added “other” columns to each subdivision, as there were several responses which fit into the subcategories but did not fit into the specific categories listed in the coding manual, and we felt this was the best way to capture them.
- Additional coding notes: A feeling of insecurity was coded under the column for helpless as well as the column for unknown future.

Question 40 (NYC impact)

- Coding manual: 7 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 6 columns for financial/emotional responses, 5 columns for political/social responses, 5 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.
- Our coding: 8 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 7 columns for financial/emotional responses, 6 columns for political/social responses, 6 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.
- Reasons for differences: We added “other” columns to each subdivision, as there were several responses which fit into the subcategories but did not fit into the specific categories listed in the coding manual, and we felt this was the best way to capture them.
- Additional coding notes: Insecurity and uncertainty were coded as fear of being a future target/unsafe. Tragedy was included with pain/sadness. Items such as disaster, surrounding buildings undermined and city torn apart were included with destruction under financial/economic. Responses such as disruption or change in the way of life were included in loss of how things used to be. Responses such as “people are banding together...helping each other” were included in the column for optimism about the future of NY

Question 41 (US impact)

- Coding manual: 5 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 5 columns for financial/emotional responses, 9 columns for political/social responses, 9 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.
- Our coding: 6 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 6 columns for financial/emotional responses, 10 columns for political/social responses, 10 columns for philosophical/ideological responses.

- Reasons for differences: We added “other” columns to each subdivision, as there were several responses which fit into the subcategories but did not fit into the specific categories listed in the coding manual, and we felt this was the best way to capture them.
- Additional coding notes: For #41, two subjects said things implying we should have a stricter immigration policy, which was coded as new domestic legislation. Responses pertaining to the US being more involved in international politics were coded as new foreign policy. Responses such as “things will never be the same” and “change in the way of life” were coded as new stage of American history. Issues pertaining to being loose w/ security were coded as failure of government to secure borders.

Question 42 (greatest concern)

- Coding manual: 3 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 2 columns for financial/emotional responses, 8 columns for political/social responses, 2 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.
- Our coding: 4 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 3 columns for financial/emotional responses, 9 columns for political/social responses, 3 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.
- Reasons for differences: We added “other” columns to each subdivision, as there were several responses which fit into the subcategories but did not fit into the specific categories listed in the coding manual, and we felt this was the best way to capture them.

Question 43 (US response)

- Coding manual: 6 columns for responses toward military strategy, 7 columns for responses toward domestic policy, 5 columns for responses toward foreign policy, 4 columns for responses toward culprits, 1 column for other.
- Our coding: 7 columns for responses toward military strategy, 8 columns for responses toward domestic policy, 6 columns for responses toward foreign policy, 5 columns for responses toward culprits, 1 column for other.
- Reasons for differences: We added “other” columns to each subdivision, as there were several responses which fit into the subcategories but did not fit into the specific categories listed in the coding manual, and we felt this was the best way to capture them.

Question 44 (who’s responsible)

- Coding manual: 19 columns taken from a random sampling or surveys.
- Our coding: same as above
- There were no differences in the coding of this question.

Follow-up survey:

For questions 2-12, 27, 29.1-29.2:

- In order to address questions of consistency in responses between the initial and follow up survey, we added six columns to questions 2-7, 8.2, and 27 (1 for recall consistent, 1 recall distortion, 1 recall failure, 1 recognition consistent, 1 recognition distortion, 1 recognition failure). We added three columns to questions 8.1 (recall only), 29.1, and 29.2 (recognition only). The first three columns coded for whether the recall response was the same at the follow up survey as it was at the initial survey, and the last three coded for whether the recognition response was the same at follow up. If the recall response was the same at follow-up, the recall consistent column was coded 1, if not it was coded 0. If the recall response was different, the recall distortion column was coded as 1. If there was no recall response at follow up (but there had been a response at the initial survey), the recall failed column was coded as 1. In this way, a subject would have a 0 in two of these three columns for all questions, with a 1 in one column at most. The fourth, fifth, and sixth columns coded for whether the recognition response was the same at follow up as it was at the initial survey. If the recognition response was the same, the eighth column was coded as 1. If it was different (but there was a response), the ninth column was coded as 1. If there was no recognition response at follow up (but there had been a response at the initial survey), the tenth column was coded as 1.
- Question 2: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, 1 recognition response yes/no). The first was numerically coded based on the content of the subject's recall response; the second was coded in a binary fashion- 0 if not stated, 1 if stated. The third was numerically coded based on the content of the subject's recognition response, and the fourth was coded in a binary fashion.
- Question 3: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 4: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 5: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 6: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 7: 6 columns (1 for primary emotional recall response code, 1 for secondary emotional recall response code, 1 for presence of an emotional recall response, 1 for primary emotional recognition response, 1 for secondary emotional recognition response, 1 for presence of an emotional recognition response). The first and second columns were coded numerically based on the content of the subject's recall response, the first based on their primary response, the second on their secondary response. The third was given a binary code- 0 if there was no response, 1 if there was. The fourth, fifth and sixth columns followed this pattern for recognition responses.
- Question 8.1: 2 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence of a recall response). The first was numerically coded based on content, and the second was binary.
- Question 8.2: 6 columns (1 for primary emotional recall response code, 1 for secondary emotional recall response code, 1 for presence of an emotional recall response, 1 for

primary emotional recognition response, 1 for secondary emotional recognition response, 1 for presence of an emotional recognition response). See coding for question 7.

- Question 9: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 10: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 11: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.
- Question 12: 4 columns (1 recall response code, 1 recall response yes/no, 1 recognition response code, and 1 recognition response yes/no). See coding for question 2.

Composite columns for 2-12

- Our coding: There were twenty-four columns that were composite scores of 2-12.
 - The first was flashbulb recall score, which was a total of the number of items the subject recalled for 2-12 and 27 (the highest possible was 13, as there were two sections of question 8 for which it was possible to have a recall response).
 - The second was flashbulb recall %, which was simply the number in the preceding column divided by 13.
 - The third was personal recall consistent percentage, which was the average of the recall consistent columns for questions 2-12 and 27.
 - The fourth was recall distortion percentage, which was the average of the recall distortion columns for 2-12 and 27.
 - The fifth was recall failure percentage, which was the average of the recall failure columns for 2-12 and 27.
 - The sixth was adjusted recall consistent percentage, which was the recall consistent percentage divided by the percentage of personal recall questions answered at the initial survey.
 - The seventh was adjusted recall distortion percentage, which was the recall distortion percentage divided by the percentage of personal recall questions answered at the initial survey.
 - The eighth was adjusted recall failure percentage, which was the recall failure percentage divided by the percentage of personal recall questions answered at the initial survey.
 - The ninth was corroborated recall consistent percentage, which was the recall consistent percentage multiplied by the percentage of personal recall responses which were corroborated by spouses at the initial survey.
 - The tenth was an alternative calculation of recall distortion. This was calculated by adding the uncorroborated responses that had been previously counted in the recall consistent column to the recall distortion column.
 - The eleventh was adjusted corroborated recall consistent percentage, which was the corroborated recall consistent percentage divided by the percentage of personal recall questions answered at the initial survey.
 - The twelfth was adjusted alternative recall distortion percentage, which was the alternative calculation of recall distortion divided by the percentage of personal recall questions answered at the initial survey.

- The thirteenth column was flashbulb recognition score, which was the number of recognition responses for questions 2-12, 27, 29.1 and 29.2 (the highest possible was 14, as only one of the parts of question 8 was a recognition question).
- The fourteenth was flashbulb recognition %, which was simply the number in the preceding column divided by 11.
- The fifteenth was flashbulb recognition consistent percentage, which was the average of the recognition consistent columns for questions 2-12, 27, 29.1 and 29.2.
- The sixteenth was recognition distortion percentage, which was the average of the recognition distortion columns for 2-12, 27, 29.1 and 29.2.
- The seventeenth was recognition failure percentage, which was the average of the recognition failure columns for 2-12, 27, 29.1 and 29.2.
- The eighteenth was adjusted recognition consistent percentage, which was the recognition consistent percentage divided by the percentage of personal recognition questions answered at the initial survey.
- The nineteenth was adjusted recognition distortion percentage, which was the recognition distortion percentage divided by the percentage of personal recognition questions answered at the initial survey.
- The twentieth was adjusted recognition failure percentage, which was the recognition failure percentage divided by the percentage of personal recognition questions answered at the initial survey.
- The twenty-first was corroborated recognition consistent percentage, which was the recognition consistent percentage multiplied by the percentage of personal recognition responses which were corroborated by spouses at the initial survey.
- The twenty-second was an alternative calculation of recognition distortion. This was calculated by adding the uncorroborated responses that had been previously counted in the recognition consistent column to the recognition distortion column.
- The twenty-third was adjusted corroborated recognition consistent percentage, which was the corroborated recognition consistent percentage divided by the percentage of personal recognition questions answered at the initial survey.
- The twenty-fourth was adjusted alternative recognition distortion percentage, which was the alternative calculation of recognition distortion divided by the percentage of personal recognition questions answered at the initial survey.

Question 12.1 and 12.2 (predicted 3 and predicted 12 month accuracy)

- 2 columns for each question (1 for response code, 1 for presence of a response).

Questions 13-18 (current emotions)

- 2 columns for each question (1 for response code, 1 for presence of a response)
- Additional coding notes: For emotional questions, we used the group mean for each emotion to replace the blank spaces for subjects who did not respond to that particular question.

Composite scores for current emotions (13-18)

- There were three columns for the subject's pattern of responses to the current emotions questions. One was an average intensity based on responses to the questions they answered. The second was a total for the number of items they responded to, with a highest possible score of 6. The third was a percentage, which was the value in the preceding column divided by 6.

Question 19 (other current emotions)

- 1 column indicating presence or absence of a response.

Questions 20 & 21 (media attention & ensuing conversation)

- 1 column for each (response code)

Factual questions (22-26, 29.3 and 29.4)

- Twelve columns were present for each part of each of the factual questions. More specific details about each question follow.
 - 1 for consistency in factual recall responses between the initial and follow-up surveys. If the responses were the same, this column was coded with a 1, if not it was coded as 0.
 - 1 for accurate and consistent factual recall responses between the initial and follow-up surveys. If the recall response was accurate at the initial survey, and was consistent at the follow-up survey, this column was coded as 1, else 0.
 - 1 for distortion of factual recall responses between the initial and follow-up surveys. If there was a response at follow up, but it was different than it was at the initial survey (and did not change to a correct response at follow-up), this column was coded as 1, else 0.
 - 1 for alternative calculation of distortion of factual recall between the initial and follow-up surveys. In addition to being coded 1 for the reasons in the above column, this column was coded as 1 if the response at the initial survey was inaccurate and their response at the follow-up survey was consistent.
 - 1 for failure of factual recall response at the follow-up survey. If the subject responded to the question at the initial survey, but failed to respond at the follow-up, this column was coded as 1, else 0.
 - 1 for improvement in factual recall. This column was coded as 1 if the subject was incorrect at the initial survey, but correct at the follow-up. Otherwise, it was coded as 0.
 - 1 for consistency in factual recognition responses between the initial and follow-up surveys. If the responses were the same, this column was coded with a 1; if not it was coded as 0.
 - 1 for accurate and consistent factual recognition responses between the initial and follow-up surveys. If the recognition response was accurate at the initial survey, and was consistent at the follow-up survey, this column was coded as 1, else 0.
 - 1 for distortion of factual recognition responses between the initial and follow-up surveys. If there was a response at follow up, but it was different than it was at the initial survey (and did not change to a correct response at follow-up), this column was coded as 1, else 0.
 - 1 for alternative calculation of distortion of factual recognition between the initial and follow-up surveys. In addition to being coded 1 for the reasons in the above column, this

column was coded as 1 if the response at the initial survey was inaccurate and their response at the follow-up survey was consistent.

- 1 for failure of factual recognition response at the follow-up survey. If the subject responded to the question at the initial survey, but failed to respond at the follow-up, this column was coded as 1, else 0.
- 1 for improvement in factual recognition. This column was coded as 1 if the subject was incorrect at the initial survey, but correct at the follow-up. Otherwise, it was coded as 0.

Question 22 (# of planes)

- 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).

Question 23 (which airlines involved and number of planes from each)

- Question 23 was divided into four parts- one for each plane. Each part had 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).

Question 24 (intended flight path of each plane)

- Question 24 was divided into 8 parts- 1 for each departure and 1 for each intended arrival. Each part had 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Additional coding notes: If subjects answered CA or West Coast, but would not choose the city when prompted with a recognition task, the response was coded as incorrect for both recall and recognition. Similarly, if subjects said either SF or LA but would not say which, they were coded as incorrect.

Question 25 (crash cities)

- Question 25 was divided into 4 parts- 1 for each crash city. Each part had 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).
- Additional coding notes: Western Pennsylvania was considered a correct response as one of the crash sites.

Question 26 (President's location)

- 6 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for in/correct recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response, 1 for in/correct recognition response).

Question 27 (first perception)

- 4 columns (1 for recall response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recall response, 1 for recognition response code, 1 for presence/absence of a recognition response).

Question 28 (important events)

- 14 columns.
 - 1 for 1st WTC building hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 2nd WTC building hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for Pentagon hit by a hijacked plane. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for hijacked plane crashes near Pittsburgh. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 1st WTC building collapsed. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for 2nd WTC building collapsed. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for total number of events in columns 1-6 mentioned. This column's code was the sum of the responses for columns 1-6.
 - 1 for total number of words in the response. The code for this column was a count of the number of words the subject used in his/her response.
 - 1 for presence or absence of a response. Responses were coded 1 if present, 0 if absent.
 - 1 for emotional description. Responses were coded 1 if stated, 0 if not mentioned.
 - 1 for any accurate but not specific details mentioned. Coded 1 if subject responded in any nonspecific way that could not be reasonably interpreted as one of the events mentioned in columns 1-6 (such as planes crashed), and 0 if not stated.
 - 1 for mention of people killed. Coded 1 if mentioned, 0 if not stated.
 - 1 for other. Coded 1 if the subject mentioned another event that occurred on 9.11.01 that was not one of the events in columns 1-6 (such as planes were hijacked), and 0 if not stated.
 - 1 for inaccuracies. Coded 1 if the subject responded inaccurately (such as the WTC was bombed), and 0 if not.
 - Additional coding notes: "Tower" was considered a specific answer for the World Trade Center. Building was considered an accurate but not specific response. Crumbling was considered a specific collapse response. One person referred to the World Trade Center being razed, which was included in the columns for World Trade Center collapse, but not for airplanes striking the towers. If it could be reasonably inferred that the subject meant that the plane crashed into the World Trade Center they were given a code of one in that column. For example, a response of "1st one plane crashed into World Trade Center, then the 2nd hit" would be coded as 1 in both columns, even though they did not explicitly state the World Trade Center for the 2nd plane. Mention of a portion of the pentagon collapsing was coded as a 1 in the pentagon-hit column. Mention of a plane crashing in an open field was not considered specific enough to count as a point for the Pittsburgh crash.

Question 29 (order of events)

- This question was split up into four parts (first event subject became aware of, last event subject became aware of, first event that actually occurred, and last event that actually occurred). The first two parts had two columns each – 1 for the response code, and 1 for presence or absence of a response. Parts three and four had 3 columns each – the same two

columns as in parts one and two, plus an additional column for correct/incorrect. (Note that none of these parts had a column for recall response- this question was recognition only).

Composite columns for 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4

- There were sixteen columns that served as composite scores of the factual questions.
 - The first was the number of correct recall responses for each subject, over all factual questions.
 - The second was a percentage of correct recall responses, which was the number from the preceding column divided by 18.
 - The third was a percentage of consistent factual recall responses for questions 22-26.
 - The fourth was a percentage of accurate and consistent factual recall responses for questions 22-26.
 - The fifth was a percentage of distorted factual recall responses for questions 22-26.
 - The sixth was a percentage of the alternative calculation of distorted factual recall for questions 22-26.
 - The seventh was a percentage of failed factual recall responses for questions 22-26.
 - The eighth was a percentage of improved factual recall responses for questions 22-26.
 - The ninth was adjusted percentage of consistent factual recall responses for questions, which was the percentage of consistent factual recall responses divided by the percentage of factual recall responses at the initial survey.
 - The tenth was adjusted percentage of accurate and consistent factual recall responses, which was the percentage of accurate and consistent factual recall divided by the percentage of factual recall responses at the initial survey.
 - The eleventh was adjusted percentage of distorted factual recall responses for questions, which was the percentage of distorted factual recall responses divided by the percentage of factual recall responses at the initial survey.
 - The twelfth was adjusted percentage of alternative distorted factual recall responses for questions, which was the percentage of alternative distorted factual recall responses divided by the percentage of factual recall responses at the initial survey.
 - The thirteenth was adjusted percentage of failed factual recall responses for questions, which was the percentage of failed factual recall responses divided by the percentage of factual recall responses at the initial survey.
 - The fourteenth was adjusted percentage of improved factual recall responses for questions, which was the percentage of improved factual recall responses divided by the percentage of factual recall responses at the initial survey.
 - The fifteenth was the number of correct recognition responses for each subject.
 - The sixteenth was a percentage of correct recognition responses, which was the number from the preceding column divided by 20.
 - The seventeenth was a percentage of consistent factual recognition responses for questions 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.
 - The eighteenth was a percentage of distorted factual recognition responses for questions 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.
 - The nineteenth was a percentage of accurate and consistent factual recognition responses for questions 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.

- The twentieth was a percentage of the alternative calculation of distorted factual recall for questions 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.
- The twenty-first was a percentage of failed factual recall responses for questions 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.
- The twenty-second was a percentage of improved factual recall responses for questions 22-26, 29.3 and 29.4.
- The twenty-third was adjusted percentage of consistent factual recognition responses for questions, which was the percentage of consistent factual recognition responses divided by the percentage of factual recognition responses at the initial survey.
- The twenty-fourth was adjusted percentage of accurate and consistent factual recognition responses, which was the percentage of accurate and consistent factual recognition divided by the percentage of factual recognition responses at the initial survey.
- The twenty-fifth was adjusted percentage of distorted factual recognition responses for questions, which was the percentage of distorted factual recognition responses divided by the percentage of factual recognition responses at the initial survey.
- The twenty-sixth was adjusted percentage of alternative distorted factual recognition responses for questions, which was the percentage of alternative distorted factual recognition responses divided by the percentage of factual recognition responses at the initial survey.
- The twenty-seventh was adjusted percentage of failed factual recognition responses for questions, which was the percentage of failed factual recognition responses divided by the percentage of factual recognition responses at the initial survey.
- The twenty-eighth was adjusted percentage of improved factual recognition responses for questions, which was the percentage of improved factual recognition responses divided by the percentage of factual recognition responses at the initial survey.

Questions 30 – 35 (future emotions)

- 2 columns for each question (1 for response code, 1 for presence of a response)
- Additional coding notes: For emotional questions, we used the group mean for each emotion to replace the blank spaces for subjects who did not respond to that particular question.

Composite columns for future emotions (30-35)

- There were three columns for the subject's pattern of responses to the current emotions questions. One was an average intensity based on responses to the questions they answered. The second was a total for the number of items they responded to, with a highest possible score of 6. The third was a percentage, which was the value in the preceding column divided by 6.

Question 36 (other future emotions)

- 1 column indicating presence or absence of a response.

Question 37 (activity percentage question)

- Coding manual: The code for each of the following columns was the percentage of time stated, if the total of the percentages added up to 100. If not, an adjusted percentage was calculated such that the total of the percentages added up to be 100. This was then entered as the code for that column.

- Column for watching television to get information about the attack
- Column for talking to friends/relatives about the attack
- Column for listening to radio coverage of the attack
- Column for consulting the internet for news about the attack
- Column for reading published accounts of the attack
- Column for going about your daily activities
- Column for trying to help those who were hurt in some manner
- Column for walking around to see what you could see
- Column for other
- Our coding: The code for each of the following columns was the stated percentage of time.
 - Column for watching television to get information about the attack
 - Column for talking to friends/relatives about the attack
 - Column for listening to radio coverage of the attack
 - Column for consulting the internet for news about the attack
 - Column for reading published accounts of the attack
 - Column for going about your daily activities
 - Column for other
 - The column for trying to help those who were hurt in some manner was coded as 1 if stated, 0 if not stated (as most of those who did help did so by a monetary donation, for which amount of time spent is not applicable).
- Additional coding notes: If the subject stated hrs/day instead of percentages, we based their answers on a 16-hour day. A response of a couple of hours was assumed to mean 2 hrs. For a range of time (ex. 2-3 hrs), the mean was taken as their response. If a subject gave two different time points for answers, their answers surrounding the first couple of days after the event were the ones coded. One subject said almost 100% for one of the items, which was coded as 100%. All day was coded as 100%.

Question 38 (% chance of another terrorist attack. Note that this is question 37 in the coding manual)

- 3 columns – 1 for each time period (month, year, five years). The code for each column was the stated percentage chance.
- Additional coding notes: If the subject did not answer in a percentage format, s/he was coded as having no response- the column was left blank.

Question 39 (attack means to you. Question 38 in coding manual)

- 14 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 4 columns for financial/emotional responses, 13 columns for political/social responses, 5 columns for philosophical/ideological responses.
- Additional coding notes: A feeling of insecurity was coded under the column for helpless as well as the column for unknown future.

Question 40 (NYC impact)

- 8 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 7 columns for financial/emotional responses, 6 columns for political/social responses, 6 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.

- Additional coding notes: Insecurity and uncertainty were coded as fear of being a future target/unsafe. Tragedy was included with pain/sadness. Items such as disaster, surrounding buildings undermined and city torn apart were included with destruction under financial/economic. Responses such as disruption or change in the way of life were included in loss of how things used to be. Responses such as “people are banding together...helping each other” were included in the column for optimism about the future of NY

Question 41 (US impact)

- 6 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 6 columns for financial/emotional responses, 10 columns for political/social responses, 10 columns for philosophical/ideological responses.
- Additional coding notes: For #41, two subjects said things implying we should have a stricter immigration policy, which was coded as new domestic legislation. Responses pertaining to the US being more involved in international politics were coded as new foreign policy. Responses such as “things will never be the same” and “change in the way of life” were coded as new stage of American history. Issues pertaining to being loose w/ security were coded as failure of government to secure borders.

Question 42 (greatest concern)

- 4 columns for emotional/psychological responses, 3 columns for financial/emotional responses, 9 columns for political/social responses, 3 columns for philosophical/ideological responses, 1 column for other.

Question 43 (US response)

- 7 columns for responses toward military strategy, 8 columns for responses toward domestic policy, 6 columns for responses toward foreign policy, 5 columns for responses toward culprits, 1 column for other.

Question 44 (who’s responsible)

- 19 columns taken from a random sampling of surveys.

Appendix D:

Expanded Version of Table 1

Appendix D: Table 1 Expanded, Personal Questions

Question	Recall			Recognition		
	AD	MCI	Older adults	AD	MCI	Older adults
2 (time became aware)	.60	.83	1.00	.86	1.00	1.00
3 (source of information)	.87	1.00	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00
4 (location when heard)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
5 (activity at the time)	.73	.94	1.00	.82	.90	1.00
6 (who else was there)	.93	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
7 (emotional response)	.93	1.00	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00
8a (person first talked with)	.93	1.00	1.00	--	--	--
8b (emotion of that person)	.93	.94	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00
9 (prior activity)	.80	.94	1.00	.86	.90	1.00
10 (subsequent activity)	.73	1.00	1.00	.86	1.00	1.00
11 (personal losses)	.93	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
12 (inconvenience in daily life)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
27 (interpretation of events)	.87	1.00	1.00	.95	1.00	1.00
29a (event aware of first)	--	--	--	.77	1.00	1.00
29b (event aware of last)	--	--	--	.68	.95	1.00
Mean	.87	.97	1.00	.91	.98	1.00
Verified Mean	.72			.74		

Notes: see Appendix for key to questions. -- indicates not applicable.

Appendix D: Table 1 Expanded, Factual Questions

Question	Recall						Recognition					
	AD		MCI		Older Adults		AD		MCI		Older Adults	
	Response	Accuracy	Response	Accuracy	Response	Accuracy	Response	Accuracy	Response	Accuracy	Response	Accuracy
22 (# of planes)	.73	.00	1.00	.78	1.00	.93	.91	.18	1.00	.76	1.00	.96
23a (plane 1 airline)	.13	.07	.72	.56	.87	.67	.55	.09	.86	.62	.83	.65
23b (plane 2 airline)	.00	.00	.44	.28	.60	.47	.23	.05	.52	.24	.65	.48
23c (plane 3 airline)	.13	.13	.67	.67	.87	.87	.32	.23	.62	.62	.83	.83
23d (plane 4 airline)	.00	.00	.50	.50	.53	.53	.09	.05	.43	.43	.61	.57
24a (departure 1)	.60	.27	.78	.78	.93	.93	.64	.27	.76	.76	.96	.96
24b (arrival 1)	.07	.07	.78	.56	.87	.73	.18	.09	.71	.52	.83	.78
24c (departure 2)	.20	.07	.61	.61	1.00	1.00	.27	.14	.62	.57	.91	.91
24d (arrival 2)	.00	.00	.56	.33	.73	.60	.05	.00	.52	.33	.57	.52
24e (departure 3)	.13	.00	.56	.33	.67	.47	.27	.05	.62	.43	.65	.48
24f (arrival 3)	.07	.07	.44	.06	.53	.07	.09	.09	.33	.10	.43	.22
24g (departure 4)	.13	.07	.39	.28	.73	.40	.14	.05	.38	.29	.70	.43
24h (arrival 4)	.00	.00	.22	.00	.53	.20	.05	.00	.19	.00	.35	.22
25a (crash city 1)	.53	.40	1.00	.94	1.00	1.00	.64	.50	.95	.95	1.00	1.00
25b (crash city 2)	.47	.33	.94	.94	1.00	1.00	.55	.41	.90	.86	1.00	1.00
25c (crash city 3)	.40	.20	.94	.89	.93	.93	.50	.23	.95	.86	.96	.96
25d (crash city 4)	.33	.13	.89	.78	1.00	.73	.50	.32	.86	.76	1.00	.91
26 (President's location)	.40	.07	.78	.56	.87	.67	.73	.09	.90	.57	.91	.70
29c (first event)	--	--	--	--	--	--	.68	.45	.95	.95	1.00	.96
29d (last event)	--	--	--	--	--	--	.64	.18	.95	.67	1.00	.96
Mean	.23	.10	.67	.55	.78	.68	.40	.17	.69	.56	.81	.72

Notes: see Appendix for key to questions. -- indicates not applicable.