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# Demographic Questions

## Phrasing and coding

*Age* was asked “how old are you?” measured and coded categorically where 1= “18-24 years old”, 2= “25-34 years old,” 3= “35-44 years old,” 4= “45-54 years old,” 5= “55-64 years old,” and 6= “65+ years old.” No respondents answered “under 18.”

*Sex* was asked “what is your sex?” where participants could answer “male,” “female,”, “other,” and “prefer not to answer.” This was recoded so that 0= “man”, 1= “female.” All “other” and “prefer not to answer” respondents were excluded from analyses regarding *sex*.

*Education* was asked, “what is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?” The options included “less than high school degree,” “high school graduate (or equivalent including GED),” “some college but no degree,” “associate degree in college (2-year),” “bachelor’s degree in college (4-year), “master’s degree,” “doctoral degree,” and “professional degree (JD, MD).” This was recoded categorically so that 1=high school or less, 2=some college, 3=Bachelors degree, and 4=graduate degree.

*Location* was posed “Please describe in what type of area you live” with answer options “big city, central,” “big city, fringe/suburb, “city or large town, central,” “city or large town, fringe/suburb,” “small town,” and “rural.” This was recoded categorically so that 1= big city, 2= small city or large town, 3= small town or rural.

*Income* was asked “What was your total household income before taxes during the past 12 months?” with answer options “less than $25,000,” “$25,000-$49,999,” “$50,000-$74,999,” “$75,000-$99,999”, “$100,000-$149,999,” “150,000 or more”, or “prefer not to say.” This was recoded categorically as follows: 1=less than $50,000, 2=$50,000-$99,999 and 3=greater than or equal to $100,000. 50 people preferred not to answer and 3 did not respond to this question. These respondents were excluded from the exploratory analysis.

## Participant demographics by policy justification and policy case

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Treatment | Case |
|  | Total | Control | Anthro. | NonAnthro. | Infra. | Cons. |
| n | 1604 | 527 | 552 | 525 | 796 | 808 |
| % (n) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age  | 18-25 | 9 (148) | (52) | (54) | (42) | (75) | (73) |
| 25-34 | 32 (510) | (168) | (160) | (182) | (253) | (257) |
| 35-44 | 27 (429) | (139) | (152) | (138) | (202) | (227) |
| 45-54 | 14 (228) | (75) | (72) | (81) | (113) | (115) |
| 55-64 | 11 (181) | (53) | (82) | (46) | (98) | (83) |
| 65+ | 7 (108) | (40) | (32) | (36) | (55) | (53) |
| Sex | Male | 50 (790) | (251) | (268) | (271) | (375) | (415) |
| Female | 50 (795) | (265) | (281) | (249) | (409) | (386) |
| Education | High school or less | 12 (196) | (58) | (71) | (67) | (104) | (92) |
| Some college | 28 (454) | (142) | (161) | (151) | (226) | (228) |
| Bachelors degree | 43 (693) | (241) | (238) | (216) | (335) | (358) |
| Graduate degree | 16 (261) | (86) | (84) | (91) | (131) | (130) |
| Location | Big city | 34 (542) | (183) | (185) | (174) | (257) | (285) |
| Small city or large town | 42 (667) | (215) | (223) | (229) | (348) | (319) |
| Small town or rural | 25 (395) | (129) | (144) | (122) | (191) | (204) |
| Income  | Less than $50,000  | 34 (531) | (168) | (188) | (175) | (259) | (274) |
| $50,000-$99,999 | 41 (627) | (217) | (202) | (208) | (307) | (320) |
| Greater than or equal to $100,000 | 25 (393) | (127) | (140) | (126) | (202) | (191) |

19 people did not answer male or female for sex. 50 people preferred not to report their income and 3 didn’t respond. We exclude these participants from the analysis.

## Randomization test of 6 experimental groups

*Results from ANOVA tests*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | F statistic | Significance |
| Age | 0.72 | 0.61 |
| Sex | 3.70 | 0.054 |
| Education | 0.09 | 0.97 |
| Location | 0.61 | 0.54 |
| Income  | 0.35 | 0.71 |
| Political Identification | 0.69 | 0.41 |
| Environmental Concern | 0.66 | 0.62 |
| Intrinsic Evaluation | 1.09 | 0.36 |

# Primary analysis and hypothesis testing

## Normality checks for policy acceptability and post-treatment variables

*Results from Shapiro Wilk test and Skewness and Kurtosis Test*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | n | W | V | z | Prob>z | Pr(skewness) | Pr(kurtosis) | chi2(2) | Prob>chi2 |
| Policy acceptability | 1604 | 0.96 | 32.05 | 8.75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205.79 | 0 |
| Perceived Justification | 1599 | 0.99 | 5.31 | 4.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93.07 | 0 |
| Preferred Justification | 1600 | 0.98 | 15.78 | 6.96 | 0 | 0.37 | 0.05 | 4.66 | 0.10 |

## T-test results for policy acceptability

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene f value | t-statistic |  | 95% CI Lower difference | 95% CI Upper difference | Cohen’s d (effect size) |
| Infrastructure v. Conservation case | 1.29 | -5.27\*\*\* |  | 5.61 | 5.74 | -0.26 |
| Anthropocentric v. control treatment | 1.14 | 0.61 |  | 5.53 | 5.68 | 0.04 |
| Non-anthropocentric v. control treatment | 1.20 | -2.25\* |  | 5.64 | 5.80 | -0.14 |
| Anthropocentric v. Non-anthropocentric | 1.06 | -2.99\*\* |  | 5.62 | 5.77 | -0.18 |

## \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

## Primary linear regression results for policy acceptability

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 |
| Anthropocentric justification (*control* as base) | -0.0485 |  | 0.0251 |  |
| (0.0798) |  | (0.112) |  |
| Non-anthropocentric Justification(*control* as base) |  | 0.180\* |  | 0.295\*\* |
|  | (0.0798) |  | (0.112) |
| Conservation case (*Infrastructure* as base) |  |  | 0.465\*\*\* | 0.465\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.113) | (0.112) |
| Anthropocentric ##conservation (*control* and *infrastructure* as base) |  |  | -0.152 |  |
|  |  | (0.158) |  |
| Non-anthropocentric##conservation (*control* and *infrastructure* as base) |  |  |  | -0.233 |
|  |  |  | (0.158) |
| \_cons | 5.630\*\*\* | 5.630\*\*\* | 5.398\*\*\* | 5.398\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0570) | (0.0564) | (0.0798) | (0.0789) |
| *N* | 1079 | 1052 | 1079 | 1052 |
| *R*2 | 0.000 | 0.005 | 0.023 | 0.025 |
| adj. *R*2 | -0.001 | 0.004 | 0.020 | 0.022 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

## Between treatment linear regression results for policy acceptability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | M5 | M6 |
| Between justification(*Anthropocentric* as base) | 0.228\*\* | 0.270\* |
| (.0763) | (0.108) |
| Conservation case (*Infrastructure* as base) |  | 0.313\*\* |
|  | (0.106) |
| Non-anthropocentric##conservation (*anthropocentric* and *infrastructure* as base) |  | -0.0807 |
|  | (0.152) |
| \_cons | 5.582\*\*\* | 5.432\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0533) | (0.0755) |
| *N* | 1077 | 1077 |
| *R*2 | 0.008 | 0.020 |
| adj. *R*2 | .007 | 0.018 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.00

# Post treatment spill over analysis

## Post-treatment variables by justification and case, mean (s.d)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Justification | Case |
|  | Total | Control | Anthro. | NonAnthro. | Infra. | Cons. |
| *Perceived justification* (1=people and society, 4=both options equally, 7=wildlife and ecosystems) | 3.41 (1.64) | 3.37 (1.61) | 2.97 (1.54) | 3.93 (1.63) | 3.03 (1.58) | 3.79 (1.62) |
| *Preferred justification* (1=people and society, 4=both options equally, 7=wildlife and ecosystems) | 4.29 (1.42) | 4.31 (1.4) | 4.08 (1.35) | 4.48 (1.47) | 4.11 (1.34) | 4.46 (1.47) |

5 did not respond for *perceived justification* and 4 didn’t respond for *preferred justification*. We exclude these participants in analysis.

## Means and standard deviations for perceived justification

|  |
| --- |
| **Perceived Justification** mean (SD) |
| Control | Anthropocentric | Non-anthropocentric |
| 3.37 (1.61)n = 525 | 2.97 (1.54)n = 552 | 3.93 (1.63)n = 522 |
| **Perceived justification split by policy case** |
| Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation |
| 2.92 (1.52)n = 262 | 3.83 (1.57)n = 261 | 2.53 (1.37)n = 272 | 3.39 (1.58)n = 280 | 3.68 (1.62)n = 257 | 4.18 (1.60)n = 265 |

## Means and standard deviations for perceived justification, excluding those who failed comprehension check

|  |
| --- |
| **Perceived Justification** mean (SD) |
| Control | Anthropocentric | Non-anthropocentric |
| 3.14 (1.41)n = 157 | 2.33 (1.25)n = 331 | 4.00 (1.63)n = 464 |
| **Perceived justification split by policy case** |
| Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation |
| 2.83 (1.24)n = 93 | 3.59 (1.53)n = 64 | 2.19 (1.17)n = 202 | 2.57 (1.35)n = 129 | 3.75 (1.62)n = 219 | 4.22 (1.61)n = 245 |

## Means and standard deviations for preferred justification

|  |
| --- |
| **Preferred Justification** mean (SD) |
| Control | Anthropocentric | Non-anthropocentric |
| 4.31 (1.41)n = 526 | 4.07 (1.35)n = 551 | 4.48 (1.47)n = 523 |
| **Preferred justification split by policy case** |
| Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation |
| 4.07 (1.34)n = 264 | 4.38 (1.42)n = 262 | 3.89 (1.26)n = 272 | 4.25 (1.41)n = 279 | 4.38 (1.38)n = 260 | 4.59 (1.55)n = 263 |

## Means and standard deviations for preferred justification, excluding those who failed comprehension check

|  |
| --- |
| **Preferred Justification** mean (SD) |
| Control | Anthropocentric | Non-anthropocentric |
| 4.31 (1.41)n = 526 | 4.07 (1.35)n = 551 | 4.48 (1.47)n = 523 |
| **Preferred justification split by policy case** |
| Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation |
| 4.15 (1.21)n = 93 | 4.48 (1.23)n = 64 | 3.83 (1.25)n = 202 | 3.84 (1.40)n = 128 | 4.45 (1.40)n = 221 | 4.67 (1.54)n = 243 |

## Linear regression results for spillover effects with policy justification

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Perceived Justification | Perceived Justification+ | Preferred Justification | Preferred Justification+ |
|  | S.M1 | S.M2 | S.M3 | S.M4 |
| Anthropocentric (*control* as base) | -0.408\*\*\* | -0.802\*\*\* | -0.234\*\* | -0.456\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0971) | (0.143) | (0.0857) | (0.134) |
| Non-anthropocentric (*control* as base) | 0.558\*\*\* | 0.862\*\*\* | 0.174\* | 0.278\* |
|  | (0.0985) | (0.136) | (0.0868) | (0.128) |
| \_cons | 3.373\*\*\* | 3.140\*\*\* | 4.310\*\*\* | 4.287\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0695) | (0.118) | (0.0613) | (0.110) |
| *N* | 1599 | 952 | 1600 | 951 |
| *R*2 | 0.058 | 0.207 | 0.014 | 0.054 |
| adj. *R*2 | 0.057 | 0.205 | 0.013 | 0.052 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001, +only those who passed comprehension check

## Linear regression results for spillover effects with policy case and policy justification interaction

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Perceived Justification | Preferred Justification |
| S.M5 | S.M6 | S.M7 | P.M8 |
| Anthropocentric justification (*control* as base) | -0.399\*\* |  | -0.179 |  |
| (0.131) |  | (0.117) |  |
| Non-anthropocentric Justification (*control* as base) |  | 0.753\*\*\* |  | 0.305\* |
|  | (0.138) |  | (0.125) |
| Conservation case (*Infrastructure* as base) | 0.903\*\*\* | 0.903\*\*\* | 0.478\*\*\* | 0.478\*\*\* |
| (0.132) | (0.138) | (0.118) | (0.124) |
| Anthropocentric ##conservation (*control* and *infrastructure* as base) | -0.0362 |  | -0.117 |  |
| (0.185) |  | (0.166) |  |
| Non-anthropocentric##conservation (*control* and *infrastructure* as base) |  | -0.403\* |  | -0.265 |
|  | (0.195) |  | (0.176) |
| \_cons | 2.924\*\*\* | 2.924\*\*\* | 4.072\*\*\* | 4.072\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0932) | (0.0971) | (0.0836) | (0.0878) |
| *N* | 1077 | 1047 | 1077 | 1049 |
| *R*2 | 0.094 | 0.078 | 0.031 | 0.020 |
| adj. *R*2 | 0.092 | 0.076 | 0.028 | 0.017 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

# Additional and demographics analysis:

Regressions were run with environmental concern and nature evaluation as continuous and indicator variables. Only significant regressions are reported (thus the absence of indicator results).

There were significant interactions when regressing policy acceptability on (1) environmental concern or (2) intrinsic evaluation, a binary indicator of the policy case, and an interaction of the two. This indicated that participants with high levels of environmental concern have higher policy acceptability when given the conservation expansion compared to wildlife infrastructure case, b=.31, SE=.07, p<.00, 95% CI [.18, .44]. Likewise, those given the conservation case with high reported levels of intrinsically evaluating nature have higher policy acceptability than those given the infrastructure case, b=.20, SE=.04, p<.00, 95% CI [.12, .28].

An additional model regressing policy acceptability on a policy case indicator, nature evaluation as categorical, policy justification, and an interaction of the latter two showed one interesting interaction. There was one meaningful interaction between non-anthropocentric justification and intrinsic evaluation; participants with the highest levels of intrinsic evaluation (reporting level 7) compared to lowest have higher policy acceptability when given the non-anthropocentric justification than anthropocentric and no justification. Too few participants reported instrumental evaluations of nature to meaningfully detect an effect at the lower levels of this measure, but the pattern held between anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric treatment for levels higher than 4 even if the interactions were not significant

## Additional linear regression results of policy acceptability

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | E.M1 | E.M2 | E.M3 | E.M4 | E.M5 | E.M6 |
| Anthropocentric justification (*control* as base) |  | -0.0698 |  | -0.0341 |  | -0.0551 |
|  | (0.0759) |  | (0.0717) |  | (0.0741) |
| Non-anthropocentric Justification(*control* as base) |  | 0.166\* |  | 0.210\*\* |  | 0.178\* |
|  | (0.0769) |  | (0.0726) |  | (0.0751) |
| Conservation case (*Infrastructure* as base) |  | 0.0605 |  | -1.003\*\*\* |  | -0.787\*\*\* |
|  | (0.114) |  | (0.290) |  | (0.238) |
| Democrat(*Republican* as base) | 0.672\*\*\* | 0.472\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
| (0.0689) | (0.0964) |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat##conservation (*Republican* and *infrastructure* as base) |  | 0.389\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.136) |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental concern (1=low, 5=high) |  |  | 0.537\*\*\* | 0.386\*\*\* |  |  |
|  |  | (0.0339) | (0.0464) |  |  |
| Environmental concern##conservation (*infrastructure* as base) |  |  |  | 0.312\*\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.0665) |  |  |
| Intrinsic evaluation (1=instrumental, 7=intrinsic) |  |  |  |  | 0.228\*\*\* | 0.130\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.0204) | (0.0286) |
| Intrinsic evaluation##conservation (*infrastructure* as base) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.199\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0400) |
| \_cons | 5.202\*\*\* | 5.142\*\*\* | 3.381\*\*\* | 3.801\*\*\* | 4.364\*\*\* | 4.712\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0578) | (0.0902) | (0.148) | (0.207) | (0.121) | (0.177) |
| *N* | 1584 | 1584 | 1599 | 1599 | 1598 | 1598 |
| *R*2 | 0.057 | 0.084 | 0.136 | 0.170 | 0.072 | 0.112 |
| adj. *R*2 | 0.056 | 0.081 | 0.135 | 0.168 | 0.072 | 0.109 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

## Exploratory linear regression results…continued

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | E.M7 |
| Case (*Infrastructure* as base) | Conservation case  | 0.356\*\*\* |
| (0.0610) |
| Justification (*control* as base) | Anthropocentric justification  | 1.440\*\* |
| (0.503) |
| Non-anthropocentric Justification(*control* as base) | 0.142 |
| (0.451) |
| Intrinsic Evaluation (level 1 as base) | Intrinsic evaluation at 2  | 0.377 |
| (0.478) |
| Intrinsic evaluation at 3  | 0.0735 |
| (0.412) |
| Intrinsic evaluation at 4  | 0.209 |
| (0.366) |
| Intrinsic evaluation at 5  | 0.699\* |
| (0.356) |
| Intrinsic evaluation at 6  | 0.988\*\* |
| (0.342) |
| Intrinsic evaluation at 7  | 1.169\*\*\* |
| (0.335) |
| Interaction term (*control* and level *1* as base) | Anthro## Intrinsic eval. at 2  | -1.561\* |
| (0.677) |
| Anthro## Intrinsic eval. at 3  | -1.191 |
| (0.625) |
| Anthro## Intrinsic eval. at 4  | -1.335\* |
| (0.555) |
| Anthro## Intrinsic eval. at 5  | -1.687\*\* |
| (0.541) |
| Anthro## Intrinsic eval. at 6  | -1.658\*\* |
| (0.525) |
| Anthro## Intrinsic eval. at 7  | -1.471\*\* |
| (0.515) |
| Non-anthropocentric## Intrinsic eval. at 2 | -0.0441 |
| (0.657) |
| Non-anthropocentric## Intrinsic eval. at 3  | -0.000304 |
| (0.588) |
| Non-anthropocentric## Intrinsic eval. at 4  | -0.0356 |
| (0.509) |
| Non-anthropocentric## Intrinsic eval. at 5  | -0.232 |
| (0.496) |
| Non-anthropocentric## Intrinsic eval. at 6  | -0.0719 |
| (0.477) |
| Non-anthropocentric## Intrinsic eval. at 7  | 0.204 |
| (0.465) |
|  | \_cons | 4.582\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.326) |
|  | *N* | 1598 |
|  | *R*2 | 0.122 |
|  | adj. *R*2 | 0.111 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

## Adjusted linear predictions of policy acceptability with 95% CIs, interaction of policy justification and Intrinsic Evaluation of Nature



Adjusted linear predictions of model E.M7.

## Demographics linear regression results of policy acceptability

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | D.M1 | D.M2 |
| Case (*Infrastructure* as base) | Conservation case  | 0.309\*\*\* | 0.302\*\*\* |
| (0.0650) | (0.0606) |
| Justification (*control* as base) | Anthropocentric  | -0.0465 | -0.0424 |
| (0.0793) | (0.0739) |
| Non-anthropocentric  | 0.182\* | 0.193\*\* |
| (0.0802) | (0.0749) |
| Education level(*High school or lower* as base) | Some college | 0.226\* | 0.120 |
| (0.112) | (0.104) |
| Bachelors Degree | 0.348\*\* | 0.192 |
| (0.110) | (0.103) |
| Graduate degree | 0.292\* | 0.144 |
| (0.130) | (0.121) |
| Income (*less than $50k* as base) | $50,000-$99,0000 | -0.0413 | 0.00857 |
| (0.0780) | (0.0728) |
| Greater than or equal to $100,000 | 0.00513 | 0.0607 |
| (0.0917) | (0.0856) |
| Sex (*male* as base) | Female | 0.0748 | 0.00651 |
| (0.0651) | (0.0609) |
| Location (*big city* as base) | Small city or large town | -0.00344 | 0.0166 |
| (0.0760) | (0.0708) |
| Small town or rural | -0.113 | 0.0136 |
| (0.0880) | (0.0824) |
|  | Environmental concern (1=low, 5=high) |  | 0.530\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0346) |
|  | \_cons | 5.214\*\*\* | 3.035\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.130) | (0.187) |
|  | *N* | 1536 | 1531 |
|  | *R*2 | 0.031 | 0.161 |
|  | adj. *R*2 | 0.024 | 0.154 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

# Robustness and comprehension check results:

As expected, 60% of participants passed the comprehension check; when considering justification, 89% passed in the non-anthropocentric justification, 60% for anthropocentric, and 30% for control. When removing participants who failed the comprehension check, like our primary analysis significant effects between justification exist. There is also a significant interaction between conservation case and non-anthropocentric justification indicating that those who answered the comprehension check correctly were more sensitive to case than the entire sample.

## Comprehension check results

Comprehension check answers by experiment group; highlighted cells are correct

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | InfrastructureControl | Infra.Anthro | InfraNonAnthro | ConservationControl | Cons.Anthro | Cons. NonAnthro |
| “Well-being of people and society” | 476 | 93 | 202 | 23 | 20 | 129 | 12 |
| “Well-being of wildlife and ecosystems” | 897 | 77 | 45 | 221 | 178 | 131 | 245 |
| “No explicit information” | 226 | 93 | 25 | 16 | 64 | 20 | 8 |
| Percentage correct |  | 35% | 74% | 85% | 24% | 46% | 92% |

## Means and standard deviations for policy acceptability, excluding those who failed comprehension check

|  |
| --- |
| **Policy Justification** mean (SD) |
| Control | Anthropocentric | Non-anthropocentric |
| 5.61 (1.33)n = 157 | 5.53 (1.34)n = 331 | 5.88 (1.21)n = 466 |
| **Policy justification split by policy case** |
| Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation | Infrastructure | Conservation |
| 5.33 (1.45)n = 93 | 6 (1.02)n = 63 | 5.39 (1.37)n = 202 | 5.77 (1.27)n = 129 | 5.77 (1.35)n = 221 | 5.97 (1.07)n = 245 |

## T-test results for policy acceptability*,* excluding those who failed comprehension check

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene f value | t-statistic | 95% CI Lower difference | 95% CI Upper difference | Cohen’s d (effect size) |
| Infrastructure v. Conservation case | 1.53 | -4.53\*\*\* | 5.81 | 6.02 | -0.29 |
| Anthropocentric v. control treatment | 0.99 | 0.54 | 5.44 | 5.68 | 0.05 |
| Non-anthropocentric v. control treatment | 1.21 | -2.25\* | 5.71 | 5.99 | -0.22 |
| Anthropocentric v. Non-anthropocentric | 1.23 | -3.74\*\*\* | 5.77 | 5.99 | -0.27 |

## Linear regression results for policy acceptability*,* excluding those who failed comprehension check

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | R.M1 | R.M2 | R.M3 | R.M4 |
| Anthropocentric justification (*control* as base) | -0.0704 |  | 0.0528 |  |
| (0.130) |  | (0.165) |  |
| Non-anthropocentric Justification(*control* as base) |  | 0.270\* |  | 0.436\*\* |
|  | (0.115) |  | (0.152) |
| Conservation case (*Infrastructure* as base) |  |  | 0.667\*\* | 0.667\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.214) | (0.200) |
| Anthropocentric ##conservation (*control* and *infrastructure* as base) |  |  | -0.285 |  |
|  |  | (0.261) |  |
| Non-anthropocentric##conservation (*control* and *infrastructure* as base) |  |  |  | -0.464\* |
|  |  |  | (0.230) |
| \_cons | 5.605\*\*\* | 5.605\*\*\* | 5.333\*\*\* | 5.333\*\*\* |
|  | (0.107) | (0.0992) | (0.137) | (0.128) |
| *N* | 488 | 623 | 488 | 623 |
| *R*2 | 0.001 | 0.009 | 0.033 | 0.031 |
| adj. *R*2 | -0.001 | 0.007 | 0.027 | 0.026 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

## Between treatment linear regression results for policy acceptability*,* excluding those who failed comprehension check

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | R.M5 | R.M6 |
| Between justification(*Anthropocentric* as base) | 0.341\*\*\* | 0.383\*\* |
| (.0911) | (0.123) |
| Conservation case (*Infrastructure* as base) |  | 0.381\*\* |
|  | (0.142) |
| Non-anthropocentric##conservation (*anthropocentric* and *infrastructure* as base) |  | -0.179 |
|  | (0.184) |
| \_cons | 5.535\*\*\* | 5.386\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0697) | (0.0887) |
| *N* | 797 | 797 |
| *R*2 | 0.017 | 0.030 |
| adj. *R*2 | .016 | 0.026 |

Standard errors in parentheses, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

# Qualtrics Experimental Survey

Advertisement on Prolific

The study will ask your opinion on public expenditure projects.

Answers are to be indicated on scales. That is, you are not expected to type a lot in this study.

The study should take about 2 to 3 minutes to complete and you will be paid 0.50 pounds at completion.

We ask some standard demographic questions and questions about general political leaning, otherwise no sensitive information.

In order to participate, you have to live in the US.

Thank you!

Complete Questionnaire

What is your Prolific ID?

*Please note that this response should auto-fill with the correct ID*

I consent to participating in the study

* I consent

First we have some general questions about you and your opinions.

What is your sex?

* Male
* Female
* Other
* Prefer not to answer

How old are you?

* Under 18
* 18-24 years old
* 25-34 years old
* 35-44 years old
* 45-54 years old
* 55-64 years old
* 65+ years old

What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

* Less than high school degree
* High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED)
* Some college but no degree
* Associate degree in college (2-year)
* Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)
* Master's degree
* Doctoral degree
* Professional degree (JD, MD)

In which state do you currently reside?

▼ Alabama ... I do not reside in the United States

Which of the following options best describe the area where you live?

* Big City, Central
* Big City, Fringe/Suburb
* City or Large Town, Central
* City or Large Town, Fringe/Suburb
* Small Town
* Rural

What was your total household income before taxes during the past 12 months?

* Less than $25,000
* $25,000-$49,999
* $50,000-$74,999
* $75,000-$99,999
* $100,000-$149,999
* $150,000 or more
* Prefer not to say

To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
| I am concerned about the environment  |  |  |  |  |  |

Which statement better reflects your opinion?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |
| Nature matters mostly in the ways that it can help humans. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Aspects of nature have value in themselves regardless of humans. |

How many children under 18 live in your household? For this question, please write *blue* in the "More than 7"-box regardless of how many children you actually have.

* 1
* 2
* 3
* 4
* 5
* 6
* 7
* More than 7 (please type) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Generally speaking, how do you think of yourself politically?

* Republican
* Democrat
* Independent
* Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* No preference

Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?

* Republican
* Democratic

Thank you!

Next we have some questions about your opinion on investments in the environmental domain.

(insert vignette: see table 1 in main text)

What is your opinion on using the state budget to fund an infrastructure/conservation bill of this kind in your state?

* Strongly against 1
* 2
* 3
* Neither for nor against 4
* 5
* 6
* Strongly in favor 7

This question is to make sure our instructions were clear to everyone.

 According to the information written on the previous page, what, if anything, did the bill reflect a concern for?

* The well-being of people and society
* The well-being of wildlife and ecosystems
* There was no explicit information about this

In general, what do you think the government is most concerned for when passing bills like the one described earlier? (displayed horizontally)

* People and society
*
*
* Both options equally
*
*
* Wildlife and ecosystems

In general, what do you think the government should be most concerned for when passing bills like the one described earlier? (displayed horizontally)

* People and society
*
*
* Both options equally
*
*
* Wildlife and ecosystems

Thank you for completing the survey!

Press the arrow to submit and receive your completion code