

Supplemental Information

SI.A: Experimental Protocol

In this section, we describe the protocols and provide the materials and question wordings we used for our experiments.

SI.A1: Study 1—Conjoint Experiment

Our experiment was included in a survey fielded using Lucid Theorem from December 1 to December 3, 2022. Lucid Theorem is a survey respondent recruitment platform commonly used in political science research that provides researchers with survey samples representative of the American public for common demographic characteristics such as race, gender, and party identification (Coppock and McClellan 2019). The researchers paid \$1.00 to Lucid Theorem for each survey respondent, a portion of which was later remitted to each respondent by Lucid in the form of an incentive (e.g., gift card). 2,077 respondents reached the conjoint experiment module in our survey and provided a choice or rating outcome in at least one task.¹ The demographic characteristics of these respondents are presented in SI.A1b.

After providing consent to participate, respondents completed a battery of demographic questions and two attention checks styled after those introduced by Berinsky, Margolis, and Sances (2014).² Subsequently, respondents read a short prompt asking them to imagine that they have won a two-week, all expenses paid vacation package to the destination of their choice in the United States during the following July. On the following pages, they would view information about potential vacation destinations and the states in which they are located provided to them by a travel agent helping them book the vacation package.

¹ At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were provided debriefing materials and given the option to remove their responses from our final analysis by typing “REMOVE” in a text entry box. This mechanism was included in the survey in order to comply with ETSU IRB’s policy that any study that does not provide respondents the researchers’ precise hypotheses in the informed consent document is considered a deception study and must give participants the ability to opt out of the study once the precise hypotheses is stated in the debriefing materials. Because we feared that making participants aware of our precise hypotheses would induce response bias, we sought and received approval as a deception study and provided this opt-out option to respondents. 76 respondents not included in our final sample of 2,077 chose to opt out at the end of the survey.

² The first attention check question copies directly the example from Berinsky, Margolis, and Sances (2014) concerning news sources. The second attention check question uses the same format but instead prompts respondents to indicate which Taylor Swift songs in the list below they had listened to in the past year, but, later in the prompt, specified two choices they should select to indicate they are paying attention.

Each of the following pages presented respondents with one of 10 conjoint tasks³ containing 3 destination profiles⁴ with six pieces of information (i.e., levels of attributes):⁵

- The destination’s community type
- The destination’s average temperature in July
- The travel time to the destination from the respondent’s home
- The most popular tourist activity/attraction at the destination
- The 2020 presidential election result for the state in which the destination is located
- Recent news about the state

After reviewing this information in each task, we asked respondents to indicate their level of interest in vacationing at each of the five destinations on a five-point ordinal scale and to indicate which destination they most preferred.⁶

SI.A1a: EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS

Preface to Conjoint Tasks

Imagine that you entered a contest and won a two-week, all expenses paid vacation package to the destination of your choice in the United States in July 2023. Congratulations!

A travel agent assigned to help you arrange your vacation wants you to first select a destination. To get you started, the travel agent has provided you with several popular vacation destinations to consider.

On each of the following 10 pages, you will be presented with descriptions of 3 potential destinations and the states in which they are located. Once you have reviewed these destinations, you will be asked to indicate your interest in vacationing at them.

Each Conjoint Task

Please review the information about the following 3 vacation destinations and the states in which they are located: *[EACH ATTRIBUTE-LEVEL RANDOMLY DRAWN FROM POTENTIAL VALUES LISTED BELOW]*

³ In our pre-registration document, we anticipated providing respondents with 6 conjoint tasks, but the authors decided before fielding the survey to increase this number to 10 the number of observations but neglected to update this number in the pre-registration document before filing it. We apologize for the oversight.

⁴ While conjoint experiments often only include 2 profiles per task, Jenke et al. (2021) show that the AMCEs recovered when including more than 2 profiles are comparable to those obtained when using only 2 profiles. We utilize 3 profiles per task in order to increase our number of observations without requiring respondents to complete additional tasks.

⁵ Following Hainmueller et al. (2014), we randomized the order in which attributes were presented across respondents but kept constant the order in which they were displayed for all 10 of each respondent’s tasks.

⁶ Because respondents could plausibly choose to not take a vacation if none of the available destinations are sufficiently desirable, we will also provide respondents the ability to abstain from the choice-based outcome (Miller and Ziegler, n.d.).

	Destination 1	Destination 2	Destination 3
Recent state news			
State-level 2020 presidential election result			
Destination's average July temperature (in degrees Fahrenheit)			
Travel time from your home (by air)			
Most popular tourist attractions			
Destination community type			

ATTRIBUTES/LEVELS

RECENT STATE NEWS

- *State legislature enacted a law to expand voters' ability to vote early in elections*
- *State legislature enacted a law to limit voters' ability to vote early in elections*
- *State legislature enacted a law to expand the right to protest at the state capitol building*
- *State legislature enacted a law to limit the right to protest at the state capitol building*
- *State legislature formed a commission to study ways to stimulate economic growth*

COMMUNITY TYPE

- *Urban*
- *Suburban*
- *Rural*

STATE-LEVEL 2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION RESULT

- *Donald Trump won by a large margin*
- *Donald Trump won by a small margin*
- *Joe Biden won by a small margin*
- *Joe Biden won by a large margin*

AVERAGE JULY TEMPERATURE (IN DEGREES FAHRENHEIT)⁷

- *64*
- *67*

⁷ Temperature values based on 20th, 40th, 60th, and 80th percentile values for statewide temperature in July 2021 (obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Climate Monitoring web site, <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/climate-at-a-glance/national/rankings>). Because statewide temperature data is not kept for Hawaii, that for the Honolulu International Airport is used.

- 72
- 78

TRAVEL TIME FROM YOUR HOME (BY AIR)

- *Less than 2 hours*
- *2-4 hours*
- *4-6 hours*
- *More than 6 hours*

MOST POPULAR TOURIST ATTRACTIONS

- *Beaches*
- *National parks*
- *Museums*
- *Theaters*
- *Amusement parks*
- *Sporting events*

Conjoint Task Outcome Questions

How interested are you in vacationing at each destination? [1-5 SCALE, NOT AT ALL INTERESTED TO EXTREMELY INTERESTED]

- Destination 1
- Destination 2
- Destination 3

At which of these destinations are you most interested in vacationing?

- Destination 1
- Destination 2
- Destination 3
- None of these destinations

SI.A1b: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table SI.1 Demographic Characteristics for Participants in Study 1

Characteristic	Percentage (Number) of Respondents
<u>Gender</u>	
Female	52.2% (1084)
Male	47.8% (993)
NA	0.0% (0)
<u>Age</u>	
18-29	22.8% (474)
30-49	37.5% (778)

50-64	22.6% (470)
65 and older	17.1% (355)
NA	0.0% (0)
<hr/>	
<u>Ethnicity/Race</u>	
Asian	6.2% (128)
Black, Hispanic	2.0% (42)
Black, Non-Hispanic	10.5% (218)
White, Hispanic	5.1% (106)
White, Non-Hispanic	67.1% (1394)
Other	8.5% (177)
NA	0.6% (12)
<hr/>	
<u>Education</u>	
Less than high school degree	3.2% (66)
High school degree	25.9% (537)
Some college, no 4-year degree	29.9% (620)
Bachelor's degree	23.1% (480)
Post-graduate degree	16.9% (352)
NA	1.1% (22)
<hr/>	
<u>Annual Household Income</u>	
Less than \$25,000	31.4% (652)
\$25,000-\$49,999	24.7% (513)
\$50,000-\$74,999	18.7% (389)
\$75,000-\$99,999	9.3% (193)
\$100,000-\$199,999	11.8% (245)
More than \$200,000	2.2% (46)
NA	1.9% (39)
<hr/>	
<u>Party Identification</u>	
Democrat	44.2% (918)
Republican	35.1% (728)
Independent	14.2% (294)
Other	6.6% (137)
NA	0.0% (0)
<hr/>	
<u>Ideology</u>	
Very liberal	14.5% (301)
Somewhat liberal	13.7% (284)
Slightly liberal	8.4% (175)
Moderate	37.9% (787)
Slightly conservative	6.9% (143)
Somewhat conservative	10.1% (210)
Very conservative	8.0% (166)
NA	0.5% (11)

SI.A2: Study 2—Vignette Experiment

Our experiment was included in a survey fielded between February 24 and 28, 2023, using CloudResearch Connect. Connect is a survey respondent recruitment platform maintained by CloudResearch (formerly MTurk Prime) that provides researchers with survey samples representative of the American public for common demographic characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, and age. 1,166 respondents reached the vignette experiment module in our survey and provided a response to at least one of our outcome measures.⁸

After providing consent to participate, respondents completed a battery of demographic questions and the same attention check questions used in Study 1. Subsequently, we asked respondents to indicate their level of interest on a five-point scale in vacationing in each of the states indicated as the top five vacation destinations by WalletHub: California, Florida, New York, Nevada, and Illinois.⁹

Then, respondents were asked to imagine that they are considering taking a vacation to Florida and looked for more information about traveling there using their favorite search engine.¹⁰ Below this prompt, respondents were presented a set of five search results stylized after those which appear when searching for “vacation to Florida” using Google. In both the control and treatment conditions, the first, third, fourth, and fifth results were generic links about vacationing in Florida. In the control condition, the second result was a story attributed to the Tampa Bay Times—one of Florida’s major newspapers that is deemed “center” by AllSides’ media bias rating¹¹—concerning the Florida state legislature’s adoption of strawberry shortcake as the official state dessert last year.¹² For respondents in the treatment condition, the second result was a story attributed to the

⁸ ⁸ At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were provided debriefing materials and given the option to remove their responses from our final analysis by typing “REMOVE” in a text entry box. This mechanism was included in the survey in order to comply with ETSU IRB’s policy that any study that does not provide respondents the researchers’ precise hypotheses in the informed consent document is considered a deception study and must give participants the ability to opt out of the study once the precise hypotheses is stated in the debriefing materials. Because we feared that making participants aware of our precise hypotheses would induce response bias, we sought and received approval as a deception study and provided this opt-out option to respondents. 4 respondents not included in our final sample of 1,166 chose to opt out at the end of the survey.

⁹ A June 2022 report from WalletHub ranks all 50 states by their level of “fun” using information about 26 indicators of each state’s recreation, entertainment, and nightlife amenities (McCann, Adam. “Most Fun States in America.” WalletHub, June 13, 2022, <https://wallethub.com/edu/most-fun-states/34665/>). While the degree to which a state is fun does not necessarily reflect its desirability as a vacation destination, this ranking is more recent than the few other rankings of states by vacation desirability that we could locate and Florida places in the top five of both the WalletHub ranking and those surveys whose concepts of interest better mirrored our own (e.g., Polland, Jennifer. “A Detailed Look at How Americans Travel Within The US.” *Business Insider*, October 30, 2014, <https://www.businessinsider.com/the-most-popular-us-states-for-tourism-2014-10>; Statz, Augusta. “Survey Finds America’s Most And Least Favorite States To Visit On Vacation.” *Simplemost*, July 28, 2017, <https://www.simplemost.com/most-least-favorite-us-states-vacation/>).

¹⁰ We chose Florida because it is in the top five states for vacation travel and because it has enacted several backsliding policies in recent years—including restrictions on vote-by-mail, which we use as the stimulus in our treatment condition.

¹¹ “Tampa Bay Times,” *AllSides*, <https://www.allsides.com/news-source/tampa-bay-times-media-bias>.

¹² “Governor Ron DeSantis Signs Bill to Officially Designate Strawberry Shortcake as the State Dessert,” March 7, 2022, <https://www.flgov.com/2022/03/07/governor-ron-desantis-signs-bill-to-officially-designate-strawberry-shortcake-as-the-state-dessert/>.

Tampa Bay Times concerning a recent law passed by the Florida legislature that limits residents' ability to vote by mail.¹³

After viewing the search results for their assigned condition, respondents were again asked to indicate their level of interest in vacationing in each of the states featured in the pre-treatment question. Finally, respondents were also asked if they would like to receive additional information about vacationing in each of these five states; if respondents elected to receive additional information, they were provided with links to the official state tourism agencies for the selected states on the next page.

SI.A2a EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS

Pre-Treatment Questions

We would like to learn about your preferences for vacationing in different parts of the United States.

Please indicate your level of interest in taking a vacation in each of the following states:

[FIVE-POINT RESPONSE SCALE: NOT AT ALL INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, VERY INTERESTED, EXTREMELY INTERESTED]

[PRESENT THE FOLLOWING FIVE STATES: CALIFORNIA, FLORIDA, NEW YORK, NEVADA, AND ILLINOIS]

Vignette

Imagine you are considering taking a vacation to the state of Florida. To learn more, you used your favorite Internet search engine to look for information about vacationing in Florida. Below are some of the results you received through your search. Please take a moment to review these results.

[INSERT "CONTROL" OR "TREATMENT" INTERNET SEARCH RESULTS HERE]

CONTROL

<https://www.taylorstravels.com> > must-see-summer... ⋮

[Must-See Summer Attractions in Florida – Taylor's Travels](https://www.taylorstravels.com)

In my many trips to Florida, I've found them unparalleled ...

<https://www.tampabay.com> > Florida-legislature... ⋮

[Florida Legislature Makes Strawberry Shortcake State Dessert – Tampa](https://www.tampabay.com)

¹³ Bridges, C. & "Election 2022: How to vote in Florida under DeSantis' new law. What's changed?" *Tallahassee Democrat*, July 20, 2022, <https://www.tallahassee.com/story/news/politics/elections/2022/07/20/florida-elections-what-you-need-know-how-vote-under-new-desantis-election-law/6986583002>. Last year, the Florida legislature passed a law designating strawberry shortcake as the official state dessert...

<https://www.smithtravelagency.com> > top-ten-places-to... ⋮

[The Top 10 Places to Visit in Florida – Smith Travel Agency](https://www.smithtravelagency.com)

Florida is home to many well-known tourist attractions, so today we're counting down our top

TREATMENT

<https://www.taylorstravels.com> > must-see-summer... ∴

Must-See Summer Attractions in **Florida** – Taylor’s Travels

In my many trips to Florida, I’ve found them unparalleled ...

<https://www.tampabay.com> > Florida-legislature... ∴

Florida Legislature Enacts New Law Limiting Voting by Mail – Tampa Bay Times

Ahead of the 2022 midterm elections, the **Florida** legislature enacted a law that limits residents’ ability to vote by mail in future elections...

<https://www.smithtravelagency.com> > top-ten-places-to... ∴

The Top 10 Places to Visit in **Florida** – Smith Travel Agency

Florida is home to many well-known tourist attractions, so today we’re counting down our top ten favorite places to visit...

<https://www.foodnetwork.com> > best-restaurants-in-major... ∴

The Best Restaurants in Florida - Food Network

Florida hosts a wide variety of restaurants to suit anyone’s palate...

<https://www.travelbookings.com> > **Florida**-hotels-for... ∴

Florida Hotels For Every Budget - Bookings Now

Search for **Florida** hotels by nightly rates, amenities, and ratings, starting at...

Post-Treatment Questions

We would like to learn about your preferences for vacationing in different parts of the United States.

Please indicate your level of interest in taking a vacation in each of the following states:

[FIVE-POINT RESPONSE SCALE: NOT AT ALL INTERESTED, SLIGHTLY INTERESTED, SOMEWHAT INTERESTED, VERY INTERESTED, EXTREMELY INTERESTED]

[PRESENT THE FOLLOWING FIVE STATES: CALIFORNIA, FLORIDA, NEW YORK, NEVADA, AND ILLINOIS]

We can provide you with more information on vacationing in these five states. Please indicate if you would like to receive more information about each state:

[OFFER BINARY RESPONSE CHOICE FOR EACH OF THE FIVE STATES IN RANDOM ORDER; FOR ANY STATES SELECTED, PROVIDE LINK TO STATE'S TOURISM BUREAU ON NEXT PAGE]

SI.A2b: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table SI.2 Demographic Characteristics for Participants in Study 2

Characteristic	Percentage (Number) of Respondents
<u>Gender</u>	
Female	49.5% (577)
Male	50.1% (584)
Other	0.3% (4)
NA	0.1% (1)
<u>Age</u>	
18-29	22.2% (259)
30-49	39.0% (455)
50-64	27.6% (322)
65 and older	11.1% (129)
NA	0.1% (1)
<u>Ethnicity/Race</u>	
Asian	5.4% (63)
Black, Hispanic	1.6% (19)
Black, Non-Hispanic	9.3% (109)
White, Hispanic	8.4% (98)

White, Non-Hispanic	71.9% (838)
Other	3.2% (37)
NA	0.2% (2)
<hr/>	
<u>Education</u>	
Less than high school degree	0.4% (5)
High school degree	10.5% (123)
Some college, no 4-year degree	30.1% (351)
Bachelor's degree	42.1% (491)
Post-graduate degree	16.6% (194)
NA	0.2% (2)
<hr/>	
<u>Annual Household Income</u>	
Less than \$25,000	14.3% (167)
\$25,000-\$49,999	25.7% (300)
\$50,000-\$74,999	22.2% (259)
\$75,000-\$99,999	15.1% (176)
\$100,000-\$199,999	18.4% (214)
More than \$200,000	4.3% (50)
NA	0.0% (0)
<hr/>	
<u>Party Identification</u>	
Democrat	57.2% (667)
Republican	28.9% (337)
Independent	11.6% (135)
Other	2.2% (26)
NA	0.1% (1)
<hr/>	
<u>Ideology</u>	
Very liberal	13.9% (162)
Somewhat liberal	24.3% (283)
Slightly liberal	14.2% (165)
Moderate	20.8% (243)
Slightly conservative	9.4% (110)
Somewhat conservative	12.9% (150)
Very conservative	4.5% (53)
NA	0.0% (0)

SI.B: Empirical Analysis

In this section, we present the data and models used to create Figures 1 and 2 in the main paper. All analyses include all respondents irrespective of attention check passage. The substantive interpretation of our findings is consistent across both experiments when we use information about attention check passage to calculate complier average treatment effects.

SI.B1: Study 1—Conjoint Experiment

We estimate average marginal component effects (AMCEs) for both our choice and rating outcomes among all respondents and average component interaction effects (ACIEs) among Democrats and Republicans using linear regression (Hainmueller et al. 2014). To account for non-independence of observations, we cluster our standard errors by respondent.

SI.B1a: CHOICE AND RATING OUTCOMES

The AMCEs obtained using the choice and rating outcomes are presented in tabular form in Tables SI.3 and SI.4, respectively. Following our pre-registration document, we focus on our choice outcome in the main paper, as the choice outcome better mirrors the real-world context we wish to study—how respondents decide where to vacation—and provide the AMCEs associated with the rating outcome here.

When focusing on the AMCEs among all respondents, the substantive conclusions drawn for our “Recent state news” attribute are substantively similar across the choice and rating outcomes with a few minor differences:

- Whereas the AMCE associated with “Expanded early voting” was not statistically distinguishable from zero when using the choice outcome, it is distinguishable when using the rating outcome, though its magnitude is substantively small (-0.04 on a five-point scale); however, the AMCE associated with “Expanded early voting” remains distinguishable from those for “Limited early voting” and “Limited right to protest” when using the rating outcome.
- Whereas the AMCE associated with “Expanded right to protest” was statistically distinguishable from the AMCEs for “Limited right to protest” and “Limited early voting” when using the choice outcome, it is no longer statistically distinguishable as compared to “Limited right to protest” when using the rating outcome and is only statistically distinguishable from “Limited early voting” at the $p < 0.10$ level.

However, even with these minor differences, the AMCEs emerging from the rating outcome among all respondents communicate the same substantive point: respondents are less interested in vacationing at destinations located in states that have recently enacted backsliding policies.

The comparisons of the choice and rating ACIEs when considering Democrats and Republicans, separately, are more nuanced. For Democrats, the only distinction is that the ACIEs for “Expanded protest rights” and “Limited protest rights” are nearly identical and no longer statistically distinguishable when using the rating outcome rather than the choice outcome. For Republicans, the ACIEs when using the choice outcome for all non-baseline “Recent state news” attribute-levels are of similar magnitude and statistically distinguishable from the baseline attribute-level, only one ACIE—that for “Limited right to protest”—remains distinguishable from the baseline attribute-level, and that ACIE is roughly twice as large as the others. Further, the ACIE among Republicans for “Limited right to protest” when using the rating outcome is distinguishably more negative than that for “Expanded right to protest” at the $p < 0.05$ and for “Expanded early voting” at the $p < 0.10$ level, whereas no such difference emerged under the choice outcome.

Because the partisan-conditional effects are not consistent across the choice and rating outcomes, we prefer to take a conservative approach and only place emphasis on the finding that *is* consistent across outcomes: that Democrats are less interested in vacationing in states that recently enacted backsliding policies as compared to states that recently expanded early voting or created a committee to study economic growth. However, the distinctions that emerge highlight an important avenue for future research—that partisans may react to different types of “quality of democracy” policies differently. In our case, respondents in general and Democrats seem to place more importance on voting rights relative to the right to protest, which may be associated with the common wisdom that enhancing voting rights tends to benefit the Democratic Party (Biggers and Hanmer 2015). Differently, Republicans seem to place more emphasis on the right to protest rather than voting rights,¹⁴ which may be associated with Republicans’ perception that free speech rights are both particularly important and under threat (Armaly and Enders 2023). We encourage future researchers to focus more attention on how partisanship influences perceptions of policies thought to relate to the quality of democracy.

Table SI.3: Effect of Destination Characteristics on Destination Choice

Attribute/Level	All Respondents	Democrats Only	Republicans Only
Recent State News			
<i>Created economic growth committee (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Expanded right to protest</i>	-0.02* [-0.03,-0.01]	-0.01 [-0.03,0.01]	-0.04* [-0.06,-0.02]
<i>Expanded early voting</i>	-0.01 [-0.02,0.00]	0.02* [0.00,0.04]	-0.04* [-0.06,-0.02]
<i>Limited right to protest</i>	-0.03* [-0.05,-0.02]	-0.03* [-0.04,-0.01]	-0.04* [-0.06,-0.02]
<i>Limited early voting</i>	-0.03* [-0.04,-0.02]	-0.03* [-0.05,-0.01]	-0.03* [-0.05,-0.01]
Temperature			
<i>64°F (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>67°F</i>	0.02* [0.01,0.03]	0.02* [0.00,0.03]	0.02* [0.01,0.04]
<i>72°F</i>	0.04* [0.03,0.05]	0.04* [0.02,0.06]	0.05* [0.03,0.07]
<i>78°F</i>	0.05* [0.04,0.06]	0.04* [0.02,0.06]	0.06* [0.04,0.08]
Community Type			
<i>Rural (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Suburban</i>	-0.00 [-0.01,0.01]	0.01 [-0.00,0.02]	-0.02* [-0.03,-0.00]
<i>Urban</i>	-0.00	0.02*	-0.02*

¹⁴ While this does not manifest using the choice outcome, it does in the rating outcome, where the AMCE for “Limited right to protest” is 0.06 to 0.07 smaller than each of the AMCEs for the other non-baseline attribute levels, and each of those differences are or approach statistical distinguishability (different from “Expanded right to protest” and “Limited early voting” at the $p < 0.05$ level, different from “Expanded early voting” at the $p < 0.10$ level).

	[-0.01,0.01]	[0.01,0.03]	[-0.03,-0.00]
<u>Main Attractions</u>			
<i>Amusement parks</i> (baseline)	-	-	-
<i>Beaches</i>	0.09* [0.07,0.10]	0.06* [0.04,0.09]	0.13* [0.10,0.16]
<i>Museums</i>	-0.02* [-0.04,-0.01]	-0.00 [-0.03,0.02]	-0.05* [-0.07,-0.03]
<i>National parks</i>	0.05* [0.03,0.07]	0.04* [0.02,0.06]	0.08* [0.05,0.10]
<i>Sporting events</i>	-0.05* [-0.07,-0.04]	-0.05* [-0.08,-0.03]	-0.06* [-0.08,-0.03]
<i>Theaters</i>	-0.06* [-0.07,-0.04]	-0.04* [-0.06,-0.02]	-0.06* [-0.09,-0.04]
<u>Travel Time</u>			
<i>Less than 2 hours</i> (baseline)	-	-	-
<i>2-4 hours</i>	-0.02* [-0.03,-0.01]	-0.02* [-0.03,-0.00]	-0.02* [-0.04,-0.00]
<i>4-6 hours</i>	-0.04* [-0.05,-0.03]	-0.03* [-0.05,-0.02]	-0.04* [-0.06,-0.02]
<i>More than 6 hours</i>	-0.05* [-0.06,-0.04]	-0.06* [-0.08,-0.04]	-0.05* [-0.07,-0.03]
<u>2020 Presidential Election Result</u>			
<i>Trump won by large margin</i> (baseline)	-	-	-
<i>Trump won by small margin</i>	-0.00 [-0.01,0.01]	0.03* [0.01,0.04]	-0.04* [-0.05,-0.02]
<i>Biden won by small margin</i>	0.00 [-0.01,0.02]	0.12* [0.10,0.14]	-0.13* [-0.15,-0.11]
<i>Biden won by large margin</i>	0.01 [-0.01,0.02]	0.14* [0.12,0.16]	-0.16* [-0.18,-0.14]
Number of observations	59,109	26,217	20,715
Number of respondents	2,076	918	727

This table presents the average marginal component effects (AMCEs, first column) and the average component interaction effects (ACIEs, second and third columns) used to construct Figure 1 in the main text, which represent the effect of each attribute-level on the probability of a profile's selection relative to its respective baseline. Cell entries provide the estimated causal quantity of interest and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The AMCEs in the first column are estimated using all respondents, while the ACIEs in the second and third columns are estimated using only respondents who identify as Democrats or Republicans, respectively. All causal quantities of interest are estimated using ordinary least squares regression and cluster robust standard errors (clustered on respondent); the AMCEs in the first column are estimated in their own model, while the ACIEs in the second and third columns are estimated using the same model that interacted every non-baseline attribute-level with a binary indicator for party identification. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

Table SI.4: Effect of Destination Characteristics on Destination Rating

Attribute/Level	All Respondents	Democrats Only	Republicans Only
Recent State News			
<i>Created economic growth committee (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Expanded right to protest</i>	-0.07* [-0.10,-0.03]	-0.07* [-0.12,-0.02]	-0.05 [-0.10,0.01]
<i>Expanded early voting</i>	-0.04* [-0.07,-0.00]	-0.00 [-0.05,0.05]	-0.05 [-0.11,0.00]
<i>Limited right to protest</i>	-0.08* [-0.12,-0.05]	-0.07* [-0.12,-0.02]	-0.11* [-0.17,-0.05]
<i>Limited early voting</i>	-0.10* [-0.13,-0.06]	-0.13* [-0.19,-0.08]	-0.05 [-0.11,0.01]
Temperature			
<i>64°F (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>67°F</i>	0.03* [0.00,0.06]	0.02 [-0.02,0.07]	0.03 [-0.02,0.08]
<i>72°F</i>	0.08* [0.05,0.11]	0.07* [0.02,0.11]	0.11* [0.06,0.16]
<i>78°F</i>	0.09* [0.06,0.12]	0.07* [0.02,0.12]	0.10* [0.04,0.15]
Community Type			
<i>Rural (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Suburban</i>	0.02 [-0.01,0.05]	0.04 [-0.00,0.08]	-0.01 [-0.05,0.04]
<i>Urban</i>	0.02 [-0.01,0.05]	0.07* [0.03,0.11]	-0.02 [-0.07,0.03]
Main Attractions			
<i>Amusement parks (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Beaches</i>	0.19* [0.15,0.24]	0.12* [0.06,0.19]	0.29* [0.21,0.37]
<i>Museums</i>	-0.08* [-0.12,-0.03]	0.00 [-0.07,0.07]	-0.15 [-0.22,-0.07]
<i>National parks</i>	0.10* [0.06,0.15]	0.11* [0.04,0.17]	0.13* [0.05,0.21]
<i>Sporting events</i>	-0.17* [-0.22,-0.13]	-0.18* [-0.25,-0.12]	-0.19* [-0.27,-0.11]
<i>Theaters</i>	-0.14* [-0.19,-0.10]	-0.11* [-0.17,-0.04]	-0.18* [-0.26,-0.11]
Travel Time			
<i>Less than 2 hours (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>2-4 hours</i>	-0.02 [-0.05,0.01]	-0.02 [-0.06,0.03]	-0.02 [-0.07,0.03]

<i>4-6 hours</i>	-0.06* [-0.10,-0.03]	-0.04 [-0.09,0.01]	-0.07* [-0.13,-0.02]
<i>More than 6 hours</i>	-0.11* [-0.14,-0.08]	-0.10* [-0.15,-0.05]	-0.12* [-0.17,-0.06]
<u>2020 Presidential Election Result</u>			
<i>Trump won by large margin (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Trump won by small margin</i>	0.01 [-0.03,0.04]	0.05* [0.00,0.10]	-0.03 [-0.09,0.02]
<i>Biden won by small margin</i>	0.00 [-0.04,0.05]	0.35* [0.28,0.41]	-0.42* [-0.50,-0.34]
<i>Biden won by large margin</i>	0.03 [-0.01,0.08]	0.43* [0.37,0.50]	-0.45* [-0.53,-0.37]
Number of observations	59,077	26,343	20,611
Number of respondents	2,076	918	727

This table presents the average marginal component effects (AMCEs, first column) and the average component interaction effects (ACIEs, second and third columns) which represent the effect of each attribute-level on the probability of a profile's rating relative to its respective baseline. Cell entries provide the estimated causal quantity of interest and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The AMCEs in the first column are estimated using all respondents, while the ACIEs in the second and third columns are estimated using only respondents who identify as Democrats or Republicans, respectively. All causal quantities of interest are estimated using ordinary least squares regression and cluster robust standard errors (clustered on respondent); the AMCEs in the first column are estimated in their own model, while the ACIEs in the second and third columns are estimated using the same model that interacted every non-baseline attribute-level with a binary indicator for party identification. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

SI.B1b: SURVEY WEIGHTING

While Lucid provides researchers with survey samples expected to be representative of the American public for common demographic characteristics, they utilize only four such characteristics to perform quota sampling with quotas pegged to nationally representative targets, and any given sample of respondents may not perfectly satisfy those quotas. For instance, whereas Lucid aims for targets of 49% male and 51% female respondents, the sample obtained for Study 1 included 47.8% males and 52.2% females.¹⁵ Additionally, while Lucid does not quota sample on party identification, Study 1 leans less Republican than do high-quality nationally-representative surveys (e.g., whereas the 2020 American National Election Study reported 45.7% Democrats, 40.6% Republicans, 10.5% Independents, and 3.2% Other, the Study 1 sample contained 44.2% Democrats, 35.1% Republicans, 14.2% Independents, and 6.6% Other). If individuals with certain demographic characteristics are more or less sensitive to democratic backsliding when making decisions on where to go on vacation and the distribution of those demographic characteristics in Study 1 do not correspond with the distributions of those characteristics in the national population, the external validity of our results could be weakened.

¹⁵ In the respondent-level information Lucid uses for quota sampling and provides to researchers, the only possible values are "male" and "female"; at present, Lucid does not allow for other, non-binary values.

To assess the extent to which such imbalance might affect our results, we re-estimate our choice-based AMCEs with survey weights that make our Study 1 sample better approximate the national population. We use 8 demographic characteristics to construct these weights. First, for the four characteristics Lucid already uses to set quotas, we estimate weights to mirror those quotas:

- Gender: 49% male, 51% female
- Age: 13% 18-24, 20% 25-34, 20% 35-44, 33% 45-64, 14% 65-99
- Race: 68% White (non-Hispanic), 12% Black (non-Hispanic), 10% Hispanic, 10% Other
- Region: 20% Midwest, 20% Northeast, 26% West, 34% South

For two additional characteristics Lucid provides but does not use to set quotas, we estimate weights to mirror benchmarks obtained from the US Census Bureau's 2021 American Community Survey (One-Year):

- Education: 10.8% less than high school, 27.3% high school degree, 29.5% some college but no four-year degree, 20.2% bachelor's degree or equivalent, 12.2% post-graduate degree
- Income: 11.7% less than \$25,000, 32.2% \$25,000-\$49,999, 23.7% \$50,000-\$74,999, 12.5% \$75,000-\$99,999, 12.5% over \$100,000

Finally, for two final political characteristics, we estimate weights to mirror benchmarks obtained from the 2020 American National Election Study:

- Party Identification (including leaners with each party): 45.7% Democrats, 40.6% Republicans, 10.5% Independents, 3.2% Other
- Ideology: 5.2% extremely liberal, 17.2% liberal, 13.0% slightly liberal, 25.8% moderate, 11.6% slightly conservative, 21.1% conservative, 6.1% extremely conservative

We present our weighted AMCEs in Table SI.5. The substantive results from these weighted analyses are similar to those presented in the main paper, as respondents react more negatively to policies consistent with backsliding than with expanding democracy, and Democratic respondents differentiate more distinctly between the two sets of policies.

Table SI.5: Effect of Destination Characteristics on Destination Choice (Weighted)

Attribute/Level	All Respondents	Democrats Only	Republicans Only
<u>Recent State News</u>			
<i>Created economic growth committee (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Expanded right to protest</i>	-0.03* [-0.04,-0.01]	-0.02 [-0.04,0.01]	-0.04* [-0.08,-0.01]
<i>Expanded early voting</i>	-0.01* [-0.03,-0.00]	0.01 [-0.02,0.04]	-0.02 [-0.06,0.01]
<i>Limited right to protest</i>	-0.04* [-0.06,-0.03]	-0.03* [-0.05,-0.00]	-0.05* [-0.08,-0.01]
<i>Limited early voting</i>	-0.04* [-0.05,-0.03]	-0.03* [-0.06,-0.01]	-0.03 [-0.06,0.01]
<u>Temperature</u>			
<i>64°F (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>67°F</i>	0.03* [0.02,0.04]	0.02 [-0.00,0.05]	0.03* [0.01,0.05]

72°F	0.04* [0.03,0.06]	0.04* [0.02,0.06]	0.04* [0.01,0.07]
78°F	0.05* [0.03,0.06]	0.03* [0.01,0.06]	0.05* [0.02,0.08]
<u>Community Type</u>			
<i>Rural (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Suburban</i>	0.00 [-0.01,0.01]	0.02 [-0.01,0.04]	-0.03* [-0.05,-0.00]
<i>Urban</i>	-0.00 [-0.01,0.01]	0.01 [-0.01,0.04]	-0.02 [-0.04,0.01]
<u>Main Attractions</u>			
<i>Amusement parks (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Beaches</i>	0.07* [0.05,0.08]	0.04* [0.01,0.08]	0.10* [0.05,0.15]
<i>Museums</i>	-0.02* [-0.04,-0.01]	-0.01 [-0.04,0.02]	-0.05* [-0.10,-0.01]
<i>National parks</i>	0.03* [0.02,0.05]	0.02 [-0.01,0.06]	0.05* [0.00,0.10]
<i>Sporting events</i>	-0.06* [-0.07,-0.04]	-0.04* [-0.08,-0.01]	-0.09* [-0.13,-0.04]
<i>Theaters</i>	-0.06* [-0.08,-0.05]	-0.04* [-0.07,-0.00]	-0.09* [-0.13,-0.05]
<u>Travel Time</u>			
<i>Less than 2 hours (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>2-4 hours</i>	-0.01* [-0.02,-0.00]	-0.01 [-0.04,0.02]	-0.00 [-0.03,0.03]
<i>4-6 hours</i>	-0.02* [-0.04,-0.01]	-0.01 [-0.04,0.01]	-0.02 [-0.05,0.01]
<i>More than 6 hours</i>	-0.04* [-0.05,-0.03]	-0.05* [-0.08,-0.03]	-0.03* [-0.06,-0.00]
<u>2020 Presidential Election Result</u>			
<i>Trump won by large margin (baseline)</i>	-	-	-
<i>Trump won by small margin</i>	-0.00 [-0.02,0.01]	0.02 [-0.00,0.05]	-0.05* [-0.08,-0.02]
<i>Biden won by small margin</i>	-0.01 [-0.02,0.01]	0.10* [0.08,0.13]	-0.16* [-0.20,0.12]
<i>Biden won by large margin</i>	-0.01 [-0.02,0.01]	0.12* [0.10,0.15]	-0.18* [-0.22,0.14]
Number of observations	56,985	25,515	19,950
Number of respondents	1,996	893	697

This table presents weighted average marginal component effects (AMCEs, first column) and the average component interaction effects (ACIEs, second and third columns) which represent the effect of each attribute-level on the probability of a profile's selection relative to its respective baseline when observations are weighted to reflect the target population distributions of the demographic characteristics described above. Cell entries provide the estimated causal quantity of interest and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The AMCEs in the first column are estimated using all respondents, while the ACIEs in the second and third columns are estimated using only respondents who identify as Democrats or Republicans, respectively. All causal quantities of interest are estimated using weighted least squares regression and cluster robust standard errors (clustered on respondent); the AMCEs in the first column are estimated in their own model, while the ACIEs in the second and third columns are estimated using the same model that interacted every non-baseline attribute-level with a binary indicator for party identification. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

SI.B1c: ESTIMATED EFFECT OF BACKSLIDING ON TOURISM-RELATED ECONOMIC ACTIVITY IN US STATES

As we note in the introduction of the main paper, critics of state-level democratic backsliding often argue that backsliding policies will depress tourism-related economic activity. Because AMCEs can be interpreted as the change in the share of individuals who would choose a profile with a given level of an attribute relative to a profile with the baseline level of that attribute (Bansak et al. 2023), we can use our results to provide rough estimates of how much economic activity states stand to lose by backsliding.

We caution readers that our estimates rely on several assumptions, including:

- Our conjoint experiment appropriately maps onto the real-world decisionmaking context. An important note here is that our experiment excludes cost considerations by telling respondents to imagine they won an all-expenses paid vacation; to the extent that cost considerations affect sensitivity to backsliding, our estimates of lost economic activity may deviate from the “true” effect.
- Our conjoint experiment and the resulting AMCEs are premised on a context where respondents are selecting among 3 options; if individuals' choice sets are larger or smaller, the AMCEs on which the estimates are premised may also be larger or smaller, thus effecting our final calculations.
- The key pieces of information we need for these calculations are 1) the total estimated economic activity each state experiences through tourism and 2) the total estimated out-of-state domestic tourists visiting each state. Thus, our calculations incorporate all sources of error contained in those estimates. Further, because we cannot know how much individual tourists provide in economic activity, we must assume that each tourism provides the mean amount of economic activity.

For purposes of illustration, we selected two states which readily provide information on state-level domestic tourists and tourism-related economic activity that have contemplated and adopted backsliding policies in recent years—Florida and Georgia.

- According to Florida's official tourism corporation, VISIT FLORIDA, Florida had 121,838,000 total visitors in 2021, 117,325,000 were domestic (i.e., people who reside in the US).¹⁶ VISIT FLORIDA also estimates that the state experienced \$101.9 billion in

¹⁶ <https://www.visitflorida.org/resources/research>

tourism-related economic activity in 2021;¹⁷ assuming that all domestic and international travelers contributed the mean amount to this economic activity, domestic travelers would have contributed \$98,125,523,236 to that total.

- According to Georgia’s Department of Economic Development, Georgia had 159,557,500 total visitors in 2021, 159,200,000 of which were domestic. The total estimated impact of these visitors was \$64.5 billion; assuming that all domestic and international travelers contributed the mean amount to this economic activity, domestic travelers would have contributed \$64,355,483,133 to that total.

Under the assumption that each traveler contributed the mean amount to the state’s tourism-related economic activity, we can calculate the effect of backsliding by multiplying our AMCEs by the total tourism-related economic activity estimates. As shown in Figure 1 in the main paper, the AMCEs associated with backsliding were between 1 and 3 percentage points lower than those associated with policies expanding democracy and the baseline attribute-level (the state legislature creating a committee to study economic growth). Thus, using the 2021 tourism data from Florida and Georgia and the estimates from our conjoint experiment, we expect that adopting backsliding policies stood to cost Florida \$981 million to \$2.9 billion and Georgia \$644.6 million to \$1.9 billion in economic activity.

To further contextualize how significant those economic costs would be for Florida and Georgia, we calculate the share of each state’s gross domestic product represented by those projections. According to the US Bureau of Economic Analysis, the gross domestic products of Florida and Georgia for 2021 were \$1,255,558,300,000 and \$691,626,900,000, respectively.¹⁸ Our projected costs of backsliding on tourism-related economic activity thus represent 0.1% to 0.02% and 0.1% and 0.3% of Florida and Georgia’s gross domestic products, respectively.

SI.B2: Study 2—Vignette Experiment

We estimate average treatment effects (ATEs) among all respondents and conditional average treatment effects (CATEs) among Democrats and Republicans using linear regression. For our interest in vacationing in Florida outcome, we use as our measure the difference between respondents’ pre-treatment level of interest in vacationing in Florida on a five-point scale and their post-treatment level of interest (Clifford et al. 2021). For our request for more information about vacationing in Florida outcome, we code respondents as 0 if they did not indicate that they wanted more information about Florida post-treatment, and 1 if they did request additional information. Thus, the coefficients for our change in interest outcome reflect movement on the five-point interest scale, and the coefficients for our request for more information outcome reflect the change in probability that a respondent requests more information.

While the ATE for the level of interest in vacationing in Florida among all respondents is negative, as expected, though not statistically distinguishable, and CATE for the level of interest in

¹⁷ <https://www.visitflorida.com/about-us/#:~:text=About%20VISIT%20FLORIDA&text=Florida's%20tourism%20industry%20was%20responsible,over%201.7%20million%20Florida%20jobs>

¹⁸ <https://apps.bea.gov/itable/?ReqID=70&step=1>

vacationing in Florida among Democrats is negative and statistically distinguishable, the corresponding ATE and CATE for our behavioral outcome—whether respondents expressed interest in receiving more information about vacationing in Florida—are instead positively signed, though small in magnitude and not statistically distinguishable. While a null result represents an inability to reject the null hypothesis (that increasing the salience of backsliding discourages respondents from seeking more information) and does *not* provide support for the null hypothesis, it is important to consider why this null result may manifest.

On the one hand, this null result may represent a truly null effect, such that information about backsliding affects people’s preferences about vacation destinations but not their subsequent behaviors. However, given that preferences are causally prior to and motivate behaviors and that many studies of political consumerism, a related phenomenon in which individuals’ purchasing habits are influenced by businesses’ political activities, have demonstrated strong effects of the (mis-)alignment of consumers’ and businesses’ political positions on behavioral outcomes (e.g., Kam and Deichert 2020; Panagopoulos et al. 2020), it is plausible that backsliding has behavioral implications for leisure travel that our design merely did not detect. A few potential explanations for our inability to detect a true effect of backsliding on information-seeking behavior (besides random chance) are:

- **Unresponsive behavioral outcome**—Our measure of behavior is whether respondents indicate that they would like to receive more information about vacationing in Florida. While this survey question was meant to capture a behavioral outcome in that it represents respondents’ willingness to expend effort on information search about Florida tourism, it is possible that this particular behavioral measure is unlikely to respond to changes in textual vignettes in online surveys. Principally, because information about most anything, including leisure travel to Florida, is easily available on demand in an increasingly digitized world, respondents may have been uniformly disinterested in receiving information from the survey administrators when they could search for that information (likely in a more personalized way) on their own at a later time. Were we able to feasibly incorporate an outcome that is more costly than the first stage of information search and comes closer to measuring the ultimate vacation destination choice of interest, such as offering respondents the opportunity to enter a lottery for an all-expenses paid trip to one of a set of destinations (similar to our Study 1), we may be able to recover behavioral effects of backsliding that better reflect the effects of backsliding on preferences that we recovered in our Studies 1 and 2.
- **Small magnitude of true effect**—If the magnitude of the true effect of backsliding on our information-seeking behavioral outcome is small, our design may not have had sufficient power to detect it. For instance, when assessing the effect of backsliding among all 1,166 respondents, the effect size for which the probability that we will detect an effect in a given trial of the experiment is $p=0.80$ is approximately 0.16 (i.e., respondents apprised of Florida’s restriction of vote-by-mail would be 16 percentage points less likely to indicate that they want more information about vacationing in Florida relative to those in the control condition).¹⁹ Given the small (albeit differently-scaled) effects of backsliding on destination choice in Study 1 and interest in vacationing in Florida in Study 2, it is possible

¹⁹ Effect size calculation obtained using the `pwr.2p2n.test` function in the `pwr` R package with sample sizes of 568 and 598, significance level of 0.05, and power of 0.80.

that increasing the salience of Florida’s backsliding does have negative effects on interest in receiving information about vacationing there, but that those effects are too small for our design to reliably recover them.²⁰

Ultimately, while the effects we recover of backsliding on respondents’ leisure travel preferences encourage optimism that these policies also affect Americans’ ultimate choices of destinations for leisure travel, we are unable to discern in the present study the extent to which backsliding prompts behavioral changes with respect to leisure travel. We encourage future work to probe how backsliding influences Americans’ ultimate behavior concerning vacationing, relocating for work (Nelson and Witko, 2022, n.d.), and other ostensibly non-political activities.

Table SI.6: Effect of Backsliding Policies on the Change in Interest in Vacationing in Florida

	All Respondents	Democrats and Republicans Only
Intercept	0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.03)
Treatment	-0.02 (0.03)	0.07 (0.05)
Democrat	-	0.05 (0.04)
Democrat*Treatment	-	-0.15* (0.06)
Number of observations	1,160	999

This table presents summaries of the linear regressions used to calculate the average treatment effects (ATEs, first column) and conditional average treatment effects (CATEs, second column) for respondents in our experiment on vacationing in Florida presented in Figure 2. Cell entries provide coefficient estimates and standard errors. The model summarized by the first column includes all respondents, while the model summarized by the second column includes only respondents who identified as Democrats or Republicans. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

Table SI.7: Effect of Backsliding Policies on Requesting More Information About Vacationing in Florida

	All Respondents	Democrats and Republicans Only
Intercept	0.39 (0.02)	0.60 (0.04)
Treatment	0.01 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.05)
Democrat	-	-0.32* (0.05)
Democrat*Treatment	-	0.03

²⁰ It is also important to note that the conjoint design used in Study 1 and the pre-post analysis used for the preference outcome in Study 2 both naturally offer more precise estimates of treatment effects than the post-only analysis used for the information search outcome (Clifford et al. 2021; Hainmueller et al. 2014).

		(0.06)
Number of observations	1,166	1,004

This table presents summaries of the linear regressions used to calculate the average treatment effects (ATEs, first column) and conditional average treatment effects (CATEs, second column) for respondents in our experiment on vacationing in Florida presented in Figure 2. Cell entries provide coefficient estimates and standard errors. The model summarized by the first column includes all respondents, while the model summarized by the second column includes only respondents who identified as Democrats or Republicans. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

SI.B2a: SURVEY WEIGHTING

While CloudResearch Connect provides researchers with survey samples expected to be representative of the American public for common demographic characteristics, they utilize only four such characteristics to perform quota sampling with quotas pegged to nationally representative targets, and any given sample of respondents may not perfectly satisfy those quotas. For instance, whereas CloudResearch aims for targets of 84.1% not Hispanic and 15.9% Hispanic, our sample contains 87.7% non-Hispanic respondents and 12.3% Hispanic respondents. Additionally, while CloudResearch does not quota sample on party identification, Study 1 leans less Republican than do high-quality nationally-representative surveys (e.g., whereas the 2020 American National Election Study reported 45.7% Democrats, 40.6% Republicans, 10.5% Independents, and 3.2% Other, the Study 2 sample contained 57.3% Democrats, 28.9% Republicans, 11.6% Independents, and 2.2% Other). If individuals with certain demographic characteristics are more or less sensitive to democratic backsliding when making decisions on where to go on vacation and the distribution of those demographic characteristics in Study 1 do not correspond with the distributions of those characteristics in the national population, the external validity of our results could be weakened.

To assess the extent to which such imbalance might affect our results, we re-estimate our quantities of interest with survey weights that make our Study 2 sample better approximate the national population. We use 7 demographic characteristics to construct these weights. First, for the four characteristics CloudResearch already uses to set quotas, we estimate weights to mirror those quotas:

- Gender: 50% male, 50% female
- Age: 22.0% 18-29, 26.0% 30-44, 26.0% 45-59, 26% 60-99
- Race: 78.1%, 13.9% Black, 8.0% Other
- Ethnicity: 84.1% not Hispanic, 15.9% Hispanic

For two additional characteristics CloudResearch provides but does not use to set quotas, we estimate weights to mirror benchmarks obtained from the US Census Bureau's 2021 American Community Survey (One-Year):

- Education: 10.8% less than high school, 27.3% high school degree, 29.5% some college but no four-year degree, 20.2% bachelor's degree or equivalent, 12.2% post-graduate degree
- Income: 11.7% less than \$25,000, 32.2% \$25,000-\$49,999, 23.7% \$50,000-\$74,999, 12.5% \$75,000-\$99,999, 12.5% over \$100,000

Finally, for two final political characteristics, we estimate weights to mirror benchmarks obtained from the 2020 American National Election Study:

- Party Identification (including leaners with each party): 45.7% Democrats, 40.6% Republicans, 10.5% Independents, 3.2% Other

- Ideology: 5.2% extremely liberal, 17.2% liberal, 13.0% slightly liberal, 25.8% moderate, 11.6% slightly conservative, 21.1% conservative, 6.1% extremely conservative

We present our weighted analyses in Tables SI.8 and SI.9. The substantive results from these weighted analyses are similar to those presented in the main paper, Democratic respondents in the treatment condition express lower levels of interest in vacationing in Florida and no set of respondents express statistically distinguishable levels of interest in receiving more information about Florida.²¹

Table SI.8: Effect of Backsliding Policies on the Change in Interest in Vacationing in Florida (Weighted)

	All Respondents	Democrats and Republicans Only
Intercept	0.02 (0.02)	0.00 (0.04)
Treatment	-0.03 (0.02)	0.01 (0.06)
Democrat	-	0.04 (0.05)
Democrat*Treatment	-	-0.09 (0.06)
Number of observations	1,141	981

This table presents summaries of the weighted least squares regressions used to calculate the average treatment effects (ATEs, first column) and conditional average treatment effects (CATEs, second column) for respondents in our experiment on vacationing in Florida when observations are weighted to reflect the target population distributions of the demographic characteristics described above. Cell entries provide coefficient estimates and standard errors. The model summarized by the first column includes all respondents, while the model summarized by the second column includes only respondents who identified as Democrats or Republicans. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

Table SI.9: Effect of Backsliding Policies on Requesting More Information About Vacationing in Florida (Weighted)

	All Respondents	Democrats and Republicans Only
Intercept	0.36 (0.02)	0.61 (0.05)
Treatment	0.01 (0.03)	0.04 (0.06)
Democrat	-	-0.33* (0.05)
Democrat*Treatment	-	-0.02

²¹ While the interaction between Democrat and Treatment in the second column of Table SI.8 is not statistically distinguishable, this is in reference to the reference category for the full regression model—Republicans in the control group. A formal linear hypothesis test of Democrats in the control and treatment groups (that the coefficients for Democrat + Democrat*Treatment equal 0) concludes that Democrats in the treatment group express statistically distinguishably less interest in vacationing in Florida relative to Democrats in the control group.

		(0.07)
Number of observations	1,147	986

This table presents summaries of the weighted least squares regressions used to calculate the average treatment effects (ATEs, first column) and conditional average treatment effects (CATEs, second column) for respondents in our experiment on vacationing in Florida when observations are weighted to reflect the target population distributions of the demographic characteristics described above. Cell entries provide coefficient estimates and standard errors. The model summarized by the first column includes all respondents, while the model summarized by the second column includes only respondents who identified as Democrats or Republicans. * indicate $p < 0.05$.

SI.C: Recommended Reporting Standards for Experiments

A. Hypotheses

- a. Study 1 was designed to explore how the presence or absence of information about democratic backsliding influences people's interest in vacationing at a given destination. Study 2 was designed to explore how raising the salience of information about democratic backsliding influences people's interest in vacationing at a given destination.
- b. For both Studies 1 and 2, the key pre-registered hypotheses were 1) that people are less likely to express interest in vacationing at a destination that has recently experienced democratic backsliding 2) this negative effect of backsliding is more pronounced for Democrats than Republicans.

B. Subjects and Context

- a. Respondents in Study 1 were drawn from Lucid Theorem's opt-in panel of respondents, 2,077 of whom provided a profile rating or task choice outcome in at least one task and are included in our analysis. Respondents completed the online survey between December 1 and December 3, 2022. Please see Supplemental Information Section SI.A1 for more information.
- b. Respondents in Study 2 were drawn from CloudResearch's Connect opt-in panel of respondents, 1,166 of which provided a response for at least one of the outcome questions in our survey experiment and are included in our analysis. Respondents completed the online survey between February 24 and February 28, 2023. Please see Supplemental Information Section SI.A2 for more information.

C. Allocation Method

- a. In Study 1, attribute-levels were randomly assigned across all 3 profiles in all 10 tasks presented to respondents. These attributes and levels were obtained by Qualtrics from a .php file designed by the Conjoint Survey Design Tool 2.0.
- b. In Study 2, respondents were randomly assigned to the control or treatment conditions using Qualtrics' native randomization feature.

D. Treatments

- a. Textual materials presented to respondents in online Qualtrics surveys to deliver assigned treatments are provided in Supplemental Information Section A.

E. Results

- a. Outcome Measures and Covariates
 - i. Question wordings and descriptions of how outcome measures were created are provided in Supplemental Information Section A.
- b. CONSORT Participant Flow Diagram
 - i. In Study 1, 2,153 respondents provided informed consent and were assigned to completed at least one of their 10 conjoint tasks with randomly assigned levels of each attribute. At the conclusion of the survey, 76 opted to have their responses removed from the final analysis, such that only 2,077 respondents are included in our analysis.
 - ii. In Study 2, 1,170 respondents provided informed consent and were assigned to our control (N=568) or treatment (N=598) conditions. At the conclusion of the survey, 4 opted to have their responses removed from the final analysis, such that only 1,166 respondents are included in our analysis.
- c. Statistical Analysis
 - i. Description of statistical methods and tabular summaries of all analyses are provided in Supplemental Information Section B.

F. Other Information

- a. The surveys in which our experiments were embedded received approval from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University (Study 1 #c0922.4e; Study 2 # c0223.6e).
- b. The experiments included in this paper were pre-registered through the Evidence in Governance and Politics (EGAP) Open Science Framework (OSF) registry (Study 1, <https://osf.io/5zt2u>; Study 2, <https://osf.io/nctze>).
- c. Support for this research was provided by East Tennessee State University's Honors College and Office of Research & Sponsored Programs.
- d. The data, code, and any additional materials required to replicate all analyses in this article are available at the Journal of Experimental Political Science Dataverse within the Harvard Dataverse Network, at: doi: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/KA7DLE>.

References

- Armaly, Miles T. and Enders, Adam M. 2023. The Partisan Contours of Attitudes About Rights and Liberties. *Political Behavior*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-023-09860-3>.
- Bansak, Kirk, Jens Hainmueller, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2023. “Using Conjoint Experiments to Analyze Election Outcomes: The Essential Role of the Average Marginal Component Effect.” *Political Analysis*, 31(4): 500-518.
- Berinsky, Adam J., Margolis, Michele F., and Sances, Michael W. 2014. “Separating the Shirkers from the Workers? Making Sure Respondents Pay Attention on Self-Administered Surveys.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(3): 739-753.
- Biggers, Daniel R. and Hanmer, Michael J. 2015. “Who Makes Voting Convenient? Explaining the Adoption of Early and No-Excuse Absentee Voting in the American States.” *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 15(2): 192-210.
- Clifford, Scott, Sheagley, Geoff, and Piston, Spencer. 2021. “Increasing Precision Without Altering Treatment Effects: Repeated Measures Designs in Survey Experiments.” *American Political Science Review*, 115(3): 1048-1065.
- Coppock, Alexander and McClellan, Oliver A. 2019. “Validating the Demographic, Political, Psychological, and Experimental Results Obtained from a New Source of Online Survey Respondents.” *Research & Politics*, 6(1): 2053168018822174.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Hopkins, Daniel J., and Yamamoto, Teppei. 2014. “Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments.” *Political Analysis*, 22(1): 1-30.

- Jenke, Libby, Bansak, Kirk, Hainmueller, Jens and Hangartner, Dominik. 2021. "Using Eye-Tracking to Understand Decision-making in Conjoint Experiments." *Political Analysis*, 29(1): 75-101.
- Kam, Cindy D. and Deichert, Maggie. 2020. "Boycotting, Buycotting, and the Psychology of Political Consumerism." *Journal of Politics*, 82(1): 72-88.
- Miller, David R. and Ziegler, Jeffrey. n.d. "Preferential Abstention in Conjoint Experiments."
- Panagopoulos, Costas, Green, Donald P., Krasno, Jonathan, Schwam-Baird, Michael, and Endres, Kyle. 2020. "Partisan Consumerism: Experimental Tests of Consumer Reactions to Corporate Political Activity." *Journal of Politics*, 82(3): 996-1007.