**Appendix**

*Ethics Statement*

Prior approval to conduct all elements of the experiment was granted by the University of Miami Human Subjects Research Office on 09/13/2016 (Protocol #20120757/MOD00013692). YouGov, the provider of the research subjects, complies fully with European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR) standards for protecting individuals' privacy and information. YouGov respects the privacy of all of its visitors and participants. YouGov's privacy policy outlines what personally identifiable information is collected, how the information is used, with whom the information may be shared, and the security procedures in place to help prevent loss, misuse, or alteration of information under their control. All YouGov panelists join voluntarily through a double opt-in procedure, where respondents must confirm their consent again by responding to an email, the database checks to ensure the newly recruited panelist is in fact new, and that the address information provided is valid. YouGov invites people to complete self-administered surveys via the web using a panel of respondents. Panelists are provided the privacy policy when they voluntarily sign up, and are provided a link to this policy with each study request. Specifically, each invitation states that their participation is voluntary and confidential. YouGov's detailed privacy policy is available online (https://today.yougov.com/about/privacy). Participants were free to stop participating at any time by closing their web browser. Participation in the study was confidential. Identifying information, such as names or addresses, was not collected during the study.

*Descriptive Statistics*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A1. Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|  | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Independent variables |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partisanship (Democrat-Republican) | 968 | 1 | 7 | 3.6 | 2.1 |
| General trust in government | 1000 | 1 | 5 | 2.6 | 1.1 |
| Specific trust in local government | 1000 | 1 | 3 | 2.2 | .7 |
| Level of concern about Zika | 777 | 1 | 5 | 2.9 | 1.2 |
| Number of Zika cases in respondent’s state | 998 | 3 | 1083 | 268.0 | 350.2 |
| Google trends on searches for “zika” in respondent’s state | 998 | 25 | 100 | 52.6 | 19.9 |
| Does not have health insurance | 1000 | 0 | 1 | .1 | .3 |
| Planning on having a child | 777 | 0 | 1 | .2 | .4 |
| Female | 1000 | 0 | 1 | .5 | .5 |
| Education | 1000 | 1 | 6 | 3.2 | 1.6 |
| Birth year (older-younger) | 1000 | 1926 | 1998 | 1968.6 | 17.8 |
| Dependent variables for policy actions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Educate public | 777 | 0 | 6 | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| Insecticides | 777 | 0 | 6 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Travel warnings/bans | 777 | 0 | 6 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Fund research | 777 | 0 | 6 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Fines for standing water | 777 | 0 | 6 | .7 | .8 |
| Delay pregnancy | 777 | 0 | 6 | .8 | 1.3 |
| GMMs | 777 | 0 | 6 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Dependent variables for policy source |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal government | 777 | 0 | 7 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| State government | 777 | 0 | 7 | 1.9 | 1.6 |
| Local government | 777 | 0 | 7 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Non-profits | 777 | 0 | 7 | 1.0 | 1.3 |
| Private sector | 777 | 0 | 6 | .9 | 1.1 |
| Individuals | 777 | 0 | 7 | .7 | 1.0 |
| Note: Sample sizes vary due to missing data. | | | | | |

*Robustness Check*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A2. Correlates of desired number of policy actors to abate Zika by type of policy (multivariate regression analyses) | | | | | | |
|  | Educate public | Insecticides | Travel warnings/  bans | Fines for standing water | Delay pregnancy | GMMs |
| Partisanship (Democrat-Republican) | **-.04\***  **(.02)** | -.01  (.03) | -.01  (.02) | -.04  (.03) | -.01  (.04) | -.04  (.02) |
| General trust in government | -.001  (.04) | **.09\*\***  **(.03)** | -.03  (.03) | **.19\*\*\***  **(.06)** | **.20\*\*\***  **(.06)** | **.12\*\***  **(.04)** |
| Specific trust in local government | .02  (.06) | -.03  (.06) | .08  (.06) | .01  (.09) | .07  (.10) | -.01  (.07) |
| Level of concern about Zika | .01  (.03) | .04  (.04) | **.11\*\***  **(.04)** | .08  (.05) | .06  (.06) | .04  (.04) |
| Number of Zika cases in respondent’s state | -.00004  (.0001) | **.001\*\***  **(.0002)** | .0003  (.0002) | .0002  (.0002) | .0001  (.0003) | .0003  (.0002) |
| Google trends on searches for “zika” in respondent’s state | .001  (.003) | **-.01\*\***  **(.004)** | -.005  (.003) | -.001  (.004) | .0001  (.005) | -.003  (.004) |
| Does not have health insurance | .05  (.16) | -.21  (.14) | -.25  (.17) | -.05  (.28) | .37  (.32) | -.40  (.26) |
| Planning on having a child | .01 (.08) | -.07  (.09) | -.03  (.09) | .13  (.12) | -.07  (.16) | .05  (.11) |
| Female | .05  (.08) | -.07  (.09) | .06  (.08) | .19  .10 | -.11  (.14) | **-.32\*\*\***  **(.09)** |
| Education | **.07\***  **(.03)** | **.08\***  **(.03)** | .02  (.03) | .01  (.04) | **.14\*\***  **(.05)** | .05  (.03) |
| Birth year (older-younger) | .004  (.003) | -.001  (.003) | .003  (.002) | -.01  (.004) | -.001  (.01) | -.00004  (.003) |
| Constant | -7.83  (5.15) | 2.58  (5.42) | -5.50  (4.74) | 11.49  (6.94) | .16  (10.81) | -.16  (5.72) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| α | .14 | .05 | < .001 | <..001 | .74 | < .001 |
| Log likelihood | -1377.90 | -1097.98 | -1014.59 | -786.97 | -909.47 | -902.55 |
| x2 | 26.73\*\* | 46.86\*\*\* | 17.13 | 41.03\*\*\* | 35.69\*\*\* | 58.95\*\*\* |
| N | 755 | 755 | 755 | 755 | 755 | 755 |
| \*p <=.05, \*\*p <=.01, \*\*\*p<=.001  Model type: Negative binomial regression  Note: Cases with missing data were excluded using listwise deletion. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The model for funding research presented in Table 2 using Poisson regression would not converge using negative binomial regression. | | | | | | |