

## **Appendix for “Local Norms, Political Partisanship, and Pandemic Response: Evidence from the US”**

### **Appendix A: Supporting tables and figures for main results**

Table A1: Summary statistics for July 2020 survey

Table A2: Summary statistics for March-April 2021 survey

Table A3: Balance tests for experimental treatment

Table A4: Regression results for Figures 1, 2, &5

Table A5: Robustness tests

Table A6: Regression results for Figure 3

Table A7: Regression results for Figure 4

Table A8: Regression results using separate dimensions and components of SD behavior index

Table A9: Regression results using separate dimensions of perceived local norms index

Table A10: Drivers of local norm enforcement

### **Appendix B: Survey question wording and additional information on indicators**

**Table A1: Summary statistics for June 2020 survey**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
Social distancing behavior index	2,403	0.845	0.178	0	1
Social distancing policy support index	2,403	0.684	0.261	0	1
Local community norms	2,397	0.806	0.225	0	1
Google mobility reduction	2,275	0.703	0.091	0	1
Democrat	2,189	0.529	0.499	0	1
Independent	2,189	0.119	0.324	0	1
Republican	2,189	0.351	0.477	0	1
White	2,403	0.592	0.492	0	1
Black	2,403	0.140	0.347	0	1
Latinx	2,403	0.168	0.374	0	1
Asian	2,403	0.077	0.267	0	1
Other race	2,403	0.023	0.151	0	1
Education: hs or less	2,403	0.396	0.489	0	1
Education: some college	2,403	0.265	0.441	0	1
Education: ba	2,403	0.223	0.416	0	1
Education: post-grad	2,403	0.117	0.321	0	1
Income category	2403	6.808	3.508	1	12
Age category	2,403	4.779	1.758	2	9
Female	2,403	0.499	0.500	0	1
Covid deaths per 100K (7-day period)	2,365	0.046	0.057	0	.451
State-level restrictions index	2,365	6.713	1.900	0	10

**Table A2: Summary statistics for March-April 2021 survey**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
CM info treatment	2,414	0.487	0.500	0	1
Mask usage intention	2,414	0.859	0.254	0	1
Mask mandate support	2,316	0.749	0.334	0	1
Perceived local mask norm	2,414	0.777	0.240	0	1
Democrat	2,151	0.554	0.497	0	1
Independent	2,151	0.114	0.318	0	1
Republican	2,151	0.332	0.471	0	1
White	2,417	0.607	0.488	0	1
Black	2,417	0.144	0.351	0	1
Latinx	2,417	0.174	0.379	0	1
Asian	2,417	0.060	0.237	0	1
Other race	2,417	0.015	0.123	0	1
Education: hs or less	2,417	0.428	0.495	0	1
Education: some college	2,417	0.333	0.471	0	1
Education: ba	2,417	0.137	0.344	0	1
Education: post-grad	2,417	0.102	0.303	0	1
Income category	2,417	6.144	3.481	1	12
Age category	2,417	4.729	1.838	2	9
Female	2,417	0.502	0.500	0	1
State-level restrictions index	2,388	5.286	2.329	0	9

**Table A3: Balance Tests for Experimental Treatment**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Chi square (p-value)</i>
Age group (2-9)	9.35 (.22)
Education level (1-4)	2.52 (.47)
Female (1-2)	2.51 (.11)
Income level (1-12)	24.47 (.01)
Race (1-5)	8.47 (.08)
Partisan orientation (1-3)	.01 (.99)

These balance tests suggest that some of the demographic variables are significantly or marginally associated with treatment assignment. As a result, we control for them in our analysis of treatment effects.

**Table A4: Regression results for Figures 1, 2 & 4**

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	SD Behav	SD Policy Pref	SD Behav	SD Policy Pref	Perceived local norm	Perceived local norm
Perceived local norms index	.237** (.018)	.434** (.025)	.137** (.025)	.275** (.035)		
County-level mobility change					.165** (.058)	.147* (.065)
Independent	-.009 (.013)	-.093** (.017)	-.176** (.045)	-.311** (.063)	-.035* (.014)	-.162 (.120)
Republican	-.063** (.009)	-.150** (.014)	-.199** (.030)	-.379** (.043)	-.053** (.012)	-.051 (.093)
Independent#Perceived local norms			.207** (.050)	.268** (.071)		
Republican#Perceived local norms			.167** (.033)	.281** (.050)		
Independent# County-level mobility change						.180 (.163)
Republican# County-level mobility change						-.004 (.133)
Black	-.009 (.009)	.040** (.014)	-.007 (.009)	.042** (.014)	.029* (.013)	.029* (.013)
Latinx	.044** (.011)	.073** (.016)	.044** (.011)	.074** (.016)	.038** (.013)	.038** (.013)
Asian	.055** (.013)	.059* (.025)	.055** (.014)	.060* (.024)	.049** (.017)	.049** (.017)
Other race	-.039 (.029)	-.019 (.034)	-.029 (.028)	-.004 (.033)	-.027 (.034)	-.026 (.034)
Educ:Some college	.011 (.009)	.004 (.014)	.012 (.009)	.006 (.013)	-.008 (.013)	-.008 (.013)
Educ: BA	.021* (.010)	.005 (.014)	.022* (.010)	.006 (.014)	.003 (.014)	.003 (.014)
Educ: Post-grad	-.023 (.015)	.045** (.017)	-.023 (.016)	.045** (.017)	.018 (.018)	.018 (.018)
Income category	.001 (.001)	-.004** (.002)	.002 (.001)	-.004* (.002)	.003# (.002)	.003# (.002)
Age category	.019** (.002)	-.006# (.003)	.021** (.002)	-.004 (.003)	.023** (.003)	.023** (.003)
Female	-.028** (.006)	-.018# (.010)	-.027** (.006)	-.017# (.010)	-.007 (.010)	-.007 (.010)
Covid deaths/100K	.074 (.066)	.135 (.098)	.059 (.066)	.112 (.097)	.224* (.099)	.221* (.099)
State restrictions index	.003 (.002)	.004 (.003)	.004# (.002)	.005# (.003)	.001 (.004)	.001 (.004)
Constant	.551** (.022)	.401** (.032)	.621** (.024)	.511** (.037)	.554** (.045)	.567** (.052)
Observations	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,074	2,074
R-squared	.210	.280	.222	.294	.068	.068

OLS regression coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered at the FIPS level) in parentheses \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, # p<.1

**Table A5: Robustness tests**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Perceived local norms	.137** (.025)	.275** (.035)	.239** (.036)	.317** (.057)	.122** (.025)	.254** (.035)	.137** (.025)	.269** (.035)
Independent	-.176** (.045)	-.311** (.063)	-.161** (.045)	-.265** (.066)	-.158** (.045)	-.277** (.061)	-.129* (.055)	-.299** (.083)
Republican	-.199** (.030)	-.379** (.043)	-.184** (.030)	-.353** (.044)	-.149** (.035)	-.287** (.047)	-.150** (.037)	-.338** (.061)
Independent# Perceived local norms	.207** (.050)	.268** (.071)	.183** (.051)	.230** (.073)	.188** (.050)	.233** (.068)	.197** (.050)	.263** (.071)
Republican# Perceived local norms	.167** (.033)	.281** (.050)	.149** (.033)	.256** (.050)	.121** (.039)	.206** (.055)	.162** (.034)	.282** (.050)
Covid news index			.127# (.072)	.295** (.100)				
Covid news index# Perceived local norms			-.247** (.081)	-.149 (.111)				
Trust conservative news outlets					-.092* (.037)	-.166** (.047)		
Trust conservative news outlets# Perceived local norms					.077# (.043)	.111* (.055)		
Trump vote share							.041 (.032)	-.090* (.037)
Independent# Trump vote share							-.091 (.071)	-.014 (.098)
Republican# Trump vote share							-.098* (.042)	-.074 (.072)
Black	-.007 (.009)	.042** (.014)	-.004 (.009)	.031* (.014)	-.007 (.009)	.043** (.014)	-.006 (.010)	.034* (.014)
Latinx	.044** (.011)	.074** (.016)	.047** (.010)	.067** (.016)	.044** (.010)	.073** (.016)	.044** (.011)	.064** (.016)
Asian	.055** (.014)	.060* (.024)	.056** (.013)	.058* (.025)	.055** (.013)	.059* (.023)	.055** (.014)	.048# (.025)
Other race	-.029 (.028)	-.004 (.033)	-.023 (.029)	-.015 (.032)	-.026 (.028)	.003 (.033)	-.032 (.028)	-.009 (.033)
Educ:Some college	.012 (.009)	.006 (.013)	.013 (.009)	.005 (.014)	.012 (.009)	.005 (.013)	.012 (.009)	.005 (.013)
Educ: BA	.022* (.010)	.006 (.014)	.021* (.010)	.007 (.013)	.020* (.010)	.002 (.013)	.021* (.010)	.002 (.014)
Educ: Post-grad	-.023 (.016)	.045** (.017)	-.017 (.015)	.032# (.017)	-.023 (.015)	.045* (.018)	-.028# (.015)	.036* (.017)
Income category	.002 (.001)	-.004* (.002)	.001 (.001)	-.003* (.002)	.002 (.001)	-.004* (.002)	.002 (.001)	-.004* (.002)
Age category	.021** (.002)	-.004 (.003)	.018** (.002)	.002 (.003)	.021** (.002)	-.004 (.003)	.021** (.002)	-.002 (.003)
Female	-.027** (.006)	-.017# (.010)	-.025** (.006)	-.024* (.010)	-.026** (.006)	-.014 (.010)	-.027** (.006)	-.019* (.010)
Covid deaths/100K	.059 (.066)	.112 (.097)	.062 (.065)	.094 (.098)	.059 (.065)	.114 (.095)	.051 (.065)	.019 (.108)
State restrictions index	.004# (.002)	.005# (.003)	.004# (.002)	.004 (.003)	.004# (.002)	.006# (.003)	.004# (.002)	.004 (.003)
Constant	.621** (.024)	.511** (.037)	.573** (.035)	.398** (.056)	.636** (.025)	.540** (.037)	.598** (.031)	.569** (.042)
Observations	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,138	2,138
R-squared	.222	.294	.234	.313	.229	.311	.224	.297

Robust standard errors in parentheses \*\* p&lt;0.01, \* p&lt;0.05, # p&lt;0.1

**Table A6: Regression results for Figure 3**

VARIABLES	(1) Mask usage intention	(2) Mask usage intention	(3) Mask mandate support	(4) Mask mandate support	(5) Perceived local norm	(6) Perceived local norm
Mask info treatment	.030** (.010)	.022 (.014)	.015 (.013)	.011 (.018)	.017# (.010)	.004 (.013)
Independent	-.068** (.017)	-.090** (.023)	-.123** (.022)	-.133** (.031)	-.064** (.016)	-.104** (.022)
Republican	-.152** (.012)	-.156** (.016)	-.285** (.015)	-.286** (.021)	-.082** (.011)	-.088** (.015)
Mask info treatment# Independent		.046 (.033)		.020 (.043)		.082* (.032)
Mask info treatment# Republican		.007 (.022)		.003 (.029)		.012 (.021)
Black	.000 (.016)	-.000 (.016)	.048* (.020)	.048* (.020)	.021 (.015)	.021 (.015)
Latinx	.040** (.015)	.039** (.015)	.068** (.019)	.068** (.019)	.054** (.014)	.053** (.014)
Asian	.024 (.023)	.024 (.023)	.115** (.029)	.115** (.029)	.075** (.022)	.073** (.022)
Other race	-.055 (.043)	-.054 (.043)	-.012 (.056)	-.011 (.056)	.019 (.041)	.021 (.041)
Educ:Some college	.008 (.012)	.008 (.012)	-.018 (.016)	-.018 (.016)	-.007 (.012)	-.007 (.012)
Educ: BA	.034# (.017)	.034* (.017)	.014 (.022)	.014 (.022)	.021 (.017)	.022 (.017)
Educ: Post-grad	.036# (.020)	.036# (.020)	.040 (.025)	.040 (.025)	.045* (.019)	.046* (.019)
Income category	.003 (.002)	.003 (.002)	-.001 (.002)	-.001 (.002)	.002 (.002)	.002 (.002)
Age category	.025** (.003)	.025** (.003)	.020** (.004)	.020** (.004)	.033** (.003)	.033** (.003)
Female	.035** (.011)	.035** (.011)	.041** (.014)	.041** (.014)	.018# (.010)	.018# (.010)
State restrictions index	.004# (.002)	.004# (.002)	.003 (.003)	.003 (.003)	.003 (.002)	.003 (.002)
Constant	.716** (.024)	.721** (.024)	.705** (.031)	.707** (.031)	.595** (.023)	.602** (.023)
Observations	2,130	2,130	2,058	2,058	2,130	2,130
R-squared	.135	.136	.205	.206	.119	.122

OLS regression coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered at the FIPS level) in parentheses \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, # p<.1

**Table A7: Experimental results in communities with low mask usage**

VARIABLES	(1) Mask usage intention	(2) Mask usage intention	(3) Mask mandate support	(4) Mask mandate support	(5) Perceived local norm	(6) Perceived local norm	(7) Mask Usage intention	(8) Mask mandate support	(9) Perceived local norm
Mask info treatment	.045** (.016)	.029 (.022)	.040* (.019)	.030 (.027)	.041** (.015)	.025 (.020)	.227* (.110)	.294* (.145)	.130 (.107)
Independent	-.132** (.026)	-.152** (.036)	-.171** (.034)	-.167** (.045)	-.048# (.025)	-.094** (.033)	-.066** (.017)	-.120** (.022)	-.063** (.016)
Republican	-.177** (.018)	-.191** (.024)	-.325** (.022)	-.338** (.030)	-.070** (.017)	-.076** (.022)	-.150** (.012)	-.284** (.015)	-.080** (.011)
Mask info treat# Independent		.044 (.052)		-.009 (.066)		.102* (.049)			
Mask info treat# Republican		.031 (.034)		.027 (.042)		.013 (.031)			
State mask usage frequency							.292** (.089)	.305* (.119)	.289** (.086)
Mask info treat# State mask freq							-.233# (.130)	-.330# (.170)	-.134 (.126)
Black	-.008 (.023)	-.008 (.023)	.014 (.029)	.015 (.029)	.049* (.021)	.049* (.021)	-.000 (.016)	.048* (.020)	.021 (.015)
Latinx	.056* (.026)	.056* (.026)	.051 (.033)	.051 (.033)	.071** (.025)	.071** (.025)	.033* (.015)	.062** (.019)	.046** (.014)
Asian	.031 (.051)	.031 (.051)	.081 (.062)	.080 (.062)	.054 (.048)	.055 (.048)	.019 (.023)	.110** (.029)	.068** (.022)
Other race	-.022 (.081)	-.020 (.081)	-.042 (.104)	-.042 (.104)	.073 (.076)	.075 (.076)	-.057 (.043)	-.012 (.056)	.014 (.041)
Educ:Some college	.019 (.019)	.018 (.019)	-.035 (.023)	-.035 (.023)	-.031# (.017)	-.032# (.017)	.008 (.012)	-.018 (.016)	-.007 (.012)
Educ: BA	.051# (.027)	.051# (.027)	.013 (.033)	.014 (.033)	.027 (.025)	.027 (.025)	.034* (.017)	.014 (.022)	.021 (.017)
Educ: Post-grad	.023 (.032)	.022 (.032)	.022 (.039)	.020 (.039)	.057# (.030)	.057# (.030)	.036# (.020)	.039 (.025)	.045* (.019)
Income category	.002 (.003)	.002 (.003)	-.003 (.003)	-.003 (.003)	.001 (.003)	.001 (.003)	.003 (.002)	-.002 (.002)	.001 (.002)
Age category	.024** (.004)	.024** (.004)	.018** (.006)	.018** (.006)	.036** (.004)	.036** (.004)	.024** (.003)	.019** (.004)	.032** (.003)
Female	.031# (.017)	.030# (.017)	.044* (.021)	.044* (.021)	.017 (.016)	.017 (.016)	.037** (.011)	.042** (.014)	.020* (.010)
State restrictions index	.005 (.003)	.005 (.003)	.005 (.004)	.005 (.004)	.003 (.003)	.003 (.003)	.002 (.002)	.002 (.003)	.001 (.002)
Constant	.714** (.036)	.721** (.036)	.729** (.045)	.732** (.046)	.553** (.033)	.561** (.034)	.481** (.076)	.456** (.101)	.365** (.073)
Sample	Lo-mask	Lo-mask	Lo-mask	Lo-mask	Lo-mask	Lo-mask	Full	Full	Full
Observations	1,055	1,055	1,015	1,015	1,055	1,055	2,129	2,057	2,129
R-squared	.147	.148	.228	.228	.124	.128	.140	.208	.125

OLS regression coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered at the FIPS level) in parentheses \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, # p<.1 Note: low mask usage is defined as residing in a state where reported mask usage was below the median in the sample.



**Table A8: Regression results using separate dimensions and components of SD behavior index**

VARIABLES	(1) Factor 1	(2) Factor 2	(3) Avoided restaurant	(4) Avoided retail	(5) Avoided entertain	(6) Washed hands	(7) Kept 6ft distance	(8) Wore mask	(9) Stayed home
Perceived local norms	.057* (.024)	.291** (.018)	.097** (.029)	.086** (.029)	.066* (.027)	.155** (.020)	.300** (.023)	.367** (.032)	.313** (.026)
Independent	.028* (.014)	-.031** (.011)	.032# (.017)	.029# (.017)	.024 (.016)	-.023# (.013)	-.018 (.013)	-.057** (.019)	-.024 (.017)
Republican	-.047** (.011)	-.053** (.008)	-.054** (.012)	-.053** (.013)	-.054** (.012)	-.034** (.009)	-.045** (.010)	-.083** (.013)	-.065** (.011)
Black	-.041** (.016)	.015# (.009)	-.040* (.018)	-.039* (.020)	-.041* (.018)	.027** (.010)	.012 (.011)	.012 (.015)	-.011 (.015)
Latinx	.037* (.016)	.033** (.008)	.033# (.020)	.047* (.018)	.045* (.018)	.027** (.010)	.017# (.010)	.067** (.013)	.037* (.015)
Asian	.051** (.018)	.035** (.012)	.065** (.020)	.062** (.020)	.060** (.020)	.013 (.013)	.036* (.016)	.061** (.014)	.047** (.017)
Other race	-.009 (.029)	-.045# (.024)	-.038 (.042)	.000 (.031)	.001 (.035)	-.003 (.030)	-.047 (.031)	-.063 (.041)	-.087* (.043)
Educ:Some college	.011 (.013)	.008 (.009)	.005 (.015)	.013 (.015)	.015 (.015)	-.006 (.010)	.008 (.010)	.033* (.015)	.003 (.015)
Educ: BA	.027# (.014)	.016# (.010)	.024 (.016)	.031# (.016)	.024 (.016)	-.012 (.011)	.010 (.012)	.034* (.016)	.038* (.015)
Educ: Post-grad	-.074** (.027)	.021# (.012)	-.076* (.030)	-.071* (.030)	-.082** (.032)	-.015 (.015)	.011 (.013)	.044* (.018)	.030# (.017)
Income category	.004* (.002)	-.001 (.001)	.005** (.002)	.003# (.002)	.004* (.002)	.001 (.001)	-.000 (.001)	.001 (.002)	-.005** (.002)
Age category	.035** (.003)	.003# (.002)	.039** (.004)	.037** (.004)	.035** (.004)	-.001 (.002)	.010** (.002)	.008* (.003)	.001 (.003)
Female	-.035** (.009)	-.010 (.006)	-.042** (.011)	-.046** (.011)	-.032** (.011)	-.009 (.008)	-.009 (.007)	-.025* (.011)	-.015 (.011)
Covid deaths/100K	.113 (.090)	.026 (.065)	.076 (.105)	.156 (.104)	.123 (.105)	-.021 (.066)	-.054 (.086)	.256** (.089)	.009 (.099)
State restrictions index	-.001 (.003)	.004* (.002)	.001 (.003)	-.002 (.004)	-.001 (.004)	.003 (.002)	-.001 (.002)	.020** (.004)	-.001 (.003)
Constant	.599** (.030)	.535** (.023)	.574** (.036)	.619** (.034)	.642** (.034)	.780** (.027)	.622** (.026)	.391** (.039)	.625** (.034)
Observations	2,123	2,123	2,143	2,147	2,141	2,154	2,154	2,154	2,154
R-squared	.108	.224	.107	.101	.089	.062	.169	.204	.122

OLS regression coefficients with robust standard errors (clustered at the FIPS level) in parentheses \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, # p<.1

**Table A9: Regression results using separate dimensions of perceived local norms index**

VARIABLES	(1) Mask usage intention	(2) Mask usage intention	(3) Mask usage intention	(4) Mask mandate support	(5) Mask mandate support	(6) Mask mandate support
Perceived local norms index	.237** (.018)			.434** (.025)		
Perceived norms – family & friends		.251** (.017)			.422** (.023)	
Perceived norms – other community members			.136** (.016)			.283** (.024)
Independent	-.009 (.013)	-.002 (.013)	-.017 (.013)	-.093** (.017)	-.084** (.017)	-.105** (.018)
Republican	-.063** (.009)	-.056** (.008)	-.070** (.009)	-.150** (.014)	-.141** (.013)	-.165** (.015)
Black	-.009 (.009)	-.009 (.009)	-.005 (.009)	.040** (.014)	.041** (.014)	.042** (.015)
Latinx	.044** (.011)	.044** (.011)	.048** (.011)	.073** (.016)	.076** (.015)	.079** (.016)
Asian	.055** (.013)	.051** (.013)	.060** (.014)	.059* (.025)	.060** (.023)	.068* (.027)
Other race	-.039 (.029)	-.036 (.028)	-.031 (.029)	-.019 (.034)	-.013 (.033)	-.028 (.037)
Educ:Some college	.011 (.009)	.010 (.009)	.011 (.010)	.004 (.014)	.000 (.014)	.004 (.014)
Educ: BA	.021* (.010)	.019# (.010)	.024* (.010)	.005 (.014)	.002 (.014)	.008 (.014)
Educ: Post-grad	-.023 (.015)	-.021 (.016)	-.022 (.015)	.045** (.017)	.051** (.017)	.045* (.018)
Income category	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.002 (.001)	-.004** (.002)	-.004** (.002)	-.004* (.002)
Age category	.019** (.002)	.020** (.002)	.021** (.002)	-.006# (.003)	-.004 (.003)	-.004 (.003)
Female	-.028** (.006)	-.026** (.006)	-.029** (.007)	-.018# (.010)	-.015 (.010)	-.021* (.010)
Covid deaths/100K	.074 (.066)	.065 (.065)	.102 (.069)	.135 (.098)	.125 (.096)	.181# (.102)
State restrictions index	.003 (.002)	.004# (.002)	.003 (.002)	.004 (.003)	.006# (.003)	.004 (.003)
Constant	.551** (.022)	.520** (.022)	.626** (.020)	.401** (.032)	.373** (.033)	.524** (.032)
Observations	2,154	2,148	2,150	2,154	2,148	2,150
R-squared	.210	.235	.163	.280	.294	.224

Robust standard errors in parentheses \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, # p<.1

**Table A10: Drivers of local norm enforcement**

VARIABLES	(1) Confront Mask	(2) Confront Mask Very Likely	(3) Confront Mask Very Likely	(4) Confront Mask Very Likely	(5) Confront Mask Very Likely
Mask info treatment	.010 (.015)	.021# (.015)	.010 (.023)	.043* (.021)	.049** (.019)
Mask info treatment #			.017 (.034)		
Educ:Some college			-.034 (.045)		
Mask info treatment #					
Educ: BA					

Mask info treatment #			.092#		
Educ: Post-grad			(.050)		
Mask info treatment#1.female				-.046	
				(.030)	
Mask info treatment#Black					-.070
					(.043)
Mask info treatment#Latinx					-.099*
					(.041)
Mask info treatment#Asian					-.023
					(.063)
Mask info treatment#Other					-.041
					(.129)
Educ:Some college	-.019	-.004	-.012	-.004	-.005
	(.018)	(.018)	(.024)	(.018)	(.018)
Educ: BA	-.002	-.024	-.009	-.026	-.025
	(.026)	(.025)	(.033)	(.025)	(.025)
Educ: Post-grad	.076**	.062*	.014	.061*	.061*
	(.029)	(.029)	(.039)	(.029)	(.029)
Independent					
Republican	-.061*	-.042#	-.041#	-.042#	-.042#
	(.025)	(.024)	(.024)	(.024)	(.024)
Income	-.120**	-.037*	-.037*	-.037*	-.037*
	(.017)	(.017)	(.017)	(.017)	(.017)
Female	-.009**	-.009**	-.008**	-.009**	-.008**
	(.003)	(.002)	(.002)	(.002)	(.002)
Age	-.031#	-.028#	-.028#	-.006	-.029#
	(.016)	(.016)	(.016)	(.021)	(.016)
Black	-.008#	-.006	-.006	-.006	-.006
	(.004)	(.004)	(.004)	(.004)	(.004)
Latinx	.082**	.075**	.076**	.074**	.108**
	(.023)	(.023)	(.023)	(.023)	(.030)
Asian	.087**	.051*	.051*	.051*	.098**
	(.022)	(.022)	(.022)	(.022)	(.029)
Other	.054	-.026	-.029	-.026	-.015
	(.034)	(.033)	(.033)	(.033)	(.045)
State_restrictions	-.029	-.021	-.023	-.018	.002
	(.063)	(.062)	(.062)	(.062)	(.104)
Index	.012**	.008*	.008*	.008*	.008*
	(.003)	(.003)	(.003)	(.003)	(.003)
Constant					
	(.035)	(.034)	(.035)	(.035)	(.035)
Observations	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130
R-squared	.068	.031	.033	.032	.034

Standard errors in parentheses \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, # p<.1

In Table A9 we present the effects of the experimental intervention about mask usage in the respondent's state on an additional outcome variable: the stated likelihood of confronting someone else in the community about not wearing a mask while being in public in close proximity to other people. The responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Extremely unlikely" to "Extremely likely", and for the purposes of the analysis were recoded to a 0-1 scale, with higher values indicating higher likelihood to enforce mask norms. All models control for the standard demographic measures, as well as the respondent's partisanship.

The results in model 1 of Table A9 show that the experimental intervention, which informed respondents that, according to a Carnegie-Mellon study, a majority of people in their state wore masks regularly, had a positive effect on the likelihood to enforce norms by confronting non-mask wearers but the effects fell short of statistical significance.

In model 2 we ran the same model specification but using a dichotomous version of the dependent variable, which identified respondents who said that they would be "extremely likely" to confront non-mask wearers.

(For comparability and ease of interpretation, we still use OLS regressions for these models, but results are unchanged when using probit models.) The results in model 2 suggest a substantively larger and marginally significant (.1 one-tailed) effect of the experimental treatment, which suggests that being informed/primed about local norms increases the likelihood of norm enforcement.

In the remaining three models in Table A9 we explore the heterogeneity of treatment effects by demographic categories. We want to emphasize that these tests are purely exploratory: we had no theoretical priors about these effects and did not pre-register any of these tests. With these caveats in mind, the results of models 3-5 nevertheless reveal a number of interesting patterns. Thus, according to model 3, the experimental treatment had a much larger effect for the most educated respondents (those with a post-graduate education): for them the conditional effects were roughly five times larger than the average effect in model 2, and were statistically significant (at .05 two-tailed). Model 4 reveals heterogeneous effects by gender: whereas for men the experimental treatment led to a significant increase in the likelihood of confronting non-mask wearers, for women the intervention had no effect at all. Finally, model 5 suggests that there were important differences along racial/ethnic lines: whereas the norms treatment had a positive and significant (at .05 two-tailed) effect among Whites, the effects disappeared among Black and Latinx respondents. While a more detailed interpretation of these heterogeneous effects is beyond the scope of this study, these findings suggest that norm enforcement is more likely among those with a privileged position in their local community.

## **Appendix B: Survey question wording and additional information on indicators**

In this appendix we detail the question wordings used for our main variables.

### *Partisanship*

Partisanship was measured using the following question: “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a DEMOCRAT, a REPUBLICAN, an INDEPENDENT, or what?” The response categories included Democrat, Republican, Independent, No preference and other party. Those identifying with a party were asked about their strength of their partisan attachment in the following way: Would you call yourself a STRONG Democrat/Republican or a NOT VERY STRONG Democrat/Republican? Response options were: Strong; Not very strong. Independents were asked if they leaned towards one of the two major parties -- Do you think of yourself as CLOSER to the Republican Party or the Democratic Party? Response options were: Closer to Republican; Closer to Democratic; Neither.

As we note in the paper, independent leaners typically behave like partisans, so only pure independents are included in the independent category (Klar and Krupnikov 2016; Keith et al. 1986). Leaners were grouped with weak and strong party identifiers yielding three categories: Republicans, pure independents, and Democrats.

### *Local Norms*

We measure injunctive norms by asking respondents, “To what extent do each of the following support or oppose social distancing actions such as staying at home or wearing a mask when you leave the house? Your friends and family members; people in your community who

are not friends and family members” The responses range on a 5-category Likert scale from “Mostly support” to “Mostly oppose” with “Neither support nor oppose” in the middle.<sup>1</sup>

### *Social Distancing Behavior*

We use two main dependent variables. The first is a social distancing index which measures each respondent’s self-reported change in behavior since the beginning of the pandemic. We asked respondents, “Compared to before the crisis, are you visiting the following establishments a lot more, a little more, about the same, a little less, or a lot less? [restaurants, shopping malls and retail stores, and movie theaters and other types of entertainment]” The index also included responses to, “In the past two weeks, how often have you \_\_\_\_\_? [washed your hands frequently, stayed six feet away from other people, worn a mask when in public (indoors) like at a store, stayed home]”. Respondents could choose “very often,” “somewhat often,” “not so often,” and “never.”

To measure common preventative behaviors, respondents were asked, “In the last two weeks, how often have you...Washed your hands frequently; Stayed six feet away from other people; Worn a mask when in public (indoors) like at a store; Stayed home. The response options were: Very often; somewhat often; not so often; never.

The second outcome variable is an index based on a series of questions about support for four types of government policies meant to contain the pandemic.<sup>2</sup> Respondents were asked, “How much do you support each of the following government measures aimed at stopping the spread of the coronavirus / COVID-19? Some of these are currently in place, while others are

---

<sup>1</sup> We combined the two questions into a community support index (Cronbach’s alpha = .75.)

<sup>2</sup> The index had a Cronbach’s alpha of .88, and was recoded to a 0-1 scale (with higher values representing greater support for government social distancing measures.)

not; ordering people to wear masks that cover the nose and mouth when outside the home; requiring people to stay at home for non-essential activities; ordering non-essential businesses to close; having police officers monitor public spaces such as roads, parks, and beaches and prevent access as necessary. Response categories were; strongly support; support; oppose; strongly oppose.

### *Control Variables*

We measure demographic characteristics in the following manner:

- Age: Respondents were asked: “Please select your age”. Response categories were: Under 18; 18 – 24; 25 – 34; 35 – 44; 45 – 54; 55 – 64; 65 – 74; 75 – 84; 85 or older.
- Gender: Respondents were asked: “How would you describe your gender”? Response options were: Male; Female; Other.
- Race: Respondents were asked: “How would you describe your race or ethnicity”? Response categories were: White, non Hispanic; Black or African American, non Hispanic; Latino, Latinx, or Hispanic; Asian; American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; Other.
- Education: Respondents were asked: “What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you received”? Response options were: Less than high school degree; High school graduate (high school diploma including GED); Some college but no degree; Associate degree (2-year); Bachelor's degree (4-year); Master's degree; Doctoral degree; Professional degree (JD, MD)
- Income: Respondents were asked: “Please indicate your yearly household income”? Response options were: Less than \$10,000; \$10,000 - \$19,999; \$20,000 - \$29,999; \$30,000 - \$39,999; \$40,000 - \$49,999; \$50,000 - \$59,999; \$60,000 - \$69,999;

\$70,000 - \$79,999; \$80,000 - \$89,999; \$90,000 - \$99,999; \$100,000 - \$149,999;  
More than \$150,000.

### *Covid restrictions and Covid-19 deaths*

To measure the restrictiveness of state policies relating to Covid-19, we use data compiled by Fullman et al. (2021). The database tracks the policy actions taken by every state in a wide range of policy areas. For every day in the period under study, we summed the total number of mandates in place, excluding advisory or recommended actions, yielding an index ranging from 0-10. We used a daily measure of Covid-19 cases and deaths in the United States, which was collected by the Johns Hopkins University's Center for Systems Science and Engineering (Dong et al. 2020).



