Table 1: Sample Demographics

Statistic	Percent
Age	
18-25 yrs	16.5%
26-35 yrs	23.8%
36-50 yrs	22.0%
51-65 yrs	25.1%
>65 yrs	16.1%
Gender	
Male	36.2%
Female	63.8%
Household Income	
<$40,000	35.7%
$40,000-75,000	25.1%
$75,000-150,000	24.9%
>$150,000	14.4%
Education	
HS Grad or Less	13.8%
Some College	40.6%
Bachelor's Degree	30.6%
Advanced Degree	15.1%
Race	
Non-Hispanic White	56.2%
Hispanic	20.1%
Asian	17.3%
Black	5.9%
American Indian	3.7%
Household Location	
Rural	24.1%
Urban/Suburban	75.9%
Party ID	
Democrat	47.8%
Republican	28%
Independent	24.1%

Table 2: Effects of Treatments and Covariates on the Predicted Probability of Support for Wild Pig Management in California

Treatment/Covariate	Predicted Probability	Δ
Treatment Condition		
Control	.644	-
Ecological Loss	.849	.205
Ecological Gain	.791	.147
Economic Loss	.751	.107
Economic Gain*	.709	.065
Animal Welfare Support		
High Support	.658	
Low Support	.815	.157
Gender		
Female	.703	
Male	.819	.116

Results are predicted probabilities at specific levels for each listed treatment or covariate, while holding other covariates at their means. Δ of predicted probabilities for treatments is in relation to control. For animal welfare and gender, treatments are excluded from the model in order to include all observations. To estimate animal welfare, High=top decile, Low=bottom decile.

*Economic gain treatment not significant at p<.05 in logit model.

Table 3: Heterogeneous Treatment Effects

Subgroup	ATE	95% CI	N
Ecological Treatments (Pooled)			
Democrat	.253	.192, .314	253
Republican	.113	.058, .168	127
Independent	.035	-.001, .071	100
Enviromentalist	.176	.109, .243	124
Non-Environmentalist	.230	.158, .302	131
Economic Treatments (Pooled)			
Democrat	.136	.090, .182	214
Republican	.099	.044, .154	115
Independent	-.113	-.180, -.046	85
Enviromentalist	-.002	-.009, .005	146
Non-Environmentalist	.161	.092, .230	108

Results are predicted probabilities at specific levels for each listed treatment or