

Holier Than Thou: Partisan Gap in the Consumption of Pornography Online*

Lucas Shen[†] Gaurav Sood[‡]

January 8, 2023

Abstract

Consumption of pornography has been blamed for a variety of societal ills, including the rise in misogyny, sex crimes, and the coarsening of culture. Using passively collected browsing data from YouGov, we investigate how much pornography Americans consume online. We find that there is a sharp positive skew in the consumption of pornography, with a small number of users consuming lots of pornography and most consuming small amounts. Only about 32 percent of respondents consumed pornography online during the month-long observation period. Of the people who consumed pornography, the median consumer spent about three-quarters of an hour consuming pornography and 95 percent of the consumers spent less than five and a half hours. Lastly, we find that, in line with previous research (MacInnis and Hodson, 2015; Edelman, 2009), which was based on aggregated data, Republicans consume somewhat more pornography online than Democrats. Adjusting for immutable characteristics like age and gender makes the differences go away.

*You can download the replication materials from <https://github.com/soodoku/adult>.

[†]Lucas is a Research Fellow at the National University of Singapore, lucas@lucasshen.com

[‡]Gaurav can be reached at gsood07@gmail.com

Consumption of pornography is associated with a variety of disturbing attitudes, beliefs, emotions, and behaviors. Consuming pornography is associated with support for violence against women (Hald, Malamuth and Yuen, 2010; Malamuth, Hald and Koss, 2012; Donnerstein, 1984), belief in rape myths (Foubert, Brosi and Bannon, 2011), increased gender role conflict, lesser sexual satisfaction (Szymanski and Stewart-Richardson, 2014; Stewart and Szymanski, 2012), poorer relationship quality (Szymanski and Stewart-Richardson, 2014; Szymanski, Feltman and Dunn, 2015), and sexually risky behaviors such as engaging in paid sex, and having extramarital sex (Wright and Randall, 2012). A lot of popular pornography also contains a healthy dose of violence. An analysis of popular pornography revealed that 88.2% of the scenes contained physical aggression, and 48.7% verbal aggression (Bridges et al., 2010). For all these reasons, there are serious concerns about the consumption of pornography.

In this paper, we investigate how much pornography Americans consume online. Using passive browsing data from YouGov, we find that there is a sharp skew in the consumption of pornography, with a small set of users consuming a large chunk of pornography. About 68 percent of respondents abstained from consuming pornography online during the month-long observation period. Of the people who consumed pornography, the median consumer spent about 45 minutes consuming pornography and the 95th percentile consumer spent about five and a half hours.

We also use the data to shed light on an age-old debate—whether Democrats consume more pornography than Republicans or vice versa. Both parties claim the higher moral ground. And in surveys both parties think consumption of pornography is abhorrent. Like previous research, which relied on aggregated data, we find that Republicans consume somewhat more pornography online than Democrats (MacInnis and Hodson, 2015; Edelman, 2009). Adjusting for background attributes like age, gender etc., makes the differences go away.

Data

We use data from YouGov to measure the consumption of adult content (Sood, 2022). YouGov maintains a large panel that it recruits through various methods. YouGov uses matched sampling to survey respondents: it draws a random sample from a large synthetic representative sampling frame, finds respondents that match the sampled individuals from its panel, and invites them to take a survey. For data on how well YouGov is able to approximate a random sample, see Rivers and Bailey (2009). For our sample, panelists also shared de-identified web browsing data tracked via passive metering software installed voluntarily on their computers. The software, called RealityMine, captures online visits independent of the type of browser or browser-specific privacy settings.

The data are from 1,200 respondents for June, 2022. We have data on about 6 million visits. For each visit, we have information on the domain (e.g., wikipedia.org), the time of visit, and the time spent on the domain. The respondents visited about 64,000 unique domains.

Our data also includes characteristics of the respondents. We have data on demographic characteristics like birth year, state, gender, race, and education level. We also have information on their party identification. Except for 120 respondents who did not respond or picked “not sure” or “don’t know,” the rest selected the party they identified with or marked themselves as independents. Of those 1,080 individuals, 82 percent lean either Republican or Democrat. The remaining 18 percent identify as independent. Column (3) of Table SI 1.7 reports summary statistics.

Measuring Pornographic Content

We code pornographic content at the domain level. Our main analysis depends on the domain classifications that come with YouGov data. We code domains that YouGov categorizes as

“Adult” as pornographic. These include “Adult” (e.g., xvideos.com), “Adult, Business” (e.g., onlyfans.com), and “Adult, Entertainment” (e.g., hentainfox.com). Yougov classifies some domains that do not primarily carry pornographic content, e.g., urbandictionary.com and 4chan.org, as ‘Adult.’ Given the skew in the data (See [Figure SI 1.1](#) and [Figure SI 1.2](#))¹, we manually checked the top adult domains to remove such sites. We code a domain as pornographic if there is nudity on the landing page or if the site is some form of erotica.

In [SI 1.3](#), we leverage the `piedomains` package, which uses a machine learning model that uses the text of the website to classify the content of domains ([Chintalapati and Sood, 2022](#)). We leverage the probability estimates to produce a low false negative and low false positive version. The key conclusions remain unchanged.

Results

Our primary dependent variables of interest are total time spent on pornographic sites and the proportion of time spent on pornographic sites. (In [SI 1.5.2](#), we analyze similar metrics for visits. The upshot is that the key conclusions are unaffected.)

Consumption of Pornography

Only about 32 percent of respondents consumed pornography online during the observation period. Of the 32% of the respondents who consumed any pornography during the month, the median consumer consumed less than an hour of pornography while the 80th percentile consumer consumed nearly 4.5 hours and the 95th percentile, nearly 20 hours (see [Table SI 1.1](#)). You see a similar picture when it comes to the proportion of time spent online consuming pornography—the 50th percentile is nearly 3%, the 80th percentile is about 14%, and

¹We cite some of the statistical packages to compute key results ([Pollard et al., 2018](#); [Seabold and Perktold, 2010](#); [Shen, 2022](#); [Virtanen et al., 2020](#)).

the 95th percentile is about 58% (see [SI 1.2](#)).

The consumption of pornography is also highly concentrated among a few sites, with the ten most frequented pornography sites receiving more than 12 times the traffic to all other pornographic sites (approximately 109 minutes vs. 9 minutes, see [Figure SI 1.3](#)). Close to 80 percent of the traffic to pornographic sites is to just one pornographic site ([Figure SI 1.4](#)).


Looking at the characteristics of consumers of pornography in Panel B of [Table SI 1.8](#), expectedly, consumers of pornography online are younger and are more likely to be male. In addition, consumers of pornography are no different in terms of party identification. The mean in the 7-point scale in party identification is identical, with a mean of 3.6 and a standard deviation of 2.2, for both consumers and non-consumers of pornography. Treating party identification as subgroups (Republicans, Independents, Democrats) does not change this lack of difference in party identification between consumers and non-consumers (see also [Figure SI 1.11](#)). This foreshadows the systematic lack of partisan differences in consumption of pornography online we find below.

Partisan Differences in Consumption of Pornography Online

Given the skew in the data, we ran a quantile regression, regressing the duration on party. As [Figure 1](#), the 80th percentile of the difference is close to 0 but from thereon, there is a sharp diverging trend with the 95th percentile difference nearly 1.5 hrs. For context, the 80th and 95th percentile of time spent on pornographic sites online among Republicans is nearly .3 hours and 6.2 hours respectively. In contrast, the corresponding numbers are .2 hours and 4.5 hours for Democrats.²

²We analyze the consumption of pornography online among independents in [Appendix SI 1.4](#). The median independent consumes more pornography than partisans (1.3 hours vs 0.7 hours in [Table SI 1.20](#) and 3.4% vs 2.3% in [Table SI 1.21](#)). This pattern reverses somewhat

Figure 1: Distribution of Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites




Notes: Dependent variable is the number of hours individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Figure SI 1.5](#) for the same plot controlling for individual characteristics. See [Table SI 1.10](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

Looking at the percentage of time spent on pornographic sites reveals a similar trend to the trend in total time spent on pornographic sites (see [Figure 2](#)). The 80th percentile of the partisan difference is nearly 0 and then there is a sharply rising line with differences nearly 10% at the 100th percentile (albeit the number is very imprecisely estimated).

Looking at differences in the percentage of partisans who consume any pornographic content shows muted differences. Nearly 31% percent of Democrats and 30% percent of Republicans consumed at least some pornography online in June, 2022; the difference between the two is not statistically significant ([Figure SI 1.11](#)).

To what extent are the results "explained" by the confounding demographic differences between the parties? To learn that, we control for immutable characteristics like age, near the right tail of the distribution.

Figure 2: Distribution of Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites



Notes: Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Figure SI 1.6](#) for the same plot controlling for individual characteristics. See [Table SI 1.11](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

gender, level of education qualification, race, and region. ([Table SI 1.7](#) shows differences in age, gender, and race by party identification.) We use these variables in our analyses of pornography consumption below. As [Appendix SI 1.2.2](#) shows, once you adjust for confounders, the partisan differences melt away.³

³Using an alternative machine learning classifier of domains in [Appendix SI 1.3](#) and alternative measures of pornography consumption (using traffic to pornographic sites) in [Appendix SI 1.5.2](#) does little to change our conclusions.

Discussion

Consumption of pornography has been attributed to a variety of ills. It is also considered problematic from a religious perspective. For instance, Christian theologians believe that consumption of pornography leads people away from purity and hence should be avoided.⁴ The Internet has dramatically increased access to pornography. This has led to the concern that pornography consumption has become very widespread and extensive. Our data suggest that pornography consumption online is highly concentrated with very few people consuming a lot of pornography and most people consuming very little or none.

The second contribution of our paper is estimates of partisan differences in consumption of pornography online. Both parties claim the higher ground when it comes to women—one’s case for morality is steeped in religion, the other’s in enduring concern for women. Our data suggest that partisan differences are likely small.

Our research has three major limitations. The first concern with our data is that we may not have all the Internet visitation data of a user. If the respondent changes their behavior in response to the knowledge that their data is being collected (even if it is de-identified), for e.g., they may modify their behavior on the machine or figure out ways to evade detection, it may bias our results. In fact, we think it is likely that people would be less likely to search for pornography on machines on which they have installed passive monitoring software (though the data are de-identified). If that is so, our estimates are a lower bound of consumption of online pornography. If this bias varies by party, our estimates of partisan differences will also be biased.

The second concern with our measurement is that we code content at a domain level. This runs the risk of incurring some ecological fallacy. For instance, our classification codes

⁴<https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/manual/help-for-pornography-users/effect-of-pornography>.

websites like Tumblr as not carrying pornographic content but some of Tumblr's content is pornographic.

The third concern is that our measures are a point in time. We have data from one month in one year - June, 2022. It is possible that people consume less pornography online and instead spend time outside in June when the weather in many parts of the US is more pleasant than in the preceding or following months.

References

- Bridges, Ana J, Robert Wosnitzer, Erica Scharrer, Chyng Sun and Rachael Liberman. 2010. “Aggression and sexual behavior in best-selling pornography videos: A content analysis update.” *Violence Against Women* 16(10):1065–1085.
- Chintalapati, Rajashekar and Gaurav Sood. 2022. “piedomains: Predict the kind of content hosted by a domain based on domain name and content.”.
URL: <https://github.com/themains/piedomains>
- Donnerstein, Edward. 1984. “Pornography: Its effect on violence against women.” *Pornography and sexual aggression* pp. 53–81.
- Edelman, Benjamin. 2009. “Markets Red Light States: Who Buys Online Adult Entertainment?” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 23(1):209–220.
- Foubert, John D, Matthew W Brosi and R Sean Bannon. 2011. “Pornography viewing among fraternity men: Effects on bystander intervention, rape myth acceptance and behavioral intent to commit sexual assault.” *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 18(4):212–231.
- Hald, Gert Martin, Neil M Malamuth and Carlin Yuen. 2010. “Pornography and attitudes supporting violence against women: Revisiting the relationship in nonexperimental studies.” *Aggressive Behavior* 36(1):14–20.
- MacInnis, Cara C and Gordon Hodson. 2015. “Do american States with more religious or conservative populations search more for sexual content on google?” *Archives of sexual behavior* 44(1):137–147.
- Malamuth, Neil M, Gert Martin Hald and Mary Koss. 2012. “Pornography, individual differences in risk and men’s acceptance of violence against women in a representative sample.” *Sex Roles* 66(7-8):427–439.

- Pollard, Tom, Alistair Johnson, Jesse Raffa and Roger Mark. 2018. “tableone: An open source Python package for producing summary statistics for research papers.”.
- URL:** <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooy012>
- Rivers, Douglas and Delia Bailey. 2009. Inference from matched samples in the 2008 US national elections. In *Proceedings of the joint statistical meetings*. pp. 627–639.
- Seabold, Skipper and Josef Perktold. 2010. statsmodels: Econometric and statistical modeling with python. In *9th Python in Science Conference*.
- Shen, Lucas. 2022. “Forestplot: A Python package to make publication-ready but customizable coefficient plots.”.
- URL:** <https://github.com/LSYS/forestplot>
- Sood, Gaurav. 2022. “YouGov Pulse Data for 1200 people for June 2022.”.
- URL:** <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/VIV4TS>
- Stewart, Destin N and Dawn M Szymanski. 2012. “Young adult women’s reports of their male romantic partner’s pornography use as a correlate of their self-esteem, relationship quality, and sexual satisfaction.” *Sex Roles* 67(5-6):257–271.
- Szymanski, Dawn M, Chandra E Feltman and Trevor L Dunn. 2015. “Male Partners’ Perceived Pornography Use and Women’s Relational and Psychological Health: The Roles of Trust, Attitudes, and Investment.” *Sex Roles* 73(5-6):187–199.
- Szymanski, Dawn M and Destin N Stewart-Richardson. 2014. “Psychological, relational, and sexual correlates of pornography use on young adult heterosexual men in romantic relationships.” *The Journal of Men’s Studies* 22(1):64–82.
- Virtanen, Pauli, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright,

Stéfan J. van der Walt, Matthew Brett, Joshua Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, Nikolay Mayorov, Andrew R. J. Nelson, Eric Jones, Robert Kern, Eric Larson, C J Carey, İlhan Polat, Yu Feng, Eric W. Moore, Jake VanderPlas, Denis Laxalde, Josef Perktold, Robert Cimrman, Ian Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, Charles R. Harris, Anne M. Archibald, Antônio H. Ribeiro, Fabian Pedregosa, Paul van Mulbregt and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. 2020. “SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python.” *Nature Methods* 17:261–272.


Wright, Paul J and Ashley K Randall. 2012. “Internet pornography exposure and risky sexual behavior among adult males in the United States.” *Computers in Human Behavior* 28(4):1410–1416.

SI 1 Supporting Information

SI 1.1 Descriptive Analysis


SI 1.1.1 Skew in Website Visits

Figure SI 1.1: Top 25 Pornography Sites




Notes: Table shows the top 25 pornographic sites that individuals visit in the sample period using over 6 million internet browsing logs. Pornography sites are as categorized by YouGov (see the [Data](#) section). The *Hours* column are the total number of hours that individuals in the sample spent on the site. The *Visits* column is total number of visits by individuals in the sample to the site. Sites to the right of the vertical dashed are the top 1 percent of pornographic sites. See [Figure SI 1.2](#) for top non-pornographic domains.

Figure SI 1.2: Top 25 (Non-Pornographic) Domains




Notes: Table shows the top 25 non-pornographic sites that individuals visit in the sample period using over 6 million internet browsing logs. The *Hours* column are the total number of hours that individuals in the sample spent on the site. The *Visits* column is total number of visits by individuals in the sample to the site. Sites to the right of the vertical dashed are the top 1 percent (of non-pornographic sites). See [Figure SI 1.2](#) for top non-pornographic domains.

Figure SI 1.3: Traffic to Top 10 Pornographic Sites



Notes: The Top 10 bar indicates traffic to the top 10 pornographic sites in the data (see [Figure SI 1.1](#)). Observations are at the individual-domain level ($N = 2,437$) for pornography sites and individuals who consume pornography online. The Others bar indicates traffic to all other pornographic sites outside of the top 10. The y-axis is the total time spent on pornographic sites, averaged across individuals. Time units is hours. Vertical bars are 95% confidence intervals from bootstrapped standard errors ($n = 1,000$).

Figure SI 1.4: Traffic to Top x Pornographic Sites by Party



Notes: Figure shows concentration of pornography consumption based on individuals' most frequented pornographic sites. Observations are from the 256 individuals with party identification (Republicans or Democrats) who consume pornography online. Shaded areas are 95% confidence intervals from bootstrapped standard errors ($n = 1,000$).

SI 1.1.2 Skew in Consumption of Pornographic Content

Table SI 1.1: Distribution of Consumption of Pornography Online

| Percentile | Hours |
|------------|-------|
| 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.1 |
| 0.30 | 0.2 |
| 0.40 | 0.4 |
| 0.50 | 0.7 |
| 0.60 | 1.5 |
| 0.70 | 2.4 |
| 0.80 | 4.5 |
| 0.90 | 10.1 |
| 0.95 | 20.0 |
| 0.96 | 22.0 |
| 0.97 | 26.8 |
| 0.98 | 29.1 |
| 0.99 | 40.8 |
| 1.00 | 94.0 |

Notes: Table shows key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) and their corresponding values for the duration (hours) spent by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period ($n = 353$). See [Table SI 1.2](#) for the distribution in terms of percentage of time.

Table SI 1.2: Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites

| Percentile | % time |
|------------|--------|
| 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.1 |
| 0.30 | 0.7 |
| 0.40 | 1.3 |
| 0.50 | 3.1 |
| 0.60 | 4.8 |
| 0.70 | 8.4 |
| 0.80 | 14.3 |
| 0.90 | 36.4 |
| 0.95 | 58.5 |
| 0.96 | 63.5 |
| 0.97 | 64.8 |
| 0.98 | 69.8 |
| 0.99 | 74.5 |
| 1.00 | 87.5 |

Notes: Table shows key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) and their corresponding values for the percentage of time on pornography sites spent by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period ($n = 353$). See [Table SI 1.1](#) for the distribution in terms of hours.

SI 1.2 Partisan Differences

SI 1.2.1 Distribution of Differences

Table SI 1.3: Distribution of Consumption of Pornography Online by Party

| Percentile | Hours | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Republicans | Democrats |
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 0.30 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 0.40 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| 0.50 | 1.4 | 0.5 |
| 0.60 | 2.2 | 0.7 |
| 0.70 | 3.0 | 1.5 |
| 0.80 | 5.5 | 2.7 |
| 0.90 | 11.2 | 7.0 |
| 0.95 | 25.4 | 13.8 |
| 0.96 | 27.1 | 18.3 |
| 0.97 | 27.9 | 19.9 |
| 0.98 | 30.0 | 22.0 |
| 0.99 | 36.5 | 46.0 |
| 1.00 | 37.5 | 90.5 |

Notes: Table shows splits by party and by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the duration (hours) spent by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Sample includes 256 Republicans and Democrats (see [Table SI 1.8](#)). See [Table SI 1.4](#) for the distribution in terms of percentage of time. See [Table SI 1.5](#) including non-consumers of pornography. See [Table SI 1.14](#) for the distribution using an alternate machine learning classifier of pornographic sites. A two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returns a p-value of 0.005, rejecting the null that the Republican and Democrat distributions are the same.

Table SI 1.4: Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites by Party

| Percentile | % time | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Republicans | Democrats |
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| 0.30 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| 0.40 | 2.3 | 0.9 |
| 0.50 | 4.0 | 1.3 |
| 0.60 | 6.6 | 3.2 |
| 0.70 | 10.7 | 5.7 |
| 0.80 | 20.8 | 12.3 |
| 0.90 | 36.8 | 35.8 |
| 0.95 | 46.4 | 53.4 |
| 0.96 | 54.8 | 58.6 |
| 0.97 | 63.3 | 64.0 |
| 0.98 | 68.7 | 65.0 |
| 0.99 | 71.9 | 72.9 |
| 1.00 | 87.5 | 77.4 |

Notes: Table shows splits by party and by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the percentage of time spent on pornography by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Sample includes 256 Republicans and Democrats (see [Table SI 1.8](#)). See [Table SI 1.3](#) for the distribution in terms of percentage of time. See [Table SI 1.6](#) including non-consumers of pornography. See [Table SI 1.15](#) for the distribution using an alternate machine learning classifier of pornographic sites. A two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returns a p-value of 0.025, rejecting the null that the Republican and Democrat distributions are the same at the 5% level.

Table SI 1.5: Distribution of Consumption of Pornography Online by Party
(Including non-consumers)

| Percentile | Hours | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Republicans | Democrats |
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.40 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.60 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.70 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.80 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| 0.90 | 2.6 | 1.0 |
| 0.95 | 6.2 | 4.5 |
| 0.96 | 10.0 | 5.4 |
| 0.97 | 10.9 | 7.0 |
| 0.98 | 17.0 | 9.9 |
| 0.99 | 27.4 | 19.3 |
| 1.00 | 37.5 | 90.5 |

Notes: Table shows splits by party and by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the duration (hours) spent by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Sample includes 834 Republicans and Democrats (see [Table SI 1.8](#)). See [Table SI 1.4](#) for the distribution in terms of percentage of time. See [Table SI 1.14](#) for the distribution using an alternate machine learning classifier of pornographic sites. A two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returns a p-value of 0.37, rejecting the null that the Republican and Democrat distributions are the same.

Table SI 1.6: Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites by Party
(Including non-consumers)

| Percentile | % time | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Republicans | Democrats |
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.40 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.60 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.70 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.80 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 0.90 | 8.4 | 4.8 |
| 0.95 | 28.4 | 16.3 |
| 0.96 | 32.1 | 25.8 |
| 0.97 | 36.2 | 36.5 |
| 0.98 | 42.2 | 49.2 |
| 0.99 | 59.1 | 63.6 |
| 1.00 | 87.5 | 77.4 |

Notes: Table shows splits by party and by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the percentage of time spent on pornography by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Sample includes 834 Republicans and Democrats (see [Table SI 1.8](#)). See [Table SI 1.3](#) for the distribution in terms of percentage of time. See [Table SI 1.15](#) for the distribution using an alternate machine learning classifier of pornographic sites. A two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returns a p-value of 0.6, rejecting the null that the Republican and Democrat distributions are the same at the 5% level.

SI 1.2.2 Accounting for Confounders

Table SI 1.7: Differences in Pornography Consumption and Individual Characteristics by Party

| | | Panel A. Measures of pornography consumption | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|
| | (1) Subgroups | (2) NA | (3) Total | (4) Democrat | (5) Republican | (6) P-val | (7) SMD |
| n | | | 1200 | 530 | 356 | | |
| Consume porn, n (%) | No | 65 | 774 (68.2) | 343 (68.5) | 235 (70.6) | 0.569 | 0.046 |
| | Yes | | 361 (31.8) | 158 (31.5) | 98 (29.4) | | |
| Minutes, mean (SD) | | 65 | 73.4 (342.1) | 58.8 (331.7) | 75.8 (277.4) | 0.423 | 0.056 |
| % of time, mean (SD) | | 65 | 3.4 (11.2) | 2.9 (10.7) | 3.5 (11.1) | 0.486 | 0.049 |
| Visits, mean (SD) | | 65 | 74.3 (328.9) | 59.9 (298.9) | 73.7 (271.1) | 0.489 | 0.048 |
| % of visits, mean (SD) | | 65 | 2.2 (7.1) | 1.7 (6.1) | 2.3 (7.1) | 0.238 | 0.085 |
| | | Panel B. Individual characteristics | | | | | |
| | (1) Subgroups | (2) NA | (3) Total | (4) Democrat | (5) Republican | (6) P-val | (7) SMD |
| n | | | 1200 | 530 | 356 | | |
| Party (7-point), mean (SD) | | 120 | 3.6 (2.2) | 1.7 (0.8) | 6.3 (0.8) | <0.001 | 5.670 |
| 2020 Pres. election, n (%) | Other/No vote | 170 | 270 (26.2) | 97 (20.2) | 47 (14.1) | <0.001 | 3.296 |
| | Vote Biden | | 419 (40.7) | 369 (76.9) | 8 (2.4) | | |
| | Vote Trump | | 341 (33.1) | 14 (2.9) | 278 (83.5) | | |
| Age, mean (SD) | | 0 | 49.5 (18.1) | 48.7 (17.8) | 55.4 (18.0) | <0.001 | 0.373 |
| Gender, n (%) | Female | 0 | 635 (52.9) | 312 (58.9) | 174 (48.9) | 0.004 | 0.201 |
| | Male | | 565 (47.1) | 218 (41.1) | 182 (51.1) | | |
| Race, n (%) | Asian | 0 | 49 (4.1) | 31 (5.8) | 6 (1.7) | <0.001 | 0.747 |
| | Black | | 152 (12.7) | 96 (18.1) | 7 (2.0) | | |
| | Hispanic | | 176 (14.7) | 87 (16.4) | 35 (9.8) | | |
| | Others | | 61 (5.1) | 29 (5.5) | 9 (2.5) | | |
| | White | | 762 (63.5) | 287 (54.2) | 299 (84.0) | | |
| Education, n (%) | College | 0 | 525 (43.8) | 258 (48.7) | 158 (44.4) | 0.625 | 0.091 |
| | HS | | 354 (29.5) | 146 (27.5) | 103 (28.9) | | |
| | No HS | | 73 (6.1) | 24 (4.5) | 17 (4.8) | | |
| | Some college | | 248 (20.7) | 102 (19.2) | 78 (21.9) | | |
| Region, n (%) | Midwest | 8 | 239 (20.1) | 100 (19.0) | 83 (23.4) | 0.034 | 0.204 |
| | Northeast | | 210 (17.6) | 103 (19.6) | 50 (14.1) | | |
| | South | | 502 (42.1) | 208 (39.6) | 159 (44.8) | | |
| | West | | 241 (20.2) | 114 (21.7) | 63 (17.7) | | |

Notes: Table shows splits by party for pornography consumption and for individual characteristics for all 1,200 individuals in the sample. 65 of the 1,200 individuals did not clocked any browsing activity and are in the first panel. These 65 individuals are not substantially different in characteristics than those included in the sample (untabulated). 52 of the 65 are partisans, so in later analyses the sample of partisans drop from the 886 to 834. Party identification is based on a 7-point scale. We code 1–3 as “Democrat”, 4 as “Independent”, 5–7 as “Republican”. Column (1) shows subgroups for categorical variables. Column (2) indicates the count of missing variables, if any. Columns (3)–(5) show means and standard deviations for continuous variables and count and percentage of data for categorical variables, for the full sample, Democratic individuals, and Republican individuals. Standard deviations and percentages in parentheses. Column (6) and column (7) report the p-values and standardized mean differences for Democrats vs Republicans. Given the skew in consumption of pornography, we also performed tests for difference in medians for the measures of pornography consumption by party (see [Table SI 1.9](#)).

Table SI 1.8: Differences in Pornography Consumption and Individual Characteristics by Pornography Consumers

| | | Panel A. Measures of pornography consumption | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------|--------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| | Subgroups | NA | Total | Non-Consumers | Consumers | P-val | SMD |
| n | | | 1200 | 774 | 361 | | |
| Minutes, mean (SD) | | 65 | 73.4 (342.1) | 0.0 (0.0) | 230.8 (576.3) | <0.001 | 0.566 |
| % of time, mean (SD) | | 65 | 3.4 (11.2) | 0.0 (0.0) | 10.6 (17.9) | <0.001 | 0.833 |
| Visits, mean (SD) | | 65 | 74.3 (328.9) | 0.0 (0.0) | 233.5 (550.8) | <0.001 | 0.599 |
| % of visits, mean (SD) | | 65 | 2.2 (7.1) | 0.0 (0.0) | 6.9 (11.2) | <0.001 | 0.870 |
| | | Panel B. Individual characteristics | | | | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| | Subgroups | NA | Total | Non-Consumers | Consumers | P-val | SMD |
| n | | | 1200 | 774 | 361 | | |
| Party (7-point), mean (SD) | | 120 | 3.6 (2.2) | 3.6 (2.2) | 3.6 (2.1) | 0.580 | -0.037 |
| Party, n (%) | D | 120 | 530 (49.1) | 343 (49.4) | 158 (48.8) | 0.226 | 0.115 |
| | I | | 194 (18.0) | 117 (16.8) | 68 (21.0) | | |
| | R | | 356 (33.0) | 235 (33.8) | 98 (30.2) | | |
| 2020 Pres. election, n (%) | Other/No vote | 170 | 270 (26.2) | 145 (22.1) | 110 (34.9) | <0.001 | 0.287 |
| | Vote Biden | | 419 (40.7) | 281 (42.8) | 114 (36.2) | | |
| | Vote Trump | | 341 (33.1) | 230 (35.1) | 91 (28.9) | | |
| Age, mean (SD) | | 0 | 49.5 (18.1) | 51.3 (18.2) | 46.1 (17.1) | <0.001 | -0.295 |
| Gender, n (%) | Female | 0 | 635 (52.9) | 487 (62.9) | 109 (30.2) | <0.001 | 0.695 |
| | Male | | 565 (47.1) | 287 (37.1) | 252 (69.8) | | |
| Race, n (%) | Asian | 0 | 49 (4.1) | 37 (4.8) | 9 (2.5) | 0.059 | 0.193 |
| | Black | | 152 (12.7) | 86 (11.1) | 58 (16.1) | | |
| | Hispanic | | 176 (14.7) | 113 (14.6) | 55 (15.2) | | |
| | Others | | 61 (5.1) | 36 (4.7) | 20 (5.5) | | |
| | White | | 762 (63.5) | 502 (64.9) | 219 (60.7) | | |
| Education, n (%) | College | 0 | 525 (43.8) | 363 (46.9) | 131 (36.3) | 0.002 | 0.244 |
| | HS | | 354 (29.5) | 228 (29.5) | 115 (31.9) | | |
| | No HS | | 73 (6.1) | 46 (5.9) | 22 (6.1) | | |
| | Some college | | 248 (20.7) | 137 (17.7) | 93 (25.8) | | |
| Region, n (%) | Midwest | 8 | 239 (20.1) | 147 (19.2) | 78 (21.7) | 0.659 | 0.081 |
| | Northeast | | 210 (17.6) | 140 (18.3) | 60 (16.7) | | |
| | South | | 502 (42.1) | 328 (42.8) | 146 (40.6) | | |
| | West | | 241 (20.2) | 152 (19.8) | 76 (21.1) | | |

Notes: Table shows splits by consumers of pornography for pornography consumption and for individual characteristics for all 1,200 individuals in the sample. 65 of the 1,200 individuals did not clocked any browsing activity and are in the first panel. These 65 individuals are not substantially different in characteristics than those included in the sample (untabulated). 52 of the 65 are partisans, so in later analyses the sample of partisans drop from the 886 to 834. Party identification is based on a 7-point scale. We code 1–3 as “Democrat”, 4 as “Independent”, 5–7 as “Republican”. Column (1) shows subgroups for categorical variables. Column (2) indicates the count of missing variables, if any. Columns (3)–(5) show means and standard deviations for continuous variables and count and percentage of data for categorical variables, for the full sample, non-consumers of pornography, and consumers of pornography. Standard deviations and percentages in parentheses. Column (6) and column (7) report the p-values and standardized mean differences for non-consumers vs consumers.

Table SI 1.9: Differences (in Medians) in Pornography Consumption

| | | Measures of pornography consumption | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|--|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | |
| | Subgroups | NA | Total | Democrats | Republicans | P-val | SMD | |
| n | | | 1200 | 530 | 356 | | | |
| Minutes, median [Q1,Q3] | | 65 | 0.0 [0.0,4.8] | 0.0 [0.0,3.1] | 0.0 [0.0,3.6] | 0.981 | 0.056 | |
| % of time, median [Q1,Q3] | | 65 | 0.0 [0.0,0.1] | 0.0 [0.0,0.1] | 0.0 [0.0,0.1] | 0.842 | 0.049 | |
| Visits, median [Q1,Q3] | | 65 | 0.0 [0.0,8.0] | 0.0 [0.0,6.0] | 0.0 [0.0,8.0] | 0.933 | 0.048 | |
| % of visits, median [Q1,Q3] | | 65 | 0.0 [0.0,0.2] | 0.0 [0.0,0.1] | 0.0 [0.0,0.2] | 0.916 | 0.085 | |

Notes: Table shows splits by party for pornography consumption and for individual characteristics for all 1,200 individuals in the sample. This table focuses on differences in medians. Party identification is based on a 7-point scale. We code 1–3 as “Democrat”, 4 as “Independent”, 5–7 as “Republican”. Column (1) shows subgroups for categorical variables. Column (2) indicates the count of missing variables, if any. Columns (3)–(5) show the medians, the first quartiles, and the third quartiles, for the full sample, Democrats, and Republicans. 1st and 3rd quartiles in brackets. Column (6) and column (7) report the p-values and standardized median differences for Democrats vs Republicans. See Panel A of [Table SI 1.7](#) for differences in means.

Table SI 1.10: Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OLS | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.28 (0.35) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 ^a (0.04) | 0.01 (0.11) | 0.17 (0.30) | 0.80 ^a (0.49) | 1.61 ^a (0.49) | 2.10 (1.84) |
| Constant | 0.98 ^a (0.25) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 ^a (0.03) | 0.05 ^c (0.07) | 0.16 ^b (0.19) | 0.49 ^b (0.31) | 1.01 ^a (0.31) | 4.52 ^a (1.17) |


Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions. Dependent variable is the number of hours of pornography consumption online by individuals. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See [Figure 1](#) for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. See [Table SI 1.12](#) for estimates controlling for individual characteristics. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

Table SI 1.11: Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OLS | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.54 (0.77) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 (0.00) | −0.00 ^a (0.08) | 0.05 (0.64) | 0.24 (0.78) | 2.10 ^a (0.78) | 3.71 (2.38) | 13.28 ^c (7.76) |
| Constant | 2.92 ^a (0.48) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 ^a (0.05) | 0.06 (0.40) | 0.65 (0.50) | 1.46 ^a (1.50) | 4.81 ^a (1.50) | 16.30 ^a (4.87) |


Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions. Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals spend on pornography consumption online. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See [Figure 2](#) for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. See [Table SI 1.13](#) for estimates controlling for individual characteristics. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

Figure SI 1.5: Distribution of Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)



Notes: Dependent variable is the number of hours individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. Covariates included on the right-hand side are: gender (Female/Male), race (White/Black/Hispanic/Asian/Others), education level (no HS/HS graduate/some college/college graduate), age and its quadratic, and region (NE/MW/S/W). 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Figure 1](#) for the same plot without covariates. See [Table SI 1.12](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

Figure SI 1.6: Distribution of Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)



Notes: Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. Covariates included on the right-hand side are: gender (Female/Male), race (White/Black/Hispanic/Asian/Others), education level (no HS/HS graduate/some college/college graduate), age and its quadratic, and region (NE/MW/S/W). 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Figure 2](#) for the same plot without covariates. See [Table SI 1.13](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

Table SI 1.12: Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Co-
variates)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | OLS | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.17 (0.29) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.01 (0.09) | 0.02 (0.14) |
| Female | -1.56 ^a (0.37) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.01 ^a (0.00) | -0.06 ^a (0.00) | -0.17 ^a (0.01) | -0.36 ^a (0.01) | -0.73 ^a (0.02) | -1.53 ^a (0.04) | -2.32 ^a (0.05) | -4.26 ^a (0.08) | -9.40 ^a (0.14) |
| Educ (HS) | 0.85 ^b (0.33) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.00 (0.09) | 0.01 (0.13) | 0.02 (0.22) | 0.12 (0.40) |
| Educ (some college) | 1.58 ^b (0.64) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.02 (0.05) | 0.05 (0.10) | 0.29 ^b (0.14) | 0.47 ^b (0.22) | 4.61 ^a (0.41) |
| Educ (college grad) | 0.42 ^b (0.20) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.00 (0.09) | 0.00 (0.13) | 0.00 (0.21) | 0.03 (0.39) |
| Age | 0.08 (0.05) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.01 (0.01) | -0.02 ^b (0.01) | -0.03 ^b (0.01) | -0.01 (0.02) |
| Age ² | -0.00 ^c (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 ^c (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) |
| Race (Black) | 0.63 (0.76) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.06) | 0.00 (0.09) | 0.04 (0.14) | 4.31 ^a (0.24) |
| Race (Hispanic) | 0.26 (0.74) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.05 (0.06) | 0.04 (0.07) | 0.01 (0.12) | 0.58 ^a (0.21) |
| Race (Asian) | -0.40 (0.51) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.05) | -0.00 (0.10) | -0.02 (0.13) | -0.03 (0.25) | -0.09 (0.48) |
| Race (Other) | 0.28 (0.48) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.03 ^b (0.03) | 0.18 ^a (0.05) | 0.63 ^a (0.10) | 0.26 ^a (0.13) | 0.03 (0.22) | 0.84 ^a (0.38) |
| Region (MW) | 1.26 ^b (0.60) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 ^c (0.01) | 0.06 ^a (0.01) | 0.17 ^a (0.03) | 0.18 ^a (0.07) | 0.63 ^a (0.13) | 0.32 (0.21) | 0.00 (0.31) | 0.01 (0.60) | 0.45 (1.43) |
| Region (South) | 1.00 ^c (0.58) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 ^c (0.01) | 0.06 ^a (0.01) | 0.17 ^a (0.03) | 0.18 ^a (0.07) | 0.63 ^a (0.13) | 0.33 (0.21) | 0.00 (0.31) | 0.01 (0.60) | 0.10 (1.43) |
| Region (West) | 1.43 ^b (0.58) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 ^c (0.01) | 0.06 ^a (0.01) | 0.17 ^a (0.03) | 0.18 ^a (0.07) | 0.63 ^a (0.13) | 0.36 ^c (0.21) | 0.01 (0.31) | 0.42 (0.60) | 0.13 (1.43) |
| Constant | -1.67 (1.25) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.08) | 0.18 ^b (0.15) | 0.10 (0.25) | 1.43 ^a (0.36) | 2.99 ^a (0.66) | 5.32 ^a (1.51) |

Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions. Dependent variable is the number of hours of pornography consumption online by individuals. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See [Figure SI 1.5](#) for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

Table SI 1.13: Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | OLS | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.45 (0.76) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.01 (0.13) | 0.01 (0.20) | 0.02 (0.41) | 0.54 (0.49) |
| Female | -4.39 ^a (0.78) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.02 ^a (0.00) | -0.10 ^a (0.00) | -0.41 ^a (0.01) | -0.98 ^a (0.03) | -2.26 ^a (0.06) | -4.66 ^a (0.12) | -7.30 ^a (0.18) | -15.17 ^a (0.38) | -27.43 ^a (0.46) |
| Educ (HS) | 3.50 ^a (0.94) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.00 (0.16) | 0.07 (0.32) | 0.05 (0.46) | 0.06 (1.00) | 2.37 ^b (1.03) |
| Educ (some college) | 3.97 ^a (1.07) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.05 (0.17) | 0.63 ^c (0.32) | 1.36 ^a (0.47) | 4.51 ^a (1.02) | 8.10 ^a (1.07) |
| Educ (college grad) | 1.23 ^b (0.56) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.00 (0.16) | 0.01 (0.31) | 0.01 (0.44) | -0.00 (0.98) | -0.34 (1.05) |
| Age | 0.16 (0.11) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.02 (0.02) | -0.04 (0.03) | -0.03 (0.06) | 0.07 (0.08) |
| Age ² | -0.00 ^c (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) |
| Race (Black) | 2.19 (1.64) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.01 (0.11) | 0.01 (0.20) | 1.05 ^a (0.31) | 3.38 ^a (0.65) | 14.43 ^a (0.74) |
| Race (Hispanic) | 1.29 (1.33) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.02) | -0.00 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.10) | 0.58 ^a (0.18) | 1.36 ^a (0.28) | 6.51 ^a (0.55) | 12.24 ^a (0.68) |
| Race (Asian) | -1.99 ^b (0.92) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.04) | -0.00 (0.08) | -0.01 (0.17) | -0.01 (0.32) | -0.03 (0.53) | -0.03 (1.09) | -0.95 (1.22) |
| Race (Other) | -0.65 (1.04) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.08) | 0.25 ^a (0.17) | 0.08 (0.31) | 0.53 ^a (0.47) | 0.02 (1.01) | -0.04 (1.54) |
| Region (MW) | 2.34 (1.59) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.02 ^c (0.01) | 0.10 ^a (0.02) | 0.41 ^a (0.08) | 0.08 (0.18) | 0.55 (0.42) | 0.19 (0.68) | 0.02 (1.15) | 0.04 (2.80) | 0.85 (4.36) |
| Region (South) | 3.01 ^c (1.55) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.02 ^c (0.01) | 0.10 ^a (0.02) | 0.41 ^a (0.08) | 0.08 (0.18) | 0.55 (0.42) | 0.20 (0.67) | 0.04 (1.14) | 0.06 (2.78) | 0.31 (4.37) |
| Region (West) | 3.34 ^b (1.59) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.02 ^c (0.01) | 0.10 ^a (0.02) | 0.41 ^a (0.08) | 0.08 (0.18) | 0.55 (0.42) | 0.21 (0.67) | 0.05 (1.15) | 0.05 (2.78) | 2.08 (4.36) |
| Constant | -2.77 (2.90) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.09) | 0.00 (0.21) | 0.90 ^a (0.49) | 1.79 ^a (0.81) | 5.09 ^a (1.32) | 8.72 ^a (3.11) | 16.09 ^a (4.58) |

Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions. Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals spend on pornography consumption online. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See [Figure SI 1.6](#) for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

SI 1.3 Alternate Ways of Measuring Pornography

Table SI 1.14: Distribution of Consumption of Pornography Online by Party

| Percentile | Hours | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Republicans | Democrats |
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.30 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 0.40 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 0.50 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| 0.60 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
| 0.70 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| 0.80 | 3.4 | 2.0 |
| 0.90 | 6.4 | 5.0 |
| 0.95 | 16.3 | 7.8 |
| 0.96 | 18.7 | 9.9 |
| 0.97 | 24.0 | 13.1 |
| 0.98 | 29.9 | 18.4 |
| 0.99 | 31.7 | 33.4 |
| 1.00 | 33.7 | 34.4 |

Notes: Table shows splits by party and by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the duration (hours) spent by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Classification of pornography sites are based on a machine learning classifier ([Chintalapati and Sood, 2022](#)). Sample includes 256 Republicans and Democrats (see [Table SI 1.8](#)). See [Table SI 1.15](#) for the corresponding distribution in terms of percentage of time. A two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returns a p-value of 0.0481, rejecting the null that the Republican and Democrat distributions are the same at the 5% level.

Table SI 1.15: Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites by Party

| Percentile | % time | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Republicans | Democrats |
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 0.30 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 0.40 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| 0.50 | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| 0.60 | 3.4 | 1.4 |
| 0.70 | 5.4 | 3.0 |
| 0.80 | 10.8 | 7.1 |
| 0.90 | 33.4 | 18.2 |
| 0.95 | 42.1 | 41.9 |
| 0.96 | 46.5 | 44.7 |
| 0.97 | 60.6 | 46.3 |
| 0.98 | 70.6 | 50.9 |
| 0.99 | 71.8 | 56.6 |
| 1.00 | 74.6 | 70.5 |


Notes: Table shows splits by party and by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the percentage of time spent on pornography by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Classification of pornography sites are based on a machine learning classifier (Chintalapati and Sood, 2022). Sample includes 256 Republicans and Democrats (see Table SI 1.8). See Table SI 1.14 for the corresponding distribution in terms of hours. A two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returns a p-value of 0.19, failing to reject the null that the Republican and Democrat distributions are the same at the 5% level.

Table SI 1.16: Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OLS | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.26 (0.26) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 ^a (0.00) | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.06 (0.06) | 0.38 (0.23) | 0.48 (0.70) | 0.83 (0.90) |
| Constant | 0.69 ^a (0.14) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.01 ^a (0.00) | 0.04 ^b (0.02) | 0.11 ^a (0.04) | 0.40 ^a (0.15) | 1.07 ^b (0.44) | 4.19 ^a (0.56) |

Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions using the classification of pornographic sites using a machine learning classifier (Chintalapati and Sood, 2022). Dependent variable is the number of hours of pornography consumption online by individuals. All models have $N = 834$; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See Figure SI 1.7 for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. See Table SI 1.10 for estimates using the YouGov classification. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

Figure SI 1.7: Distribution of Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites




Notes: Dependent variable is the number of hours individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Classification of pornography sites are based on a machine learning classifier (Chintalapati and Sood, 2022). Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See Figure SI 1.9 for the same plot controlling for individual characteristics. See Table SI 1.16 for a numerical report of the estimates.

Table SI 1.17: Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OLS | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.60 (0.66) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.01 ^a (0.00) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.16 (0.24) | 1.10 ^c (0.63) | 1.48 (1.66) | 3.34 (3.69) |
| Constant | 2.13 ^a (0.37) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.02 ^a (0.04) | 0.08 ^c (0.15) | 0.31 ^b (0.40) | 1.16 ^a (1.05) | 3.65 ^a (1.05) | 10.85 ^a (2.32) |

Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions using the classification of pornographic sites using a machine learning classifier (Chintalapati and Sood, 2022). Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals spend on pornography consumption online. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See Figure SI 1.8 for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. See Table SI 1.11 for estimates using the YouGov classification. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.


Figure SI 1.8: Distribution of Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites



Notes: Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Classification of pornography sites are based on a machine learning classifier ([Chintalapati and Sood, 2022](#)). Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Figure SI 1.10](#) for the same plot controlling for individual characteristics. See [Table SI 1.17](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

SI 1.3.1 Accounting for Confounders

Figure SI 1.9: Distribution of Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)



Notes: Dependent variable is the number of hours individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Classification of pornography sites are based on a machine learning classifier ([Chintalapati and Sood, 2022](#)). Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. Covariates included on the right-hand side are: gender (Female/Male), race (White/Black/Hispanic/Asian/Others), education level (no HS/HS graduate/some college/college graduate), age and its quadratic, and region (NE/MW/S/W). 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Table SI 1.18](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

Table SI 1.18: Partisan Differences in Hours Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Co-variates)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | OLS | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.08 (0.23) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.00 (0.10) |
| Female | -1.36 ^a (0.26) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.02 ^a (0.00) | -0.05 ^a (0.00) | -0.15 ^a (0.01) | -0.51 ^a (0.02) | -1.06 ^a (0.03) | -1.69 ^a (0.04) | -3.69 ^a (0.07) | -6.56 ^a (0.10) |
| Educ (HS) | 0.84 ^a (0.29) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.01 (0.10) | 0.00 (0.19) | 0.18 (0.27) |
| Educ (some college) | 0.79 ^b (0.34) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.13 (0.11) | 0.26 (0.19) | 0.85 ^a (0.27) |
| Educ (college grad) | 0.34 ^b (0.16) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.01 (0.10) | 0.01 (0.18) | 0.00 (0.26) |
| Age | 0.03 (0.03) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.01 ^c (0.01) | -0.02 ^c (0.01) | -0.04 ^b (0.01) |
| Age ² | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 ^c (0.00) |
| Race (Black) | 0.16 (0.49) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.06 (0.07) | 0.15 (0.12) | 1.35 ^a (0.16) |
| Race (Hispanic) | -0.21 (0.32) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.04) | 0.13 ^b (0.06) | 0.00 (0.11) | -0.01 (0.16) |
| Race (Asian) | -0.15 (0.42) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.04 (0.04) | 0.37 ^a (0.07) | 0.16 (0.11) | 0.53 ^a (0.19) | 0.81 ^a (0.25) |
| Race (Other) | -0.21 (0.32) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.05 ^a (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) | 0.03 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.00 (0.11) | 0.11 (0.19) | 0.10 (0.24) |
| Region (MW) | 1.03 ^b (0.44) | -0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.05 ^a (0.03) | 0.02 (0.10) | 0.05 (0.20) | 0.10 (0.26) | 0.05 (0.52) | 0.06 (0.95) |
| Region (South) | 0.94 ^b (0.43) | -0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.05 ^a (0.03) | 0.02 (0.10) | 0.06 (0.20) | 0.06 (0.26) | 0.00 (0.52) | 0.18 (0.95) |
| Region (West) | 1.10 ^b (0.44) | -0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.05 ^a (0.03) | 0.02 (0.10) | 0.17 ^c (0.20) | 0.18 (0.26) | 0.44 ^c (0.52) | 0.68 (0.96) |
| Constant | -0.61 (0.82) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.16 ^a (0.04) | 0.54 ^a (0.12) | 1.17 ^a (0.22) | 2.10 ^a (0.30) | 4.33 ^a (0.57) | 7.85 ^a (0.99) |


Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions using the classification of pornographic sites using a machine learning classifier (Chintalapati and Sood, 2022). Dependent variable is the number of hours of pornography consumption online by individuals. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See Figure SI 1.9 for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. See Table SI 1.12 for estimates using the YouGov classification. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

Table SI 1.19: Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | OLS | Quantile regressions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | q5 | q10 | q15 | q20 | q25 | q30 | q35 | q40 | q45 | q50 | q55 | q60 | q65 | q70 | q75 | q80 | q85 | q90 | q95 |
| Republican | 0.34 (0.69) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.05) | -0.00 (0.09) | -0.00 (0.14) | 0.05 (0.23) | -0.11 (0.35) |
| Female | -3.49 ^a (0.64) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.02 ^a (0.00) | -0.12 ^a (0.01) | -0.46 ^a (0.02) | -1.39 ^a (0.04) | -2.64 ^a (0.08) | -5.04 ^a (0.13) | -8.97 ^a (0.21) | -23.93 ^a (0.33) |
| Educ (HS) | 3.01 ^a (0.80) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.03 (0.04) | 0.20 (0.10) | 0.44 (0.22) | 0.63 (0.32) | 7.97 ^a (0.56) |
| Educ (some college) | 2.52 ^a (0.84) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.03 (0.11) | 0.77 ^a (0.22) | 0.59 ^c (0.33) | 1.69 ^a (0.57) | 3.22 ^a (0.94) |
| Educ (college grad) | 1.02 ^b (0.48) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.10) | 0.00 (0.21) | 0.03 (0.31) | 0.01 (0.54) | 0.05 (0.91) |
| Age | 0.06 (0.09) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.02 ^b (0.01) | -0.02 ^c (0.01) | -0.04 ^b (0.02) | -0.08 ^b (0.03) | 0.02 (0.05) |
| Age ² | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 ^c (0.00) | 0.00 ^c (0.00) | 0.00 ^c (0.00) | 0.00 ^c (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) |
| Race (Black) | 0.09 (1.06) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.03) | 0.01 (0.07) | 0.00 (0.14) | 0.04 (0.22) | 0.00 (0.36) | -0.26 (0.58) |
| Race (Hispanic) | 1.72 (1.25) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.04 (0.06) | 0.04 (0.12) | 0.41 ^a (0.19) | 0.87 ^a (0.31) | 5.92 ^a (0.49) |
| Race (Asian) | -1.64 ^b (0.79) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.11) | -0.01 (0.23) | -0.07 (0.37) | -0.20 (0.59) | -0.53 (1.06) |
| Race (Other) | -0.46 (0.93) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.08 ^a (0.04) | 0.00 (0.11) | 0.01 (0.24) | 0.00 (0.35) | 0.00 (0.56) | -0.05 (0.97) |
| Region (MW) | 2.15 ^c (1.21) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.11 ^a (0.09) | 0.02 (0.27) | 0.17 (0.61) | 0.26 (0.81) | 0.43 (1.55) | 0.53 (3.21) |
| Region (South) | 2.41 ^b (1.22) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.11 ^a (0.09) | 0.02 (0.27) | 0.17 (0.61) | 0.27 (0.81) | 0.43 (1.54) | 0.59 (3.22) |
| Region (West) | 3.29 ^a (1.27) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.11 ^a (0.09) | 0.02 (0.27) | 0.18 (0.61) | 0.41 (0.81) | 1.00 (1.54) | 1.47 (3.22) |
| Constant | -0.70 (2.37) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.00 (0.04) | 0.51 ^a (0.11) | 1.80 ^a (0.31) | 3.23 ^a (0.68) | 6.15 ^a (0.94) | 11.19 ^a (1.71) | 23.39 ^a (3.38) |

Notes: Table reports estimates from OLS and quantile regressions using the classification of pornographic sites using a machine learning classifier (Chintalapati and Sood, 2022). Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals spend on pornography consumption online. All models have N = 834; only partisans are included in the sample. Baseline category is Democrats. See Figure SI 1.10 for a plot of the quantile estimates for the Republican coefficient. See Table SI 1.13 for estimates using the YouGov classification. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ^c 0.1 ^b 0.05 ^a 0.01.

Figure SI 1.10: Distribution of Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)



Notes: Dependent variable is the percentage of time individuals in our sample spent on pornographic sites. Classification of pornography sites are based on a machine learning classifier ([Chintalapati and Sood, 2022](#)). Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. Covariates included on the right-hand side are: gender (Female/Male), race (White/Black/Hispanic/Asian/Others), education level (no HS/HS graduate/some college/college graduate), age and its quadratic, and region (NE/MW/S/W). 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors. See [Table SI 1.19](#) for a numerical report of the estimates.

SI 1.4 Consumption of Pornography Among Independents

Table SI 1.20: Distribution of Consumption of Pornography Online Among Independents

| Percentile | (1) Republicans | (2) Democrats | (3) Partisans | (4) Independents | (5) Independents/DK |
|------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 0.30 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| 0.40 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| 0.50 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| 0.60 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 2.0 |
| 0.70 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.8 |
| 0.80 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 4.6 |
| 0.90 | 11.2 | 7.0 | 9.7 | 14.0 | 12.0 |
| 0.95 | 25.4 | 13.8 | 19.1 | 22.7 | 20.6 |
| 0.96 | 27.1 | 18.3 | 21.4 | 24.7 | 23.2 |
| 0.97 | 27.9 | 19.9 | 26.0 | 26.7 | 26.4 |
| 0.98 | 30.0 | 22.0 | 29.4 | 27.4 | 27.6 |
| 0.99 | 36.5 | 46.0 | 37.1 | 33.3 | 43.8 |
| 1.00 | 37.5 | 90.5 | 90.5 | 44.3 | 94.0 |

Notes: Table shows splits by partisans and non-partisans, by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the duration (hours) spent by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Party identification is based on a 7-point scale. We code 1–3 as “Democrat”, 4 as “Independent”, 5–7 as “Republican”. Column (1) includes Republicans (n = 95). Column (2) includes Democrats (n = 154). Column (3) includes both individuals from columns (1) and (2)—the Republicans and Democrats (n = 249). Column (4) includes Independents (n = 67). Column (5) includes Independents, those who report “Don’t Know” for partisan identification, and those who do not report (n = 104).

Table SI 1.21: Percentage of Time Spent on Pornographic Sites Among Independents


| Percentile | (1) Republicans | (2) Democrats | (3) Partisans | (4) Independents | (5) Independents/DK |
|------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.10 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| 0.30 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| 0.40 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| 0.50 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| 0.60 | 6.6 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 6.9 | 6.7 |
| 0.70 | 10.7 | 5.7 | 7.3 | 9.7 | 9.8 |
| 0.80 | 20.8 | 12.3 | 13.9 | 14.3 | 14.2 |
| 0.90 | 36.8 | 35.8 | 36.5 | 32.2 | 33.6 |
| 0.95 | 46.4 | 53.4 | 52.5 | 66.4 | 63.5 |
| 0.96 | 54.8 | 58.6 | 59.3 | 68.5 | 64.1 |
| 0.97 | 63.3 | 64.0 | 64.1 | 69.9 | 67.5 |
| 0.98 | 68.7 | 65.0 | 68.5 | 72.3 | 69.7 |
| 0.99 | 71.9 | 72.9 | 73.3 | 77.9 | 73.4 |
| 1.00 | 87.5 | 77.4 | 87.5 | 86.5 | 86.5 |

Notes: Table shows splits by partisans and non-partisans, by key percentiles (each of the ten deciles plus quantiles at the right tail) for the percentage of time spent on pornography by individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Party identification is based on a 7-point scale. We code 1–3 as “Democrat”, 4 as “Independent”, 5–7 as “Republican”. Column (1) includes Republicans (n = 95). Column (2) includes Democrats (n = 154). Column (3) includes both individuals from columns (1) and (2)—the Republicans and Democrats (n = 249). Column (4) includes Independents (n = 67). Column (5) includes Independents, those who report “Don’t Know” for partisan identification, and those who do not report (n = 104).

SI 1.5 Alternate Measures

SI 1.5.1 Proportion of Partisans Who Consumed Any Pornography


Figure SI 1.11: Pornography Consumption by Party



Notes: Figure shows proportion of individuals in the sample who ever consumed pornography in the sample period by party. Capped vertical bars are 95% confidence intervals from bootstrapped standard errors (n = 1,000).


SI 1.5.2 Analyses of Visits

Figure SI 1.12: Distribution of Traffic to Pornography Online




Notes: Figure shows the number of visits to pornography sites by the 361 individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Individuals are split into deciles with each bin containing approximately the same number of individuals. Height of bars indicate mean of each bin. Capped vertical bars are 95% confidence intervals.

Figure SI 1.13: Percentage of Traffic to Pornography Online




Notes: Figure shows the proportion of visits to pornography sites by the 361 individuals who consumed pornography in the sample period. Individuals are split into deciles with each bin containing approximately the same number of individuals. Height of bars indicate mean of each bin. Capped vertical bars are 95% confidence intervals.

Figure SI 1.14: Distribution of Partisan Differences in Visits to Pornographic Sites




Notes: Dependent variable is the number of visits to pornographic sites by individuals in our sample. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors.

Figure SI 1.15: Distribution of Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Visits to Pornographic Sites




Notes: Dependent variable is the percentage of traffic to pornographic sites by individuals in our sample. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors.

Figure SI 1.16: Distribution of Partisan Differences in Visits to Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)



Notes: Dependent variable is the number of visits to pornographic sites by individuals in our sample. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. Covariates included on the right-hand side are: gender (Female/Male), race (White/Black/Hispanic/Asian/Others), education level (no HS/HS graduate/some college/college graduate), age and its quadratic, and region (NE/MW/S/W). 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors.

Figure SI 1.17: Distribution of Partisan Differences in the Percentage of Visits to Pornographic Sites (Conditional on Covariates)



Notes: Dependent variable is the percentage of traffic to pornographic sites by individuals in our sample. Each point indicates the difference between Republicans and Democrats and corresponds to a quantile regression at the quantile indicated by the x-axis. Sample includes 834 individuals identified as either Republicans or Democrats. Covariates included on the right-hand side are: gender (Female/Male), race (White/Black/Hispanic/Asian/Others), education level (no HS/HS graduate/some college/college graduate), age and its quadratic, and region (NE/MW/S/W). 95% confidence intervals constructed from standard errors.