There is **no evidence** that voters support relief spending over prevention spending.

**Background**
- Past research has shown that citizens reward incumbents for relief spending in response to disasters, but not for prevention spending (Gailmard & Patty, 2019; Healy & Malhotra, 2009).
- Prevention spending is more effective than relief spending.
- It is not clear whether this reflects the public's true policy preferences.

**Predictions**
1. People prefer relief policies over prevention policies.
2. People will give more attention to deservingness cues in a relief frame than in the prevention frame.

**Methods**
- Data: Amazon Mturk (N = 397)
- Subjects randomly assigned to read a prevention-frame vignette or the relief-frame vignette.
- Half of the participants in each condition assigned to different deservingness framings: “trying” versus “not trying.”
- Participants indicate how likely they are to support the hypothetical policy (+2 being “Very likely,” -2 being “Very unlikely”).

**Results Summary**
- The level of support for the relief policy is lower than the prevention policy. Prediction (1) is not supported. See Figure 1.
- However, this effect seems to be driven solely by those in the “Not Trying” treatment group.
- The effect of deservingness cues is stronger in the relief (after) frame, but not in the prevention frame. Prediction (2) is supported.

**Implications**
- If voters are given the information and the outcomes very explicitly, voters can be convinced to support prevention.

**Future Research**
- Economic game in which real money is at stake. Real people with real “victims.”
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