**Supplementary Online Appendix**

Table A1: Predicted Vote Share in Favor of a Ballot Measure: Instrumental Variable Analyses

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| VARIABLES | Vote Share (%) | Vote Share (%)Bond Measure | Vote Share (%)Property Tax Measure |
| % Black - std | -1.813 | 7.454 | 6.920 | 15.499\* | -9.996 | -9.090+ |
|  | (5.400) | (4.815) | (8.391) | (6.689) | (6.232) | (4.838) |
| % Hispanic - std | -49.590\*\* | -43.035\*\* | -40.534\* | -34.226\* | -10.369 | -9.950 |
|  | (12.190) | (10.142) | (18.476) | (13.662) | (13.142) | (10.111) |
| Diversity Index - std | -8.061+ | -5.659\* | -25.856\*\* | -17.732\*\* | 18.386\*\* | 12.888\*\* |
|  | (4.298) | (2.833) | (6.404) | (3.998) | (4.646) | (3.086) |
| Enrollment (log) - std | -3.645 | -8.229\* | -0.515 | -7.381+ | -2.902 | -0.749 |
|  | (3.519) | (3.650) | (4.400) | (4.345) | (2.481) | (2.457) |
| District Population (log) - std | 5.982 | 1.161 | 15.929\* | 9.235+ | -9.956\* | -8.267\* |
|  | (5.294) | (4.279) | (7.470) | (5.593) | (4.765) | (3.589) |
| District Population Ages 5-17 (log) - std | 5.942 | 10.840\* | -13.371+ | -4.522 | 19.810\*\* | 16.098\*\* |
|  | (5.165) | (4.459) | (7.135) | (5.699) | (5.000) | (3.898) |
| County Median Income - std 2014 $ |  | 0.793+ |  | 0.627 |  | 0.155 |
|  |  | (0.464) |  | (0.649) |  | (0.495) |
| District Poverty Rate Ages 5-17 - std |  | 0.865\* |  | 0.918+ |  | -0.051 |
|  |  | (0.375) |  | (0.490) |  | (0.309) |
| Federal Revenue/Pupil - 2014 $ - std |  | 0.135 |  | -1.017\* |  | 1.173\*\* |
|  |  | (0.308) |  | (0.420) |  | (0.310) |
| Number of Votes (log) - std |  | 0.401 |  | -3.347\* |  | 3.767\*\* |
|  |  | (0.728) |  | (1.497) |  | (1.393) |
| % Free/Reduced Lunch - std |  | -1.082\*\* |  | -1.105\* |  | 0.009 |
|  |  | (0.414) |  | (0.514) |  | (0.358) |
| % English Language Learner - std |  | 2.957\*\* |  | 2.962\*\* |  | 0.078 |
|  |  | (0.740) |  | (0.994) |  | (0.720) |
| % Special Ed - std |  | -0.677\* |  | -0.518 |  | -0.174 |
|  |  | (0.315) |  | (0.416) |  | (0.263) |
| District Fixed Effects | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| State Time Trend | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Test of IV Strength | 7.93● | 9.49● | 7.93● | 9.49● | 7.93● | 9.49● |
| Underidentification Test | 23.28\*\* | 27.68\*\* | 23.28\*\* | 27.68\*\* | 23.28\*\* | 27.68\*\* |
| Endogeneity Test | 86.36\*\* | 86.39\*\* | 91.68\*\* | 78.83\*\* | 50.43\*\* | 41.44\*\* |
| Observations | 18,046 | 16,872 | 18,046 | 16,872 | 18,046 | 16,872 |
| Number of Districts | 940 | 936 | 940 | 936 | 940 | 936 |

Sources: CEDA 1995-2014; NCES 1995-2014; U.S. Census Bureau SAIPE 1995-2014.

Sample is limited to district-year observations with demographic information.

Shading indicates that coefficients predicting passage of a bond measure are significantly different from those predicting passage of a property tax measure (p<0.05; Paternoster et al. 1998). Std indicates measure is standardized (i.e. measured in standard deviation units).

Robust standard errors adjusted for district clustering in parentheses. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, + p<0.1

All models include district fixed effects, a state time-trend, and an indicator for holding a ballot measure.

Test of IV strength indicates Kleibergen-Paap rk Wald F statistic is above Stock and Yogo (2005) critical values: ◊ = 15%; ○ = 20%; ● = 25%.

Underidentification Test assesses whether the excluded instruments are correlated with the endogenous regressors. Using the LM version of the Kleibergen-Paap rk statistic, because standard errors are adjusted for clustering, rejecting the null hypothesis indicates the model is identified.

Endogeneity Test assesses whether the null hypothesis of no endogeneity (i.e. whether parental educational similarity could be treated as exogenous and a traditional, non-IV model could be appropriate) can be rejected. In models predicting a continuous outcome, it indicates the difference between two Sargan–Hansen statistics, robust to heteroskedasticity (similar to a Hausman test, but for clustered data).