APPENDIX A
Survey Information

I. Oregon:
Our survey data for the Oregon case come from Lindholm Research, L.L.C
(http://www.lindholmresearch.com/). Spearheaded by Dr. Rick Lindholm, who received his PhD in economics
from the University of Chicago, Lindholm Research has conducted quality polling in Oregon and California
for more than 20 years.

Oregon 2010 Special Tracking Survey #1 (N = 400, Nov 30 - Dec 2, 2009); #2 (N = 400, Jan 4 - 6, 2010).
Registration based sampling, landline and cell. Interviews conducted by Western Wats of Provo, Utah

Dependent Variable:
"If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on Measure 66: Raises tax on household income at
and above $250,000 (and $125,000 for individual filers). Reduces income taxes on unemployment benefits in
2009. Provides funds currently budgeted for education, health care, public safety, other services."
1. Strongly Yes
2. Somewhat Yes
3. Lean Yes
4. Don't Know
5. Lean No
6. Somewhat No
7. Strongly No

Income:
"I'm going to read some categories for household income. Would you please stop me when I have read the
category indicating the total combined income for all the people in your household in 2009?"
1. Under $30,000
2. $30,000 to $50,000
3. $50,000 to $75,000
4. $75,000 to $100,000
5. Over $100,000

Actual text of Measure 66:
 "[Measure 66] Raises tax on household income at and above $250,000 (and $125,000 for individual filers).
Reduces income taxes on unemployment benefits in 2009. Provides funds currently budgeted for education,
health care, public safety, other services.
- **Yes vote:** "Yes" vote raises tax on incomes above $250,000 for households, $125,000 for individual
  filers. Tax rate increases 1.8 percentage points on amount of taxable income between $250,000 and
  $500,000, 2 percentage points on amount above $500,000 for households. For individual filers, the
  rate increases begin at $125,000 and $250,000 respectively. Eliminates income taxes on the first
  $2,400 of unemployment benefits received in 2009. Raises estimated $472 million to provide funds
  currently budgeted for education, health care, public safety, other services.
- **No vote:** "No" vote rejects tax changes on incomes at and above $250,000 for households, $125,000
  for individual filers. Rejects tax exemption for first $2,400 of unemployment benefits received in
  2009. Leaves amount currently budgeted for education, health care, public safety, other services
  underfunded by estimated $472 million."

II. Illinois
Paul Simon Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University, "Simon Poll, Fall 2014 (state wide)"
N = 1,006 registered voters across Illinois
Random digit dialing, landline (70%) and cell (30%)
Interviews conducted by Customer Research International of San Marcos, Texas: a mid-range market research firm consisting of more than 200 employees and has conducted interviews for academic and private sector firms for more than two decades. http://www.cri-research.com/. Fieldwork was conducted from September 23 through October 15. English and Spanish interviews conducted according to respondent preference, http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ppi_statepolls/8

Dependent Variable:
"Would you favor or oppose an advisory proposal to add a 3 percent tax on all income above $1 million a year to provide additional funding to public schools."
1. Strongly Favor
2. Favor
3. Oppose
4. Strongly Oppose

Income:
And finally, again for statistical purposes, we'd like a rough estimate of your total household income last year. Just stop me when I get to your category. Was it…?
1. Under $25,00
2. $25,001 - $35,000
3. $35,001 - $50,000
4. $50,001 - $70,000
5. $70,000 - $100,000
6. $100,000 - $150,000
7. Over $150,000

III. California
Public Policy Institute of California, Statewide Surveys
Adults living in California. September 2016 (N = 1,702, Sep 9-18); October 2016 (N = 1,704, Oct 14-23)
Random digit dialing, landline and cell
Interviews conducted by Abt Associates: a large research firm founded in 1965 that is operational in 60 countries, employs thousands of staff, the majority of which have advanced degrees in a range of disciplines. They have been widely used in academic, government, and private sector research. https://www.abtassociates.com/. English and Spanish interviews conducted according to respondent preference. http://www.ppic.org/data-set/ppic-statewide-survey-data-2016/

Dependent Variable:
"Proposition 55 is called the "Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare. Initiative Constitutional Amendment." It extends by twelve years the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 on earnings over $250,000 dollars, with revenues allocated to K-to-12 schools, California Community Colleges, and, in certain years, healthcare. The fiscal impacts are increased state revenues of $4 to $9 billion dollars annually from 2019 through 2030—depending on the economy and stock market—and increased funding for schools, community colleges, health care for low-income people, budget reserves, and debt payments. If the election were held today, would you vote yes or no on Proposition 55?"
1. Yes
2. No

Income:
"Which of the following **categories** best describes your total annual household income before taxes, from all sources?"

1. under $20,000
2. $20,000 to under $40,000
3. $40,000 to under $60,000
4. $60,000 to under $80,000
5. $80,000 to under $100,000
6. $100,000 to under $200,000
7. $200,000 or more

Actual text of Proposition 55:
Extends by twelve years the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 on earnings over $250,000, with revenues allocated to K–12 schools, California Community Colleges, and, in certain years, healthcare. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues—$4 billion to $9 billion annually from 2019–2030—depending on economy and stock market. Increased funding for schools, community colleges, health care for low-income people, budget reserves, and debt payments.
- A YES vote on this measure means: Income tax increases on high-income taxpayers, which are scheduled to end after 2018, would instead be extended through 2030
- A NO vote on this measure means: Income tax increases on high-income taxpayers would expire as scheduled at the end of 2018.

IV. Maine
Portland Herald Press Polls
September 2016 (N=593, Sep 15-20) and October 2016 (N=761, Oct 20-25)
Random Digit Dialing, landline and cell
Interviews conducted by University of New Hampshire, Survey Center. Established in 1976 the Survey Center conducts an average of 40-50 major projects a year for academic, government and private clients.
https://cola.unh.edu/unh-survey-center
AAPOR#4: Sept 20%, Oct 26%
zachary.azem@unh.edu
https://www.pressherald.com/2016/10/31/margins-of-support-shrink-for-3-of-the-6-maine-ballot-issues-poll-indicates/

Dependent Variable:
"Do you want to add a 3% tax on individual Maine taxable income above $200,000 to create a state fund that would provide direct support for student learning in kindergarten through 12th grade public education?"
1. YES (VOTE FOR REFERENDUM)
2. NO (VOTE AGAINST IT)
3. WILL NOT VOTE ON QUESTION

Income:
"How much TOTAL income did you and your family receive in 2015, not just from wages or salaries but from ALL sources -- that is, before taxes and other deductions were made? Was it ..."
1. Less than $15,000
2. $15,000 - $29,999
3. $30,000 - $44,999
4. $45,000 - $59,999
5. $60,000 - $74,999
6. $75,000 - $99,999
7. $100,000 and over?

Actual text of Question 2:(same as the question respondents of the survey were asked)
"Do you want to add a 3% tax on individual Maine taxable income above $200,000 to create a state fund that would provide direct support for student learning in kindergarten through 12th grade public education?"

- A "yes" vote was a vote to approve an additional 3 percent surcharge on the portion of any household income exceeding $200,000 per year. Revenue would be earmarked to fund public education.
- A "no" vote was a vote against this proposal to enact a 3 percent surcharge on household incomes greater than $200,000.

V. Massachusetts
WBUR Issues Surveys
January 2017 (N=508, Jan 15-17); June 2017 (N=504, Jun 19-22)
Registration based sampling, landline and cell
Interviews conducted by MassINC Polling Group: a public opinion research company that frequently conducts research for NPR and various public and private institutions.
https://www.massincpolling.com/home
http://www.wbur.org/politicker/2017/01/23/warren-baker-poll

Dependent Variable:
"There may be a measure on the 2018 ballot dealing with taxes. Would you support or oppose increasing the state's income tax on any income over one million dollars and using that money to pay for education and transportation?"
1. Support
2. Oppose

Income:
"Last year, what was your total family income from all sources, before taxes?"
1. Below 25,000 dollars
2. 25 to less than 50 thousand
3. 50 to less than 75 thousand
4. 75 to less than 100 thousand
5. 100 to less than 150 thousand
6. 150 thousand or more

VI. Maryland
Maryland Poll–State Politics and Finances
October 2007 (N=1,103, Oct 18-22)
Random digit dialing
Interviews conducted by TNS Intersearch for The Washington Post. TNS Intersearch (now Kantar TNS) is one of the world's leading data, insight and consultancy companies. Working together across the whole spectrum of research and consulting disciplines, its specialist brands, employing 30,000 people, provide inspirational insights and business strategies for clients in 100 countries
http://www.tnsglobal.com/

Data archived at The Roper Center (USWASH2007-160464)

Dependent Variable:
"The new plan uses revenue increases to help reduce the deficit. For each of the following, please say if you favor or oppose the proposal. The first is raising the top rates of the state income tax paid by people with high incomes."
1. Strongly Favor
2. Somewhat Favor
3. Somewhat Oppose
4. Strongly Oppose

Income:

"Which of the following CATEGORIES best describes your total annual household income before taxes, from all sources?"
1. Under 20 thousand dollars
2. 20 to under 35 thousand
3. 35 to under 50 thousand
4. 50 to under 65 thousand
5. 65 to under 100 thousand
6. 100 thousand or more

VII. New York
New York Poll
October 2011 (N=800, Oct 10-12)
Random digit dialing, landline and cell
Response rate 9%
Interviews conducted by the Siena College Research Institute: Founded in 1980 at Siena College in New York's Capital District, the Siena College Research Institute (SCRI) conducts regional, statewide and national surveys on business, economic, political, voter, social, academic and historical issues. The results of SCRI surveys have been published in major regional and national newspapers, including The Wall Street Journal and The New York Times, as well as in scholarly journals, books and encyclopedias (both print and online).
https://scri.siena.edu/

https://www.newsday.com/news/region-state/poll-most-in-ny-favor-millionaires-tax-1.3252679

Dependent Variable:
"Some, including many Assembly Democrats, would like to increase the personal income tax on those New Yorkers earning more than one million dollars per year. Democratic Governor Cuomo and Senate Republicans are opposed. Supporters say the tax is fair and will raise enough money from those who can most afford it to lessen the need for further state cuts to education and health care. Opponents say that New York's taxes are already too high and that the tax will make the state less competitive and attractive to businesses, putting new and existing jobs at risk. Do you support or oppose increasing taxes on those earning more than one million dollars per year?"
1. Support
2. Oppose

Income:
"Which of the following general income categories is your total household income before taxes?"
1. Under $50,000
2. At least $50,000 but under $100,000
3. $100,000 or more

VIII. New Jersey
Stockton University Poll: New Jersey Issues
March 2018 (N=728, Mar 22-29)
Random digit dialing, landline and cell
Response rate 5.4%
Interviews conducted by the Stockton Polling Institute at Stockton University: The Stockton Polling Institute, part of the Stockton University Hughes Center, conducts independent public opinion polling on elections and issues of importance in southern New Jersey and across the state.
https://stockton.edu/hughes-center/polling/polling-institute.html

Data archived at The Roper Center (31115400)

Dependent Variable:

"Turning to different issues, would you support or would you oppose raising state taxes on households with annual income of more than one million dollars?"
1. SUPPORT
2. OPPOSE

Income:
"Which of the following general categories best represents your household income last year before taxes?"
1. Less than $25,000
2. $25,000 to less than $50,000
3. $50,000 to less than $100,000
4. $100,000 to $150,000
5. Or more than $150,000?

APPENDIX B
RESULTS TABLES

[Beginning on the next page]

Table B1. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Oregon Measure 66		Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		Massachusetts Millionaires Tax		Maryland Millionaires Tax		New York Millionaires Tax		New Jersey Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.076^	(.045)	-.092*	(.043)	-.112***	(.033)	-.206***	(.050)	-.081*	(.037)	-.372***	(.064)	-.091^	(.047)	-.144*	(.060)
Uniform Controls																
Education	.205***	(.043)	-.141***	(.043)	.016***	(.034)	.043	(.068)	.085^	(.047)	.130^	(.068)	.038	(.065)	-.011	(.067)
Age	.000	(.001)	-.002***	(.001)	-.002	(.001)	-.001	(.001)	-.075*	(.033)	.000	(.001)	-.001	(.001)	-.009	(.017)
Male	-.001	(.029)	-.024	(.024)	-.017	(.018)	-.079*	(.031)	-.047*	(.022)	.026	(.029)	-.137***	(.033)	-.061^	(.033)
Party ID	-.356***	(.032)	-.257***	(.034)	-.322***	(.028)	-.555***	(.046)	-.296***	(.034)	-.411***	(.038)	-.236***	(.042)	-.146**	(.046)
Other Controls																
Black			-.031	(.035)	.028	(.037)			.044	(.053)	-.148***	(.037)	.048	(.063)	-.099^	(.056)
Latino			-.086	(.055)	.044^	(.023)			-.011	(.078)	-.188*	(.091)	-.067	(.063)	-.132^	(.074)
Asian			-.075	(.100)	-.044	(.041)			.158*	(.075)	-.289*	(.144)	.122	(.095)	-.136	(.104)
Unemployed			.042	(.038)	-.010	(.050)							-.102*	(.049)		
Union Member													.104**	(.036)		
Home Owner					-.058**	(.022)					.049	(.039)				
Children					.008	(.022)					-.077*	(.034)	.057	(.037)		
Church Attendance							-.141**	(.052)			.058	(.048)				
Gubernatorial Disapproval					-.277***	(.022)							-.118^	(.062)	-.465***	(.063)
Tea Party Support			-.275***	(.043)												
NYC Resident													-.018	(.037)		
Fixed Effects																
Survey Dummy	-.054^	(.029)			.049**	(.017)	-.048	(.030)	.061**	(.022)						
Intercept	.673	(.062)	1.18	(.061)	.998	(.045)	1.11	(.084)	.918	(.042)	.898	(.080)	1.08	(.089)	1.17	(.081)
Adj. R^2	.201		.241		.242		.192		.114		.165		.103		.193	
N	606		785		2,405		877		869		921		691		620	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table B2. Conditional Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		New York Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.224*	(.093)	-.143^	(.082)	-.222^	(.132)	-.070	(.088)
Interest / Attention	-.076	(.073)	-.008	(.054)	-.056	(.105)	-.020	(.078)
Interaction	.173	(.108)	.042	(.102)	.032	(.159)	-.038	(.125)
Uniform Controls								
Education	-.140***	(.043)	.015	(.035)	.058	(.069)	.049	(.068)
Age	-.003***	(.001)	-.002***	(.001)	-.001	(.001)	-.001	(.001)
Male	-.025	(.024)	-.018	(.018)	-.075*	(.031)	-.138***	(.033)
Party ID	-.259***	(.034)	-.321***	(.028)	-.559***	(.047)	-.239***	(.042)
Other Controls								
Black	-.030	(.036)	.028	(.037)			.056	(.064)
Latino	-.093^	(.055)	.044^	(.023)			-.062	(.064)
Asian	-.067	(.100)	-.042	(.041)			.122	(.095)
Unemployed	.039	(.038)	-.011	(.050)			-.104*	(.050)
Union Member							.107**	(.036)
Home Owner			-.058**	(.022)				
Children			.009	(.022)			.054	(.037)
Church Attendance					-.139**	(.052)		
Gubernatorial Disapproval			-.278***	(.022)			-.123^	(.063)
Tea Party Support	-.274***	(.043)						
NYC Resident							-.018	(.037)
Fixed Effects								
Survey Dummy			.050**	(.017)	-.051^	(.030)		
Intercept	1.24	(.080)	1.01	(.056)	1.14	(.108)	.966	(.090)
Adj. R^2	.242		.241		.192		.101	
N	785		2,405		877		690	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table B3. Conditional Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Oregon Measure 66	Illinois Millionaires Tax	California Proposition 55	Maine Question 2	Massachusetts Millionaires Tax	Maryland Millionaires Tax	New York Millionaires Tax	New Jersey Millionaires Tax
Income	.008 (.059)	-.004 (.055)	-.049 (.041)	-.219*** (.069)	-.022 (.053)	-.225** (.079)	-.006 (.059)	-.041 (.080)
Party ID	-.260*** (.053)	-.141* (.057)	-.172*** (.037)	-.450*** (.075)	-.200** (.070)	-.194* (.078)	-.120^ (.065)	-.013 (.082)
Interaction	-.213* (.094)	-.220* (.089)	-.162** (.060)	.041 (.104)	-.159 (.102)	-.416** (.131)	-.229* (.097)	-.239* (.122)
Uniform Controls								
Education	.197*** (.043)	-.137*** (.043)	.014 (.034)	.045 (.068)	.084^ (.047)	.107 (.068)	.036 (.065)	-.019 (.067)
Age	.000 (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.002*** (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.075* (.033)	.000 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.010 (.017)
Male	.000 (.029)	-.027 (.024)	-.018 (.018)	-.085** (.031)	-.047* (.022)	.024 (.029)	-.132*** (.033)	-.060^ (.033)
Other Controls								
Black		-.021 (.036)	.045 (.037)		.051 (.053)	-.145*** (.037)	.057 (.063)	-.090 (.056)
Latino		-.086 (.055)	.052* (.023)		-.001 (.078)	-.171^ (.090)	-.065 (.063)	-.132^ (.074)
Asian		-.075 (.099)	-.053 (.041)		.157* (.075)	-.297* (.144)	.124 (.094)	-.132 (.104)
Unemployed		.046 (.038)	-.011 (.050)				-.103* (.049)	
Union Member							.101** (.036)	
Home Owner			-.056** (.022)			.042 (.039)		
Children			.012 (.022)			-.071 (.034)	.061^ (.037)	
Church Attendance				-.132* (.053)		.061 (.048)		
Gubernatorial Disapproval			-.278*** (.022)				-.110^ (.062)	-.452*** (.063)
Tea Party Support		-.259*** (.043)						
NYC Resident							-.015 (.037)	
Fixed Effects								
Survey Dummy	-.054^ (.028)		.046** (.017)	-.047 (.030)	.063** (.022)			
Intercept	.636 (.064)	1.13 (.064)	.926 (.045)	1.05 (.086)	.882 (.048)	.832 (.083)	.909 (.086)	1.11 (.086)
Adj. R²	.207	.246	.241	.191	.115	.174	.109	197.
N	606	785	2,405	877	869	921	691	620

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

APPENDIX C
AUXILARY RESULTS

[Beginning on the next page]

Table C1. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Oregon Measure 66		Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		Massachusetts Millionaires Tax		Maryland Millionaires Tax		New York Millionaires Tax		New Jersey Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.348	(.238)	-.514*	(.251)	-.604***	(.185)	-1.02***	(.262)	-.445^	(.231)	-2.01***	(.364)	-.493^	(.291)	-.216*	(.095)
Uniform Controls																
Education	1.05***	(.232)	-.675**	(.253)	.104	(.190)	.193	(.351)	.718*	(.047)	.628	(.382)	.209	(.409)	.003	(.107)
Age	.002	(.004)	-.014***	(.004)	-.014***	(.004)	-.006	(.005)	-.355	(.207)	.001	(.006)	-.004	(.006)	-.023	(.111)
Male	.113	(.152)	-.058	(.140)	-.108	(.097)	-.410**	(.157)	-.350*	(.140)	.124	(.160)	-.780***	(.207)	-.358^	(.208)
Party ID	-1.86***	(.179)	-1.45***	(.202)	-1.55***	(.149)	-2.64***	(.254)	-1.92***	(.220)	-2.07***	(.214)	-1.26***	(.251)	-.416**	(.141)
Other Controls																
Black			-.299	(.212)	.137	(.210)			.348	(.375)	-.880	(.209)	.346	(.402)	-.677^	(.374)
Latino			-.701*	(.325)	.248*	(.125)			-.199	(.479)	-1.04***	(.493)	-.322	(.472)	-.845^	(.442)
Asian			-.604	(.540)	-.237	(.214)			1.102*	(.575)	-1.45*	(.767)	.819	(.736)	-.845	(.603)
Unemployed			.386	(.236)	-.072	(.283)							-.550^	(.313)		
Union Member													.632**	(.236)		
Home Owner					-.312**	(.119)					.274	(.217)				
Children					.043	(.123)					-.393*	(.180)	.313	(.256)		
Church Attendance							-.703**	(.267)			.348	(.269)				
Gubernatorial Disapproval					-1.28***	(.113)							-.642	(.402)	-.668***	(.101)
Tea Party Support			-1.42***	(.255)												
NYC Resident													-.097	(.244)		
Fixed Effects																
Survey Dummy	-.364*	(.149)			.272**	(.096)	-.250	(.156)	.483**	(.139)						
Constant					2.49	(.256)	3.00	(.459)			2.04	(.448)	2.35	(.583)	4.99	(.679)
Thresholds	Not Displayed		Not Displayed						Not Displayed							
Pseudo R^2	.071		.094		.194		.157		.061		.146		.107		.184	
N	606		785		2,405		877		869		921		691		620	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from logistic and ordered logistic regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table C2. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments (Income Quartiles)

	Oregon Measure 66	Illinois Millionaires Tax	California Proposition 55	Maine Question 2	Massachusetts Millionaires Tax	Maryland Millionaires Tax	New York Millionaires Tax†	New Jersey Millionaires Tax
Income Quartile								
Second Quartile	-.069^ (.037)	.038 (.034)	-.023 (.028)	-.010 (.048)	-.007 (.029)	-.104* (.037)	.006 (.041)	.014 (.045)
Third Quartile	.012 (.046)	-.016 (.030)	-.063* (.026)	-.095^ (.050)	-.029 (.034)	-.198*** (.048)	-.091^ (.047)	.012 (.050)
Fourth Quartile	-.080^ (.044)	-.127** (.042)	-.080** (.028)	-.136*** (.039)	-.076* (.035)	-.303*** (.052)	- - -	-.163** (.054)
Uniform Controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other Controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fixed Effects	✓		✓	✓	✓			
Constant	.659 (.061)	1.13 (.060)	.989 (.044)	1.06 .083	.896 .042	.839 (.080)	.935 (.084)	1.13 (.080)
Adj. R^2	.203	.248	.241	.189	.113	.167	.104	.205
N	606	785	2,405	877	869	921	691	620

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.

†The income variable in this data only has three ordered categories, so the entries are dummy variables for respondents with incomes between $50-100K and above $100K, with below $50K as the excluded baseline.

^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table C3. Multiple Imputation Analyses | Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Oregon Measure 66		Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		Massachusetts Millionaires Tax		Maryland Millionaires Tax		New York Millionaires Tax		New Jersey Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.104^	(1.66)	-.068*	(2.54)	-.077**	(2.63)	-.143***	(3.88)	-.060**	(2.06)	-.048***	(-4.81)	-.079	(1.50)	-.036*	(-2.34)
Uniform Controls																
Education	.366***	(4.62)	-.116***	(3.82)	.047	(1.09)	-.009	(0.19)	.049*	(1.96)	.023^	(1.72)	0	(0.00)	-.012	(-0.74)
Age	.001	(0.23)	-.010***	(3.79)	-.011***	(3.67)	-.003	(0.78)	-.115**	(2.87)	.001	(1.48)	0	(0.04)	-.022	(-1.34)
Male	-.069	(0.45)	-.099	(1.18)	-.068	(0.74)	-.409**	(3.04)	-.209**	(2.54)	.023	(0.85)	-.142***	(4.22)	-.059^	(-1.83)
Party ID	-.958***	(11.47)	-.466***	(7.70)	-.261***	(11.40)	-.471***	(11.35)	-.626***	(9.89)	-.099***	(-11.23)	-.247***	(5.68)	-.084***	(-3.77)
Other Controls																
Black			-.174	(1.38)	.168	(0.83)			.109	(0.54)	-.123***	(-3.51)	.029	(0.50)	-.102^	(-1.85)
Latino			-.312	(1.53)	.175	(1.59)			-.112	(0.40)	-.124	(-1.46)	-0.05	(0.64)	-.127^	(-1.76)
Asian			-.070	(0.22)	-.130	(0.66)			.577**	(2.05)	-.264^	(-1.79)	.169**	(2.26)	-.059	(-0.61)
Unemployed			.153	(1.15)	-.069	(0.28)							-0.057	(0.96)		
Union Member													.119**	(3.45)		
Home Owner					-.258**	(2.35)					.031	(0.83)				
Children					.027	(0.24)					-.056^	(-1.76)	.067^	(1.69)		
Church Attendance							-.129**	(2.22)			.001	(0.12)				
Gubernatorial Disapproval					-1.202***	(11.10)							-.077	(1.18)	-.104***	(-6.87)
Tea Party Support			-.320***	(7.70)												
NYC Resident													-.006^	(0.16)		
Fixed Effects																
Survey Dummy	-.209	(1.40)			.196**	(2.17)	-.169	(1.31)	.254**	(3.12)						
Intercept	5.526	(13.75)	6.73	(25.87)	2.374	(9.01)	3.40	(7.90)	5.46	(24.44)	0.9414	(10.97)	.895	(10.62)	1.44	(14.81)
N	800		1,009		3,406		1,354		1,012		1,103		800		693	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models (t-scores in parentheses) estimated in the software package Stata®. Missing data was imputed for 20 different versions of the data
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table C4. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maryland Millionaires Tax		New York Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.082*	(.042)	-.115***	(.033)	-.373***	(.064)	-.099*	(.045)
Uniform Controls								
Education	-.153***	(.042)	-.009	(.034)	.097	(.068)	-.028	(.063)
Age	-.002**	(.001)	-.002***	(.001)	.000	(.001)	.000	(.001)
Male	-.015	(.023)	-.021	(.018)	.028	(.029)	-.118***	(.032)
Party ID	-.169***	(.036)	-.247***	(.031)	-.362***	(.040)	-.134**	(.042)
Other Controls								
Black	-.018	(.035)	.038	(.037)	-.148***	(.037)	.053	(.060)
Latino	-.087	(.054)	.060**	(.023)	-.183*	(.090)	-.065	(.061)
Asian	-.115	(.098)	-.037	(.041)	-.263^	(.144)	.121	(.091)
Unemployed	.038	(.037)	-.004	(.050)			-.088^	(.047)
Union Member							.119***	(.034)
Home Owner			-.055*	(.021)	.048	(.039)		
Children			.016	(.022)	-.073*	(.034)	.076*	(.035)
Church Attendance					.084^	(.049)		
Gubernatorial Disapproval			-.252***	(.022)			-.071	(.060)
Tea Party Support	-.206***	(.043)						
Ideology	-.297***	(.049)	-.194***	(.034)	-.142***	(.043)	-.357***	(.046)
NYC Resident							-.024	(.036)
Fixed Effects								
Survey Dummy			.047**	(.017)				
Intercept	1.226	(.060)	1.042	(.045)	.956	(.082)	1.065	(.081)
Adj. R^2	.274		.252		.174		.176	
N	785		2,405		921		691	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table C5. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments by County Presidential Vote Share

	Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		New Jersey Millionaires Tax	
	<50% Republican	>50% Republican	<50% Republican	>50% Republican	<50% Republican	>50% Republican	<50% Republican	>50% Republican
Income	-.079^ (.047)	-.147 (.100)	-.107** (.035)	-.177 (.122)	-.256*** (.061)	-.114 (.088)	-.131^ (.070)	-.168 (.117)
Uniform Controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other Controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fixed Effects			✓	✓	✓	✓		
Constant	1.13 (.067)	1.26 (.141)	.985 (.046)	1.17 (.160)	1.06 (.101)	1.23 (.152)	1.18 (.095)	1.20 (.158)
Adj. R^2	.244	.286	.231	.313	.225	.140	.171	.287
N	630	157	2,184	221	566	311	470	150

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table C6. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments by County Presidential Vote Share

	Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		New Jersey Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.082^	(.046)	-.114***	(.034)	-252***	(.061)	-.131^	(.067)
Republican Vote	.041	(.055)	.032	(.052)	-.086	(.066)	.058	(.081)
Income × Rep. Vote	-.031	(.097)	-.000	(.098)	.126	(.096)	-.051	(.129)
<u>Uniform Controls</u>	✓		✓		✓			
<u>Other Controls</u>	✓		✓		✓			
<u>Fixed Effects</u>			✓		✓			
Intercept	1.17	(.062)	1.00	(.044)	1.45	(.088)	1.16	(.084)
Adj. R²	.239		.242		.192		.192	
N	785		2,405		877		620	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
Republican Vote is a dummy variable coded "1" if respondent resides in a county where the Republican Party won 50% or more of the Presidential vote share in 2012 (IL) or 2016 (CA, ME, NJ).
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.

Table C7. Effect of Income on Support for Redistributive State Ballot Measures and Legislative Enactments

	Illinois Millionaires Tax		California Proposition 55		Maine Question 2		New York Millionaires Tax	
Income	-.092*	(.043)	-.112***	(.034)	-.198***	(.050)	-.092*	(.047)
Interest / Attention	.024	(.038)	.009	(.035)	-.038	(.055)	-.036	(.057)
Uniform Controls								
Education	-.139***	(.043)	.014	(.035)	.057	(.069)	.050	(.068)
Age	-.003***	(.001)	-.002***	(.001)	-.001	(.001)	-.001	(.001)
Male	-.024	(.024)	-.018	(.018)	-.075*	(.031)	-.138***	(.033)
Party ID	-.257***	(.034)	-.321***	(.028)	-.560***	(.046)	-.238***	(.042)
Other Controls								
Black	-.034	(.036)	.028	(.037)			.056	(.064)
Latino	-.087	(.055)	.044*	(.023)			-.062	(.064)
Asian	-.074	(.100)	-.043	(.041)			.121	(.095)
Unemployed	.043	(.038)	-.010	(.050)			-.104*	(.050)
Union Member							.107**	(.036)
Home Owner			-.058**	(.022)				
Children			.009	(.022)			.054	(.037)
Church Attendance					-.139**	(.052)		
Gubernatorial Disapproval			-.278***	(.022)			-.123^	(.063)
Tea Party Support	-.274***	(.043)						
NYC Resident							-.018	(.037)
Fixed Effects								
Survey Dummy			.050**	(.017)	-.051^	(.030)		
Intercept	1.16	(.064)	.994	(.048)	1.13	(.088)	.974	(.085)
Adj. R^2	.240		.242		.192		.102	
N	785		2,405		877		690	

Notes: Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients from OLS regression models estimated in the software package Stata®.
^p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Reported significance levels are based upon two-tailed hypothesis tests.