

Supplement to:

Martin, Isaac W., and Jennifer M. Nations. 2018. "Taxation and Citizen Voice in School District Parcel Tax Elections." *Sociological Science* 5: 653-668.

Appendix to
Taxation and Citizen Voice in School District Parcel Tax Elections
Isaac William Martin
Jennifer Nations

Table A-1. Descriptive statistics for dependent variables, policy design features, and district-level covariates, in our sample of California parcel tax ballot measures

<u>Variable</u>	<u>All districts with more than one parcel tax measure</u>		<u>All districts with at least one parcel tax measure</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
<i>Ballot measure features</i>				
Affirmative vote share (53.9 to 88.1)	70.0	7.4	67.8	9.1
Measure passed? (1=yes)	0.67	0.47	0.59	0.49
Indirect consultation (1=oversight board)	0.43	0.50	0.46	0.50
Direct Consultation (1 = sunset within 5 years)	0.37	0.48	0.41	0.49
Direct Consultation (1 = sunset after \geq 6 years)	0.51	0.50	0.47	0.50
Rate of tax (log USD, 2.49 to 7.57)	4.77	0.82	4.71	0.78
Continues previous tax increase (1=yes)	0.44	0.50	0.35	0.48
Exempts elderly (1=yes)	0.87	0.34	0.86	0.35
<i>Contextual factors</i>				
Black students, as share of enrolled students (0 to 44.6)	3.9	6.5	4.3	7.4
Hispanic students, as share of enrolled students (0.6 to 77.7)	15.3	14.1	19.6	18.6
District homeownership rate (35.7 to 92.4)	66.8	12.7	66.1	12.9
Log Per Capita Inter-governmental Revenue (0.01 to 1.23)	0.34	0.22	0.39	0.25
N measures	236		301	
N districts	83		145	

Table A-2. Descriptive statistics for district covariates, over all years with nonmissing observations, 1997-2010

<i>Descriptive Statistic</i>	<u>All districts with observed covariates</u>			<u>All districts with at least one parcel tax measure</u>			<u>All districts with more than one parcel tax measure</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
Black students, as share of enrolled students	3.7	6.0	[0, 76.9]	5.0	8.3	[0, 76.9]	3.8	6.5	[0, 50.9]
Hispanic students, as share of enrolled students	35.6	27.5	[0.3, 100]	23.2	20.3	[0.7, 89.4]	15.8	14.3	[0.6, 79.0]
District homeownership rate	65.0	13.1	[5.3, 100]	65.9	12.5	[35.0, 94.6]	67.4	11.8	[35.0, 92.4]
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	0.59	0.32	[0, 4.80]	0.41	0.25	[0, 2.38]	0.33	0.21	[0, 1.39]
Budget shortfall, \sinh^{-1} USD	0.11	3.28	[-5.87, 6.32]	0.75	3.52	[-5.87, 6.32]	0.85	3.43	[-5.23, 5.23]
Enrollment, ln students	7.39	1.84	[1.39, 13.52]	8.07	1.58	[3.40, 13.53]	7.83	1.30	[3.40, 10.92]
N districts	919			301			236		
N district – years observed	12,200			2,038			1,177		

Table A-3. Affirmative vote share and passage rate as functions of ballot features and controls: Correlated random effects models, within-district components (N=236)

	Share of vote affirmative	Passage
<i>Ballot features</i>		
Indirect Consultation, 1 = yes	3.71 (1.37)*	0.31 (0.09)**
Direct Consultation , 1 = sunset within 5 years	5.69 (1.74)**	0.32 (0.13)*
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset after ≥ 6 years	1.49 (1.65)	0.14 (0.12)
Continues previous tax increase , 1 = yes,	5.79 (1.23)**	0.12 (0.10)
Elderly Exemption, 1 = yes	2.96 (2.58)	0.44 (0.18)*
Rate of tax, ln USD	-2.48 (1.94)	-0.21 (0.10)*
<i>Contextual factors</i>		
Black students, as share of enrolled students	0.23 (0.23)	0.03 (0.02)
Hispanic students, as share of enrolled students	0.20 (0.15)	0.01 (0.01)
District homeownership rate	0.85 (0.21)**	0.06 (0.02)*
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	8.07 (4.18)	0.31 (0.25)
<i>Sample selection adjustment</i>		
Estimated nonselection hazard	-1.64 (4.23)	-0.26 (0.30)
Within-district R ²	0.38	0.28

p-value: **.005 *.05

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include year-specific intercepts and between-district components omitted from this table.

Table A-4. Summary of coefficients and fit statistics from cross-sectional probit models of ballot selection used to predict non-selection hazard (N=14 models)

	Avg. Coeff.	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<i>Longitudinal component (de-meaned)</i>				
Black students, as share of enrolled students	-0.04	0.13	-0.33	0.18
Hispanic students, as share of enrolled students	-0.01	0.04	-0.13	0.06
District homeownership rate	0.33	0.75	-0.69	1.85
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	-1.46	4.38	-14.03	3.33
Budget shortfall, \sinh^{-1} USD	-0.01	0.06	-0.13	0.09
Enrollment, ln students	-0.22	1.56	-2.55	3.80
<i>Cross-sectional component (group mean)</i>				
Black students, as share of enrolled students	-0.02	0.06	-0.18	0.04
Hispanic students, as share of enrolled students	-0.03	0.02	-0.07	0.00
District homeownership rate	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.03
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	-2.36	2.22	-9.69	-0.75
Budget shortfall, \sinh^{-1} USD	0.13	0.12	-0.06	0.29
Enrollment, ln students	0.17	0.11	-0.05	0.38
<i>McKelvey and Zavoina's pseudo-R²</i>	0.61	0.13	0.41	0.91

Table A-5. Affirmative vote share and passage rate as functions of ballot features and controls: Fixed effects models (N=236)

	Share of vote affirmative	Passage
<i>Ballot features</i>		
Indirect Consultation, 1 = yes	3.62 (1.34)*	0.30 (0.09)**
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset within 5 years	5.33 (1.71)**	0.28 (0.13)*
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset after ≥ 6 years	1.28 (1.66)	0.12 (0.12)
Continues previous tax increase, 1 = yes, Elderly Exemption, 1 = yes	5.61 (1.18)**	0.09 (0.09)
Rate of tax, ln USD	2.98 (2.64)	0.44 (0.19)*
	-2.59 (1.87)	-0.22 (0.09)*
<i>Contextual factors</i>		
Black students, share of enrolled students	0.39 (0.21)	0.05 (0.02)*
Hispanic students, share of enrolled students	0.22 (0.14)	0.02 (0.01)
District homeownership rate	0.64 (0.38)**	0.04 (0.02)*
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	8.45 (4.87)	0.32 (0.33)
Within-district R ²	0.38	0.29

p-value: **.005 *.05

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include year-specific intercepts omitted from this table.

Table A-6. Sensitivity analysis: Affirmative vote share and passage rate as functions of ballot features and controls including temporal sequence, fixed-effects models (N=236)

	<u>Share of vote affirmative</u>	<u>Passage</u>
<i>Ballot features</i>		
Indirect Consultation, 1 = yes	3.54 (1.29)**	0.30 (0.09)**
Direct Consultation , 1 = sunset within 5 years	5.59 (1.77)**	0.29 (0.13)*
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset after \geq 6 years	1.39 (1.70)	0.12 (0.12)
Continues previous tax increase , 1 = yes,	5.53 (1.20)**	0.09 (0.09)
Exempts elderly, 1 = yes	2.78 (2.59)	0.43 (0.18)*
Rate of tax, ln USD	-2.37 (1.88)	-0.21 (0.10)
First ballot measure in district, 1= yes	-1.78 (0.87)*	-0.08 (0.09)
<i>Contextual factors</i>		
Black students, share of enrolled students	0.36 (0.20)	0.05 (0.02)*
Hispanic students, share of enrolled students	0.17 (0.15)	0.02 (0.01)
District homeownership rate	0.62 (.40)	0.04 (0.02)*
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	8.42 (4.91)	0.32 (0.32)
<u>Within R-sq.</u>	<u>0.39</u>	<u>0.29</u>

p-value: **.005 *.05

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include year-specific intercepts omitted from this table.

Table A-7. Sensitivity analysis: Affirmative vote share and passage rate as functions of ballot features and controls including temporal sequence, correlated random-effects models, within-district components only (N=236)

	Share of vote affirmative	Passage
<i>Ballot features</i>		
Indirect Consultation, 1 = yes	3.58 (1.34)**	0.31 (.09)**
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset within 5 years	5.87 (1.78)**	0.32 (0.14)*
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset after \geq 6 years	1.54 (1.69)	0.14 (0.12)
Continues previous tax increase, 1 = yes,	5.64 (1.25)**	0.12 (0.10)
Elderly Exemption, 1 = yes	2.81 (2.56)	0.43 (0.18)*
Rate of tax, ln USD	-2.39 (1.96)	-0.21 (0.10)*
<i>Contextual factors</i>		
Black students, share of enrolled students	0.21 (0.23)	0.03 (0.02)
Hispanic students, share of enrolled students	0.17 (0.16)	0.01 (0.01)
District homeownership rate	0.82 (.20)**	0.06 (0.02)*
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	8.28 (4.27)	0.32 (0.25)
First district-year of proposed tax increase, 1= yes	-1.37 (0.85)	-0.04 (0.07)
<i>Sample selection adjustment</i>		
Estimated nonselection hazard	-1.35 (4.09)	-0.25 (0.29)
Within-district R ²	0.38	0.28

p-value ** .005 * .05

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include year-specific intercepts and between-district components, omitted from this table.

Table A-8. Passage rate as a function of ballot features and controls: Correlated random effects logistic regression model, within-district components only (N=229)

	Passage
<i>Ballot features</i>	
Indirect Consultation, 1 = yes	3.46 (1.26)*
Direct Consultation , 1 = sunset within 5 years	4.19 (1.54)*
Direct Consultation, 1 = sunset after ≥ 6 years	2.64 (1.16)
Continues previous tax increase , 1 = yes,	1.55 (0.88)
Elderly exemption, 1 = yes	6.07 (2.10)**
Rate of tax, ln USD	-2.62 (1.00)*
<i>Contextual factors</i>	
Black students, as share of enrolled students	0.55 (0.30)
Hispanic students, as share of enrolled students	0.16 (0.09)
District homeownership rate	0.63 (0.54)*
Intergovernmental revenue, ln USD per capita	3.63 (3.41)
p-value ** .005 * .05	

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include year-specific intercepts omitted from this table.

Seven observations for 1998 are perfectly predicted and are dropped from the model.