Supplemental Table 2

Results of Anti-Bullying Policy Comprehensiveness and Enumerated Groups Models

Variable	Base Model	Enumerated Groups Model†	Education Budget Model	Personal Freedom Model	"No Promo Homo" Model
Neighbor Comprehensiveness	-0.59**	-3.22**	-0.55*	-0.60**	-0.60**
	(0.27)	(1.31)	(0.29)	(0.27)	(0.27)
FIRE 2013	-0.00	-0.02	0.00		-0.00
	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)		(0.00)
Personal Freedom				0.00	
				(0.01)	
Per Capita Income ($1,000)	0.07**	0.23**		0.07**	0.07**
	(0.02)	(0.11)		(0.03)	(0.03)
Education Budget			-0.03		
			(0.02)		
Legislative Professionalism	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Percent Disabled Students	0.40**	1.36**	0.30**	0.40**	0.39**
	(0.12)	(0.56)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)
LGBT Households	0.20**	0.92**	0.24**	0.21**	0.21**
	(0.08)	(0.38)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Percent African American and Hispanic	0.03**	0.11**	0.02*	0.03**	0.03**
	(0.01)	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
"No Promo Homo" Law					0.19
					(0.33)
Time	-0.06	-0.20	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06
	(0.04)	(0.15)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Intercept	-6.29**	-23.31**	-2.47*	-6.31**	-6.43**
	(1.50)	(8.02)	(1.28)	(1.51)	(1.53)
N	48	50	48	48	48
Adjusted R^2	0.37		0.28	0.37	0.36

Standard errors in parentheses

* indicates significance at p <0.10 (two-tailed); **p<0.05

†This is a logistic regression model with the dichotomous outcome being whether a state included group enumeration in their anti-bullying statutes.