Dataverse Supplementary Appendix for "Traceability and Mass Policy Feedback Effects"

Brian T. Hamel
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of North Texas
Brian.Hamel@unt.edu

May 5, 2024

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

A1 **Effect of County % Urban on Democratic Voting by Cycle** 3
A2 **Effect of County % Unemployed on Democratic Voting by Cycle** . 3
A3 **Effect of WPA and PWA Spending on Democratic Voting: Event Study Estimates** 4
A4 **Effect of WPA and PWA Spending on Bank Deposits: Event Study Estimates with County Trends** 5
A5 **Effect of PWA Spending on Bank Deposits: Event Study Estimates without County Trends** 6

Table A1: **Effect of County % Urban on Democratic Voting by Cycle**

	DV: Democratic Vote Share (0-100)					
	(1) 1924	(2) 1928	(3) 1932	(4) 1936	(5) 1940	(6) 1944
% Urban	-0.048***	-0.009	-0.029***	0.073***	0.076***	0.085***
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)
State FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	3,057	3,067	3,067	3,066	3,065	3,066
R^2	0.819	0.559	0.732	0.690	0.741	0.705

Notes: ***p<0.001; *p<0.05

Table A2: **Effect of County % Unemployed on Democratic Voting by Cycle**

	DV: Democratic Vote Share (0-100)					
	(1) 1924	(2) 1928	(3) 1932	(4) 1936	(5) 1940	(6) 1944
% Unemployed	-0.427***	-0.086	-0.075	0.637***	0.875***	0.962***
	(0.093)	(0.098)	(0.076)	(0.081)	(0.084)	(0.090)
State FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	3,057	3,067	3,067	3,066	3,065	3,066
R^2	0.818	0.559	0.731	0.688	0.744	0.708

Notes: ***p<0.001; *p<0.05

Table A3: **Effect of WPA and PWA Spending on Democratic Voting: Event Study Estimates**

	DV: Democratic Vote Share (0-100)	
	WPA	**PWA**
	(1)	(2)
1920	0.155	-0.076
	(0.270)	(0.142)
1924	-0.099	-0.141
	(0.321)	(0.165)
1928	0.099	-0.316
	(0.501)	(0.254)
1932	0.109	-0.240
	(0.325)	(0.175)
1936	0.339	-0.019
	(0.305)	(0.177)
1940	1.089***	-0.018
	(0.328)	(0.177)
1944	0.844*	-0.275
	(0.359)	(0.196)
County FE	✓	✓
State-Year FE	✓	✓
Demographic FE	✓	✓
Observations	24,403	24,403
R^2	0.932	0.932

Notes: Standard errors are clustered by county. ***p<0.001; *p<0.05

Table A4: **Effect of WPA and PWA Spending on Bank Deposits: Event Study Estimates with County Trends**

	DV: ln(Bank Deposits)	
	WPA	**PWA**
	(1)	(2)
1927	0.015	-0.008
	(0.018)	(0.142)
1928	-0.002	-0.002
	(0.022)	(0.165)
1929	0.007	0.004
	(0.029)	(0.254)
1930	-0.007	0.026
	(0.036)	(0.175)
1931	-0.016	0.025
	(0.039)	(0.177)
1932	0.0003	0.039
	(0.048)	(0.177)
1933	-0.046	0.045
	(0.057)	(0.196)
1934	-0.044	0.020
	(0.061)	(0.177)
1935	-0.049	0.032
	(0.070)	(0.177)
1936	-0.049	0.046
	(0.077)	(0.177)
County FE	✓	✓
State-Year FE	✓	✓
Demographic FE	✓	✓
Observations	36,468	36,468
R^2	0.921	0.921

Notes: Standard errors are clustered by county.

Table A5: **Effect of PWA Spending on Bank Deposits: Event Study Estimates without County Trends**

	DV: ln(Bank Deposits)
	(1)
PWA × 1927	-0.001
	(0.005)
PWA × 1928	-0.009^{+}
	(0.005)
PWA × 1929	0.021**
	(0.007)
PWA × 1930	0.046***
	(0.009)
PWA × 1931	0.051***
	(0.011)
PWA × 1932	0.068***
	(0.013)
PWA × 1933	0.079***
	(0.017)
PWA × 1934	0.059***
	(0.015)
PWA × 1935	0.076***
	(0.016)
PWA × 1936	0.095***
	(0.017)
County FE	✓
State-Year FE	✓
Demographic FE	✓
Observations	36,468
R^2	0.856

Notes: Standard errors are clustered by county. ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<0.05; $^{+}$p<0.10