

Appendix 1: Logit estimates of voter turnout for matched sample including tract information for education and income

Our matched sample analysis might not fully take into account several confounding variables unavailable in county voter registration data bases. These include income and education. Recall that the educational level of Larimer's adult population is significantly higher than that of adults living in Weld. One possible remedy for this potential shortcoming is to match respondents between the counties on shared characteristics of the census tracts in which Larimer and Weld voters reside. Using the address of each voter we coded the census tract in which each lives. This allows us to match voters on gender, age, election and party from census tracts that are similar on education and income. We replicated our analysis with this alternative matched sample of voters from Weld and Larimer Counties. Separate analyses were conducted for a match for the propensity scores calculated using individual levels with tract level education and income. This was done because we were unable to obtain a propensity scores for a model that included both tract level education and income. As expected, the alternative matching technique is not as balanced as the matched sample without the census tract variables for education and income. When matching for income we obtain a matched sample with the control group that is on average .5 years older, 3% more partisan and higher per capita income of \$150 compared to the treatment group. Moreover, we fail to obtain a exact match between control and treatment groups on voting history and type of election. Nevertheless, the probability for the McNemar test is significant ($P=.0084$). When we match on education we obtain control group that is on average 3 years older and has one year of additional

education than our treatment group. Again, the probability for the McNemar test is significant ($P < .0001$)

The subsequent logit models for the alternative matched confirm our first hypothesis (i.e., Election Day vote centers increase voter turnout) but do not confirm our second hypothesis (i.e., Election Day vote center increase turnout among infrequent voters) at conventional levels of statistical significance. The coefficient for this latter relationship is signed in the expected direction. There are reasons to be less confident with the results of this alternative matched sample. Mixing individual level data with tract level data risks measure error. Specifically, we cannot be confident that our populations are matched on either education or income when we rely on indices of tract similarities. Furthermore, the tract is not necessarily an adequate measure of an individual's context. It is not a neighborhood or municipal designation that people choose. The tract designation is an artificially drawn boundary with unknown parameters (i.e., standard deviations). In short, we have no idea how reliable the tract designation on income or education is for any one individual residing in a tract. For these reasons we place greater confidence on our matched sample with only individual level variables. We have reported the findings for the alternative matched sample below.

Matching on Education

	Coef.	S.E.	p	90% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Treatment	.614	.071	.000	.472	.756
Constant	-.680	.051	.000	-.822	-.538

N = 3396

Matching on Education with interaction term

90% Confidence Interval

	Coef.	S.E.	p	Lower	Upper
Treatment	.591	.107	.000	.377	.805
Previous	.185	.012	.000	.161	.209
T*P	-.007	.017	.660	-.041	.027
Constant	-1.49	.078	.000	-1.65	-1.33

N = 3396

Matching on Income

	Coef.	S.E.	p	90% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Treatment	.101	.069	.114	-.037	.239
Constant	-.175	.049	.000	-.273	-.077

N = 3396

Matching on Income with interaction term

	Coef.	S.E.	p	90% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Treatment	.159	.104	.130	-.049	.367
Previous	.190	.012	.000	.166	.214
T*P	-.012	.017	.47	-.046	.022
Constant	-1.06	.074	.000	-1.21	-.912

N = 3396