

TABLE 3.—RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREDICTED EMPLOYMENT INDEX AND EMPLOYMENT

	Employment/ Population, Metropolitan Counties biennially, 1990–2004	Employment/ Population, Metropolitan Counties, 1990 and 2000	Employment/ Population, Metropolitan Census Tracts, 1990 and 2000	Employment/ Population, Metropolitan Census Tracts, 1990 and 2000
Predicted employment index, 1990 weights	.552 (.462) [296]	.16 (.234) [74]	.397** (.044) [13,538]	.408** (.048) [13,538]
Predicted employment index, 1980 weights	.556 (.436) [296]	.299 (.222) [74]	.399** (.044) [13,528]	.389** (.048) [13,528]
Mean (SD) dependent variable in sample	.61 (.04)	.63 (.04)	.61 (.11)	.61 (.11)
County \times Year fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes

Each cell in the first two rows presents the estimated coefficient on the PEI from a different regression. All specifications control for county (or tract in columns 3–4) and year. Column 4 also includes County \times Year fixed effects. Sample size in brackets. Robust standard errors clustered by county (or tract in columns 3–4). Regressions weighted by voting age population. **Significant at 1%, * 5%.

TABLE 4.—IMPACT OF CHANGES IN PREDICTED EMPLOYMENT ON VOTING OUTCOMES

	Share Voting Democratic on Propositions	Share Voting for Democratic Gubernatorial Candidates	Share Turning Out in Gubernatorial Elections	Share Voting for Incumbent Party Gubernatorial Candidates
Predicted employment index, 1990 weights	-.450** (.012) {-.011} [615,788]	-.523** (.034) {-.013} [27,064]	-.380** (.111) {-.009} [20,307]	-.699** (.124) {-.017} [27,064]
Predicted employment index, 1980 weights	-.450** (.012) {-.012} [615,362]	-.474** (.036) {-.012} [27,045]	-.380** (.108) {-.010} [20,292]	-.238 (.126) {-.006} [27,045]

Each cell presents the estimated coefficient on the PEI from a different regression using a panel of metropolitan census tract voting returns. In column 1, each observation is a proposition; in the remaining columns, each observation is an election. All specifications control for tract and County \times Year effects. Robust standard errors clustered by tract in parentheses. The figure immediately below the standard errors is the implied change in outcome that results from a 1 percentage point increase in employment. Sample size in brackets. Regressions weighted by tract voting-age population. **Significant at 1%, *5%.

TABLE 5.—IMPACT OF CHANGES IN PREDICTED EMPLOYMENT ON DEMOCRATIC PROPOSITION VOTING, FIRST-DIFFERENCE ESTIMATES

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Predicted employment index	−.572** (.02)	−.777** (.064)	−.865** (.074)	−1.061** (.097)	−1.079** (.101)
One election lead of predicted employment index			.243* (.107)		.613** (.115)
Two election lead of predicted employment index				.158 (.19)	.25 (.184)
Tract fixed effects to control for tract trends	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>N</i>	47,331	47,331	40,577	33,813	33,813

Each cell represents a different regression specification. All specifications estimated in first differences using 1980 PEI, controlling for County × Year and tract fixed effects to allow tract-specific trends. Robust standard errors clustered by tract in parentheses. Regressions weighted by tract voting-age population. **Significant at 1%, *5%.