A.1 Pictures of Mailings

Each picture is the front and back of a postcard mailed by the vendor, displayed in their order of receipt.
Cracking down on deadbeat parents? Attorney General Phill Kline is MORE INTERESTED IN YOU.

Phil Kline voted against a bill that would have helped single parents collect child support.

Kansas' child support rate was 10%, with the rest of the nation averaging nearly 70% and states by more than 2.5%.

As Attorney General, he hasn't cracked down on dangerous criminals.

Meanwhile, the evidence is clear: Kansas is the state of Kansas, with the rest of the nation averaging nearly 70% and states by more than 2.5%.

Instead, he's sniffing around your private medical records.

Attorney General Phill Kline has spent his time and effort trying to snoop through your private medical records.

Unfortunately, the Kansas Snoop Dog is at it again!

The Bill of Rights protects citizens' privacy against EXCESSIVE SNOOPING.

When you go to the doctor, you expect a right to privacy.

Attorney General Phill Kline has accumulated thousands of private medical records on his personal records against you.

Phil Kline feels he has the right to snoop through your private medical records.

Kline spent hours of time reviewing records, and he should access women's present medical records.

Phil Kline is more interested in your personal life than tracking down dangerous criminals.

While Attorney General Kline has been charging the worst rates of medical malpractice, the rate of unnatural death has been over 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Sales of Insurers</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Snoop Dog Kline.
He's sniffing out everything but crime.
A.2 Local Linear Regression

Bandwidth Selection

To select the bandwidth for the local linear regressions, we implement a leave-one-out cross-validation procedure similar to that proposed by Ludwig and Miller (2005). The procedure starts by fixing a bandwidth \( s \). Select a census block \( c' \) with values of \( forcing_{c'} > 0 \), and estimate a local linear regression with a bandwidth parameter of \( s \) using all of the census blocks with \( forcing_c > 0 \), except census block \( c' \). Use the estimated function to construct a fitted vote share, \( \hat{Y}_{c'} \), for the excluded census block. Do this for each of the \( N_+ \) observations with \( forcing_c > 0 \), and find the average squared difference between the actual and fitted values. Repeat this procedure for census blocks with values of \( forcing \) below the income threshold. Our measure of the goodness-of-fit for a given bandwidth \( s \) is:

\[
CV(s)_\delta = \frac{1}{2N_-} \sum_{\delta < forcing_c < 0} (\hat{Y}_c - Y_c)^2 + \frac{1}{2N_+} \sum_{0 < forcing_c < \delta} (\hat{Y}_c - Y_c)^2.
\]

The bandwidth is selected by finding the value of \( s \) that minimizes \( CV(s)_\delta \). The smaller the value of \( \delta \), the smaller the range around the discontinuous threshold that is considered when assessing the goodness-of-fit. Below is a graph of the value of \( CV(s) \) for \( \delta = \{1, 2, 3\} \) for the DDD estimator using a rectangle kernel. We observe that \( CV(s) \) is relatively flat for values of \( s \) between 1 and 4. When \( \delta = \{2, 3\} \), the value of \( CV(s) \) is minimized at \( s = 1.57 \), while for \( \delta = 1 \) \( CV(s) \) is minimized at \( s = 3.46 \).
Figure A1: Values of Cross-Validation Function by Bandwidth and Range

Graphical Analysis

Figure A2: Local Linear Regression of Mail Concentration in 2006 by Majority Census Block Group Income (bandwidth = 1.57, rectangle kernel)
Figure A3: Local Linear Regression of Democratic Attorney General Vote Share in 2006 by Majority Census Block Group Income (bandwidth = 1.57, rectangle kernel)

Figure A4: Local Linear Regression of Difference in Democratic AG and Governor Vote Shares in 2006 by Majority Census Block Group Income (bandwidth = 1.57, rectangle kernel)
Figure A5: Local Linear Regression of the Difference in Democratic AG and Governor Vote Shares in 2006 minus the Difference in Democratic AG and Governor Vote Shares in 2002 by Majority Census Block Group Income (bandwidth = 1.57, rectangle kernel)
A.3 Additional Turnout Analysis

In this section we present estimates of precinct-level mail on precinct-level turnout. These estimates are obtained from a specification that is similar to equation (1) in the main text. However, we estimate a DD instead of a DDD because we only observe a single precinct turnout rate each year. We include the exact same set of explanatory and instrumental variables as in the vote share regressions. Figure A6 below indicates that we tend to find negative difference estimates and positive DD estimates of the effect of mail concentration on turnout. The magnitude and variability of the estimates demonstrate the statistical costs of using aggregated data. While we would not conclude that mail had a statistically significant effect on turnout in the aggregate analysis, we also would not be able to rule out many effect sizes.

![Figure A6: Estimated Effect of Mail on Precinct-Level Turnout](image)

White Circles Difference-Difference Estimate, Black Circles Difference Estimate
Black bars represent 90 percent confidence intervals