

Appendix to

Voting Access Reforms and Policy Feedback Effects on Political Efficacy and Trust

Andrew Trexler
Duke University

Marayna Martinez
University of Colorado, Boulder

Mallory E. SoRelle
Duke University

March 2025

Contents

A: Supplemental Results	2
Table A1: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Adoption Group (Full Sample)	2
Table A2: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Adoption Group (Full Sample)	3
Table A3: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Party ID	4
Table A4: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Party ID	5
Table A5: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Party Control of State Government	6
Table A6: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Party Control of State Government	7
Table A7: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Treatment Length (Full Sample)	9
Table A8: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Treatment Length (Full Sample)	9
Table A9: Estimated ATT of Mail Voting Reforms by Political Engagement	10

A: Supplemental Results

Table A1: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Adoption Group (Full Sample)

Adoption Group	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Group 1992 (AZ, CO, DC, IA, NV, OK, WY)	– –	0.0255 (0.0397)	0.0868 (0.2834)
Group 1996 (AK, HI, ID, KS, NM)	– –	–0.1422 (0.1163)	–0.2121 (0.2681)
Group 2000 (ME, MT, NE, ND, WI)	– –	–0.0010 (0.0653)	0.0329 (0.2319)
Group 2004 (FL, NC, UT, VT)	– –	–0.0127 (0.2652)	–0.0386 (1.8633)
Group 2008 (GA, NJ, OH)	– –	0.1191*** (0.0383)	0.0632 (0.0628)
Group 2012 (IL, MD)	–0.0254 (0.0209)	0.1022*** (0.0246)	0.0785 (0.0957)
Group 2016 (MN)	0.0165 (0.0158)	0.1167*** (0.0183)	0.0257 (0.0485)
Group 2020 (AL, AR, CT, KY, LA, MA, MI, MO, NH, NY, PA, RI, SC, SD, VA, WV)	–0.0047 (0.0206)	0.0490** (0.0194)	–0.0076 (0.0384)
Aggregate	–0.0070 (0.0157)	0.0487 (0.0310)	0.0091 (0.1789)
Observations	7,725	22,608	25,033
P-value for Parallel Trends Assump.	0.420	0.024	0.019
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001			

Note: Table reports adoption group ATT estimates aggregated across treatment periods.
The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across groups. Data from the ANES cumulative file.

Table A2: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Adoption Group (Full Sample)

Adoption Group	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Group 2000 (OR)	– –	0.0052 (0.0781)	0.2078*** (0.0531)
Group 2012 (WA)	–0.0944*** (0.0152)	0.1430* (0.0648)	–0.1218 (0.0920)
Group 2016 (CO)	0.0063 (0.0157)	0.0378 (0.0407)	–0.0533 (0.0290)
Group 2020 (CA, DC, HI, NV, NJ, UT, VT)	0.0078 (0.0321)	0.0119 (0.0453)	–0.0760* (0.0360)
Aggregate	–0.0053 (0.0261)	0.0293 (0.0338)	–0.0582 (0.0298)
Observations	8,323	12,097	13,690
P-value for Parallel Trends Assump.	0.690	0.000	0.004
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001			

Note: Table reports adoption group ATT estimates aggregated across treatment periods. The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across groups. Data from the ANES cumulative file.

Table A3: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Party ID

Adoption Group	<i>Democrats:</i>			<i>Republicans:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Group 1992 (AZ, CO, DC, IA, NV, OK, WY)	– –	–0.0172 (0.1799)	0.133 (0.1728)	– –	0.0915 (0.1988)	0.1907 (0.5454)
Group 1996 (AK, HI, ID, KS, NM)	– –	–0.1538 (0.1691)	–0.2564 (0.1909)	– –	–0.0962 (0.1516)	–0.1936 (0.3756)
Group 2000 (ME, MT, NE, ND, WI)	– –	–0.0597 (0.2195)	0.0309 (0.4569)	– –	0.0490 (0.1515)	0.0830 (0.3857)
Group 2004 (FL, NC, UT, VT)	– –	–0.1305 (0.3769)	–0.2408 (1.0446)	– –	0.1481 (0.8982)	0.0828 (2.2977)
Group 2008 (GA, NJ, OH)	– –	0.1230 (0.0827)	0.1484 (0.1608)	– –	0.0690 (0.0362)	–0.0538 (0.0432)
Group 2012 (IL, MD)	–0.0223 (0.0267)	0.1673*** (0.0285)	0.0616 (0.1451)	– –	0.1388* (0.0605)	–0.7231*** (0.0839)
Group 2016 (MN)	0.0207 (0.0369)	0.1388 (0.0869)	0.0357 (0.0820)	0.0233 (0.0987)	0.0871* (0.0433)	0.0894* (0.0456)
Group 2020 (AL, AR, CT, KY, LA, MA, MI, MO, NH, NY, PA, RI, SC, SD, VA, WV)	–0.0110 (0.0386)	0.0514 (0.0468)	0.0024 (0.0890)	0.0032 (0.0420)	0.0081 (0.0535)	–0.0108 (0.0434)
Aggregate	–0.0116 (0.0280)	0.0349 (0.0422)	–0.0092 (0.1110)	0.0045 (0.0367)	0.0517 (0.0960)	–0.0311 (0.0229)
Observations	3,768	10,836	12,107	2,970	8,834	9,674
P-value for Parallel Trends Assump.	0.671	0.040	0.069	0.537	0.015	0.000
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001						

Note: Table reports group-level ATT estimates aggregated across treatment periods by party identification (including leaners). The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across groups. Data from the ANES cumulative file.

Table A4: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Party ID

Adoption Group	<i>Democrats:</i>			<i>Republicans:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Group 2000 (OR)	– (0.0880)	–0.0380 (0.0880)	0.0735 (0.1427)	– (0.0713)	0.1770* (0.0713)	0.3933*** (0.1196)
Group 2012 (WA)	–0.2044 (0.1177)	0.2067** (0.0794)	–0.1513 (0.1602)	0.1191*** (0.0368)	0.0189 (0.0814)	–0.0860 (0.0737)
Group 2016 (CO)	0.0269 (0.0210)	0.0124 (0.0471)	–0.0973 (0.0637)	–0.0041 (0.0260)	–0.0144 (0.0531)	–0.0001 (0.0397)
Group 2020 (CA, DC, HI, NV, NJ, UT, VT)	0.0083 (0.0223)	0.0015 (0.0668)	–0.1205 (0.0912)	0.0017 (0.0751)	0.0094 (0.1323)	0.0193 (0.0850)
Aggregate	–0.0184 (0.0263)	0.0236 (0.0573)	–0.1074 (0.0664)	0.0153 (0.0549)	0.0199 (0.0967)	0.0314 (0.0664)
Observations	4,054	5,930	6,768	3,248	4,701	5,250
P-value for Parallel Trends Assump.	0.507	0.000	0.322	0.359	0.692	0.011
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001						

Note: Table reports group-level ATT estimates aggregated across treatment periods by party identification (including leaners). The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across groups. Data from the ANES cumulative file.

Table A5: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Party Control of State Government

Adoption Group	<i>Preferred Party Control:</i>			<i>Outparty Control or Divided:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Group 1992 (AZ, CO, DC, IA, NV, OK, WY)	— —	— —	— —	— —	0.0601 (0.0362)	0.0999 (0.1577)
Group 1996 (AK, HI, ID, KS, NM)	— —	— —	— —	— —	−0.1996 (0.2069)	−0.2217 (0.1765)
Group 2000 (ME, MT, NE, ND, WI)	— —	— —	— —	— —	0.0344 (0.3365)	0.1808 (0.4605)
Group 2004 (FL, NC, UT, VT)	— —	0.1507 (0.6458)	0.2870 (0.7309)	— —	−0.1279 (4.2534)	−0.1776 (2.9238)
Group 2008 (GA, NJ, OH)	— —	0.0042 (0.1145)	0.1835 (0.3302)	— —	0.1529 (0.1411)	−0.2553 (0.1792)
Group 2012 (IL, MD)	0.0066 (0.0383)	0.1540*** (0.0244)	0.1537* (0.0783)	— —	0.0246 (0.1954)	−0.6104*** (0.1325)
Group 2016 (MN)	— —	— —	— —	0.0767 (0.1334)	−0.0056 (0.2611)	−0.0675 (0.3201)
Group 2020 (AL, AR, CT, KY, LA, MA, MI, MO, NH, NY, PA, RI, SC, SD, VA, WV)	0.0289 (0.0306)	0.0752 (0.0385)	0.0105 (0.0499)	−0.0055 (0.0560)	0.0512 (0.0429)	0.0628 (0.2259)
Aggregate	0.0275 (0.0284)	0.0741 (0.0541)	0.0621 (0.0808)	−0.0014 (0.0500)	0.0385 (0.1838)	−0.0107 (0.1436)
Observations	3,458	7,049	8,006	3,324	10,571	11,365
P-value for Parallel Trends Assump.	0.967	0.215	0.709	0.015	0.414	0.002
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001						

Note: Table reports group-level ATT estimates aggregated across treatment periods by party control of state government. The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across groups. Data from the ANES cumulative file.

Table A6: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Party Control of State Government

Adoption Group	<i>Preferred Party Control:</i>			<i>Outparty Control or Divided:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy (1)	External Efficacy (2)	Government Trust (3)	Internal Efficacy (4)	External Efficacy (5)	Government Trust (6)
Group 2000 (OR)	– –	– –	– –	– –	0.0029 (0.1527)	0.2264 (0.3943)
Group 2012 (WA)	–0.2483*** (0.0237)	0.2448*** (0.0714)	–0.0862 (0.0696)	0.1153 (0.0646)	–0.0258 (0.0874)	–0.1082 (0.1187)
Group 2016 (CO)	– –	– –	– –	–0.0345 (0.0336)	0.0465 (0.1632)	–0.0978 (0.0794)
Group 2020 (CA, DC, HI, NV, NJ, UT, VT)	0.0220 (0.0232)	0.0547 (0.0687)	–0.2181* (0.0857)	–0.0204 (0.0521)	–0.0562 (0.1476)	0.0879 (0.0925)
Aggregate	0.0093 (0.0632)	0.0635 (0.0617)	–0.2091* (0.0841)	–0.0172 (0.0411)	–0.0412 (0.1017)	0.0575 (0.0689)
Observations	4,245	5,320	6,207	3,552	5,893	6,546
P-value for Parallel Trends Assump.	0.118	0.120	0.000	0.303	0.000	0.192
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001						

Note: Table reports group-level ATT estimates aggregated across treatment periods by party control of state government. The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across groups. Data from the ANES cumulative file.

Table A7: Estimated ATT of NEAV by Treatment Length (Full Sample)

Years from Adoption	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)
−28 Years	− −	−0.0044 (0.0281)	−0.0769* (0.0283)
−24 Years	− −	−0.0052 (0.0127)	0.0014 (0.0356)
−20 Years	− −	−0.0150 (0.2130)	−0.0080 (1.3382)
−16 Years	− −	0.0032 (0.1570)	−0.0744 (1.0003)
−12 Years	− −	−0.0119 (0.0227)	0.0413 (0.0908)
−8 Years	0.0128 (0.0360)	0.0288 (0.0332)	−0.0014 (0.1072)
−4 Years	0.0244 (0.0281)	−0.0389 (0.0417)	−0.0130 (0.0427)
0 Years	−0.0125 (0.0173)	0.0440 (0.0322)	−0.0026 (0.1105)
4 Years	−0.0037 (0.0208)	0.0504 (0.0561)	0.0414 (0.2844)
8 Years	−0.0068 (0.0182)	0.0885 (0.0555)	0.0679 (0.1377)
12 Years	− −	0.0122 (0.0847)	0.0175 (0.4897)
16 Years	− −	0.0076 (0.1127)	−0.0215 (0.7145)
20 Years	− −	−0.0349 (0.1060)	−0.0323 (0.1506)
24 Years	− −	−0.0306 (0.2062)	0.0175 (0.2444)
28 Years	− −	0.0098 (0.0320)	0.0312 (0.2329)
Aggregate	−0.0077 (0.0124)	0.0184 (0.0505)	0.0149 (0.2353)
Observations	7,725	16,735	17,820
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001			

Note: Table reports dynamic (exposure length) ATT estimates aggregated across treatment groups. The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across exposure lengths. Data from the ANES cumulative file. Pre-adoption ATT estimates (negative years) should be zero to satisfy the pre-treatment parallel trends assumption.

Table A8: Estimated ATT of UVBM by Treatment Length (Full Sample)

Years from Adoption	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Internal Efficacy	External Efficacy	Government Trust
	(1)	(2)	(3)
−24 Years	– –	0.0418 (0.0909)	0.0521 (0.1013)
−20 Years	– –	−0.1027 (0.1060)	−0.1042 (0.0952)
−16 Years	– –	0.0455 (0.0772)	−0.0284 (0.1155)
−12 Years	– –	0.0568 (0.0542)	0.0852 (0.1114)
−8 Years	−0.0209 (0.0339)	−0.0034 (0.0507)	0.0611 (0.0595)
−4 Years	−0.0059 (0.0213)	−0.0573 (0.0544)	0.0357 (0.0476)
0 Years	−0.0112 (0.0263)	0.0328 (0.0327)	−0.0480 (0.0572)
4 Years	−0.0250 (0.0392)	0.0723 (0.0483)	−0.0369 (0.0572)
8 Years	−0.0900*** (0.0186)	0.0362 (0.1127)	0.0073 (0.1583)
12 Years	– –	−0.0017 (0.0818)	0.2255*** (0.0552)
16 Years	– –	0.0348 (0.0806)	0.2309*** (0.490)
20 Years	– –	0.0709 (0.0781)	0.1081 (0.0520)
Aggregate	−0.0421* (0.0190)	0.0409 (0.0515)	0.0811 (0.0497)
Observations	8,323	11,290	12,408
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001			

Note: Table reports dynamic (exposure length) ATT estimates aggregated across treatment groups. The “Aggregate” estimate is further aggregated across exposure lengths. Data from the ANES cumulative file. Pre-adoption ATT estimates (negative years) should be zero to satisfy the pre-treatment parallel trends assumption.

Table A9: Estimated ATT of Mail Voting Reforms by Political Engagement

Sample	<i>No-excuse Absentee Voting</i> (NEAV)			<i>Universal Vote by Mail</i> (UVBM)		
	Internal Efficacy (1)	External Efficacy (2)	Government Trust (3)	Internal Efficacy (4)	External Efficacy (5)	Government Trust (6)
High Political Engagement	−0.0082 (0.0167)	0.0176 (0.3055)	−0.0201 (0.8051)	−0.0030 (0.0193)	0.0617 (0.0396)	−0.0472 (0.0449)
Low Political Engagement	0.0113 (0.0359)	0.0645* (0.0325)	0.0425 (0.0668)	−0.0202 (0.0684)	0.0003 (0.0667)	−0.0418 (0.0713)
*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001						

Note: Table provides full sample and subsample single-parameter ATT estimates via the “group” aggregation method proposed by Callaway and Sant’anna (2021). Data from the ANES cumulative file.

To assess the effect of mail voting reforms on individuals with low versus high political engagement, we rely on two measures available in the ANES cumulative file. The first asks “would you say that you have been/were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in [following] the political campaigns this year?” on a 3-point scale. Beginning in 2008, the ANES also asks “How often do you pay attention to what’s going on in government and politics?” on a 5-point scale from “Never” to “Always.” We rescale both variables to vary between 0 (lowest engagement) and 1 (highest engagement). For the 1988 through 2004 cross-sections, we rely exclusively on the first measure; for 2008 through 2020, we use the average of the two at the individual level. The median individual in the full sample scores 0.6250 on this combined measure. We re-analyze our results on respondents who score below the median value as low-engagement individuals, and on respondents who score at or above the median value as high-engagement individuals. These results are presented above in Table A9.