Supplementary Information for "Pre-Birth Factors, Post-Birth Factors, and Turnout: Evidence from Swedish Adoption Data"

Appendix A: Additional Details on Sampling Frame

Previous Swedish adoption studies have relied on outcome variables that are readily obtainable from government records, such as educational attainment and income (Björklund, Lindahl and Plug 2006), crime (Hjalmarsson and Lindquist 2013), and self-employment (Lindquist, Sol, and Van Praag 2012). Therefore, these studies rely on the entire population of adoptees as well as a large representative sample of controls. In selecting the population for this study, we faced the constraint that measures of voter turnout are not recorded in any population-based registers and had to be collected manually at a high cost. In addition, data on participation could not be obtained from individuals who were no longer alive at the time of the 2010 general election. For these reasons, we chose the following sampling frame.

We began with a sample comprising all adoptees born in Sweden between 1965 and 1975 whose biological mothers and adoptive mothers could be identified and were alive as of December 31, 2009. We identified 2,207 such individuals, who along with their adoptive and biological mothers constitute the core sample. We matched these individuals to the quinquennial census records from 1965 to 1990. We also used the census records to verify that the adoptive mother was the same person recorded as the mother in the household in all censuses. Furthermore, we obtained information from the Population Register on the first year in which the child lived with his or her adoptive parents.

We eliminated one observation because the census records contained no evidence that the mother

who supposedly adopted the child also raised him or her, and 27 observations because the census records contain no evidence that the adoptive father ever lived in the household. We subsequently examined cases in which evidence showed that multiple father or mothers reared the remaining adoptees. In 28 cases, we found that the household mother varied by census; in 70 cases, the household father varied by census; and in 21 cases, both the household mother and father varied by census between the child's first recorded residence in the adoptive parents' home and the age of 18.

Discarding the cases in which a child did not grow up with a unique pair of household parents leaves a core sample of 2,060 adopted children. By construction, the adoptive parents and biological mothers of all of these children are known, and the biological fathers can be identified in 1,340 cases. Because some mothers gave birth to or adopted multiple children, the final sample contains 1,875 unique adoptive mothers and 1,982 unique biological mothers.

The sample was also augmented with data on additional siblings of the adoptees. In some cases, a mother with adopted children also had biological children of her own. Some of the adopted children also had biological siblings who were not given up for adoption, but instead were reared by their biological mothers (Nordlöf 2001). To achieve a reasonable sample size, we included all siblings born between 1960 and 1980, a window 10 years wider than that used to select the adoptees. We also eliminated children who were not raised by both of their biological parents according to the censuses, leaving 475 biological children born to mothers who adopted and 103 children born to mothers who gave up at least one child for adoption.

We matched all of these individuals to the electoral rolls from the general elections in Sweden in 2010. Between elections, the electoral rolls are kept in each of the 290 municipalities in Sweden. Directly after the election, all electoral rolls – with information on voting participation – are sent to the 21 County Administrative Boards. We contacted each of these Boards and obtained their permission to manually match the information in the electoral rolls to the sample. The matching is not based on names, but rather on social security numbers (civic registration numbers), and is of high quality. We observe whether an individual voted in the parliamentary election and the two regional elections that were held simultaneously. The fact that turnout is only observed in one election

introduces a measurement-error problem, which the strong inertia (Plutzer 2002; Denny and Doyle 2009) in turnout hopefully mitigates. Though obtaining turnout data from multiple elections would have been preferrable, the decentralized handling of electoral rolls makes acquiring such data infeasible. We also matched the sample to administrative registers with information about educational attainment, income, and some additional demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

Appendix B: Variable Definitions

- Turnout - Equal to 1 if the individual voted in the Swedish parliamentary election in September 2010.
- Sex - Equal to 1 if female. Information from the Swedish Population Register.
- Birth year (children) - Information from the Swedish Population Register.
- Birth cohort (parents) - Parents were assigned to one of the following eight birth cohorts: born before 1926; born 1926–1930; born 1931–1935; born 1936–1940; born 1941–1945; born 1946–1950; born 1951–1955; born after 1955. Information on birth year is taken from the Swedish Population Register.
- Age at adoption - The difference between the year in which the child was first registered as living in the adoptive home (as of December 31) and the child's year of birth. Information about the year in which the child was first registered as living in the adoptive home is taken from the census in 1965 and the Swedish Population Register (1968–1977). For adoptees between 1966 and 1967, the variable is set to missing.
- County of residence - County of residence in 1970 (25 categories). Information is from the 1970 census.
- Years of schooling - Educational attainment as of January 1, 2010, according to the three-digit Swedish standard classification of education (SUN 2000). Following the manual for classifying educational programmes in OECD countries (ISCED-97), we assigned the following years of schooling to each category: (old) primary school (7); (new) compulsory school (9); high school

(10–12 depending on the program); short university (13); longer university (14–17 depending on the program); short post-graduate (18); long post-graduate (20). The information on educational attainment is taken from the Swedish Register of Education. The variable is imputed using data from the 1990 census if information is missing in 2010.

- College - Equal to 1 if the individual has at least 15 years of schooling.
- Earnings (children) - Total earned income (compensations from employment and entrepreneurial activities, excluding property income) in 2008. The information on earnings is taken from the Swedish Tax Register.
- Earnings (fathers) - Average earned income (compensations from employment and entrepreneurial activities, excluding property income) obtained from the censuses between 1970 and 1990.
- Socioeconomic status - Socioeconomic classification (16 categories) of the individuals based on their occupations: unskilled employees in goods production (1); unskilled employees in service production (2); skilled employees in goods production (3); skilled employees in service production (4); assistant non-manual employees, lower level (5); assistant non-manual employees, higher level (6); intermediate non-manual employees (7); professionals, other higher non-manual employees, and upper-level executives (8); self-employed professionals (9); farmers (10); self-employed (excluding self-employed professionals and farmers) (11); non-classified employees (12); old-age pensioners (13); housewives (or male equivalents) (14); students (15); and part-time workers (16). The information on socioeconomic status is taken from the census in 1980.
- Family size - Number of children aged 0–17 in the household. Information taken from the 1970 census.

Appendix C: Non-Linear Models

In this appendix we examine how robust the results from the linear probability model are to functional form assumptions.

Latent Variable Models

In the standard probit model, an individual i is assumed to have a latent voting propensity (Y_i^*) that is not observed. The individual's voting behavior, which *is* observed, is described by

$$Y_i^{ac} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } Y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $Y_i^{ac} = 1$ if the adopted individual voted. Y^* is determined by the process

$$Y_i^* = \tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_1 Y_i^{bp} + \tilde{\alpha}_2 Y_i^{rp} + \tilde{\alpha}_3 Y_i^{rp} \cdot Y_i^{bp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{\epsilon}_i^{ac}, \tag{1}$$

where Y_i^{bp} and Y_i^{rp} are the binary pre- and post-birth factors, X is a matrix of covariates and $\tilde{\epsilon}_i$ is a standard normal variable that is independent of X and Y and has cumulative distribution function $F(\cdot)$. For expositional clarity we can write Equation (1) as $Y_i\tilde{\alpha} + X_i\tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{\epsilon}_i^{ac}$. The probit estimate is the vector $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\gamma})$ that maximizes the log likelihood of the sample,

$$\ln L\left(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma} | \, Y^{ac}, Y, X\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}(Y_i^{ac} = 1) \ln(F\left(Y_i\tilde{\alpha} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right)) + (1 - \mathbf{1}(Y_i^{ac} = 1) \ln(1 - F\left(Y_i\tilde{\alpha} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right)).$$

Comparing Estimates

The estimates of $\alpha = (\alpha_0, .., \alpha_3)$ from the linear probability model are not directly comparable to the probit estimates of $\tilde{\alpha} = (\tilde{\alpha}_0, .., \tilde{\alpha}_3)$, because the $\tilde{\alpha}$ parameters are estimated effects on a latent variable y^* and not turnout Y^{ac}. To make the estimates comparable, we compute the change in turnout probability that, according to each of the two models, is induced by changes in Y_i^{bp} and Y_i^{rp}. Consider the most general case in which $\tilde{\alpha}_3$ is treated as a free parameter in the data-generating process given by Equation 1 and α_3 is treated as a free parameter in the linear probability model.

Probit Model. The change in voting probability induced by changing Y_i^{bp} from 0 to 1 is given by

$$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_i^{bp}} = [F\left(\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_1 + \tilde{\alpha}_2 Y_i^{rp} + \tilde{\alpha}_3 Y_i^{rp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right) - F\left(\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_2 Y_i^{rp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right)]. \tag{2}$$

The change in voting probability induced by changing Y_i^{rp} from 0 to 1 is similarly given by,

$$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_i^{rp}} = [F\left(\alpha_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_1 Y_i^{bp} + \tilde{\alpha}_2 + \tilde{\alpha}_3 Y_i^{bp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right) - F\left(\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_1 Y_i^{bp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right)]. \tag{3}$$

Linear Probability Model. The change in voting probability induced by changing Y_i^{bp} from 0 to 1 is given by,

$$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_j^{bp}} = (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 Y_i^{rp} + \alpha_3 Y_i^{rp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}) - (\alpha_0 + \alpha_2 Y_i^{rp} + X_i\tilde{\gamma}) \tag{4}$$

$$= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 Y_i^{rp})$$

and the change in voting probability induced by changing Y_i^{rp} from 0 to 1 is,

$$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_i^{ap}} = (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_j^{bp} + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 Y_j^{bp} + X_i\gamma) - \left(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_j^{bp} + X_i\gamma\right) \tag{5}$$

$$= (\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 Y_j^{bp}).$$

We obtain individual-level estimates of these quantities by replacing the unknown parameters with their maximum likelihood estimates (probit) or OLS (linear probability model) estimates in Equations 2 through 5. Performing this computation for all the adoptees in our sample gives a distribution of estimated effects of Y_i^{bp} and Y_i^{rp} under each model. To aid comparability, we impose functional-form restrictions on the data-generating process in the probit model that are analogous to the functional form restrictions in the original model.

We begin with the baseline linear probability model without interactions, setting $\alpha_3 = 0$ in Equations 4 and 5 and $\tilde{\alpha}_3 = 0$ in Equations 2 and 3. The results are shown in Columns 1 (probit) and 2 (linear probability model) of Table S1 (the paternal estimates are given in Columns 5 and 6). The linear probability estimates suggest the average effect of changing Y_j^{bp} from 0 to 1 on voting probability is 4.4 percentage points in this population of adoptees. The probit estimate is 4.3. The estimates of the adoptive mother's effect on turnout probability are also similar (4.9 and 5.1).

An interaction effect between the pre- and post-birth factors can also be defined in a way that

permits comparisons. In the probit model, the interaction is defined as

$$\frac{\Delta^2 \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_j^{bp} \Delta Y_i^{rp}} = F\left(\sum_{i=0}^{3} \tilde{\alpha}_i + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right) + F\left(\tilde{\alpha}_0 + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right) - F\left(\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_1 + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right) - F\left(\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\alpha}_2 + X_i\tilde{\gamma}\right). \quad (6)$$

The same object in the linear probability model is,

$$\frac{\Delta^2 \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_j^{bp} \Delta Y_i^{rp}} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{3} \alpha_i + X_i\gamma\right) + \left(\alpha_0 + X_i\gamma\right) - \left(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + X_i\gamma\right) - \left(\alpha_0 + \alpha_2 + X_i\gamma\right) = \alpha_3. \quad (7)$$

As is evident from Table S1 and Equation 7, the interaction effect defined by Equation 7 will trivially be equal to zero in the linear probability model where the restriction $\alpha_3 = 0$ is imposed. The interaction computed from probit estimates will generally not be zero, as the nonlinearity of the cumulative distribution function produces interactions between the covariates even if there are no interactions in the data-generating process. Columns 3 and 4 of Table S1 (paternal models in Columns 7 and 8) show estimates of the population average of Equations 2 through 7 derived from models in which α_3 and $\tilde{\alpha}_3$ are free parameters. The first two entries again give the average effect on turnout probability from changing biological mother's, or adoptive mother's, voting from 0 to 1, holding fixed the distribution of covariates in the population. The estimate of the population average of Equation 6 is of particular interest. The estimate is negative, statistically significant, and similar in magnitude (-0.163) to the linear probability estimate of the interaction (-0.150). These results are reassuring and suggest the finding of an interaction in the baseline maternal model is robust to functional-form assumptions.

Finally, Table S2 shows the untransformed estimates of the α and $\tilde{\alpha}$ parameters from which the probabilities in Table S1 were computed. The usual caveat about the $\tilde{\alpha}$ parameters applies. The latent variable y^* is abstract and may not have an obvious interpretation. It is nevertheless interesting to note that there is a negative interaction between Y_i^{ap} and Y_j^{bp} also in determining y^*. As explained by Berry, DeMeritt and Esarey (2010), the presence of a negative interaction in determining the probability of turnout in no way implies this interaction.

Appendix D: US Transmission Estimates

In this appendix, we provide some additional details on the samples used to estimate US transmission coefficients for own-birth children.

Sample Selection Criteria

Turnout - NLSY

The NLSY79 is a nationally representative sample of around 13,000 young men and women who were 14-22 years old when they were first surveyed in 1979. These individuals are known as NLSY79 respondents. The children born to the women in the original NLSY79 have also been repeatedly surveyed beginning in 1986. In 2008, a large sample of these children and their mothers were asked about their participation in the 2006 election. We use these data to estimate transmission coefficients for a large sample of own-birth children. We restrict the sample to children who reported living with both of their biological parents at least until the age of 14 and who were eligible to vote in 2006. Unfortunately, estimating transmission coefficients for fathers is not possible, as the data are not available. Because the NLSY data do contain information on the educational attainment of the mothers and fathers of the original NLSY79 respondents, we also estimate transmission coefficients for college and years of schooling using data on the original cohort of respondents and their parents.

Turnout - YPSPS

The Youth-Parent Socialization Panel Study (YPSPS) is a four-wave panel study covering three biologically related generations of Americans. The original study was based on a national probability sample of 1,669 individuals who were high school seniors in 1965. We refer to these respondents as the original cohort, their parents as the parental cohort, and the children of the original cohort members as the third-generation cohort. The members of the original cohort have been surveyed four times: in 1965, 1973, 1982, and 1997. The 1997 survey attempted to include all third-generation cohort members who had reached an age of 15 or greater. Of the original 1,669 original cohort

members, 915 responded to the 1997 survey. Of these 915 individuals, 478 were parents of a total of 769 third-generation children who also responded to the survey. Because both original cohort members and their offspring were asked about their participation in the 1992 and 1996 presidential elections we use the YPSPS data to construct parent-child dyads with information on turnout in these two elections. We restrict the sample to dyads in which the child is eligible to vote and, because we are interested in transmission in own-birth children, families that have no foster children living in them.[1]

Variable Definitions

Control Variables - NLSY

- Turnout in 2006 – Equal to 1 if the individual reported voting in the 2006 congressional election. The variable is constructed from responses to the following question:

  In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they were sick or they just didn't have time or for some other reason. Which of the following statements best describes you:

  I did not vote in the national election held in November 2006.

  I thought about voting in the national election held in November 2006, but didn't.

  I usually vote, but didn't vote in the national election held in November 2006.

  I am sure I voted in the national election held in November 2006.

- Years of Schooling (NLSY79) – We construct the years of education variable for the NLSY79 respondents using information on highest grade completed supplied in the annual surveys up until and including 1994. We use the response from 1994 when available and the most recent year with non-missing data otherwise.

[1] We do not report education transmission coefficients for the YPSPS sample for two reasons. First, the core of the sample is by construction limited to individuals who reached their senior year of high-school. And second, only a small fraction of the children in the third generation are surveyed at an age at which we can be confident they have attained their highest degree.

- Years of Schooling (parents of NLSY79) – To obtain a measure of mother's and father's education, we use information from the 1979 survey, which asked about the highest grade completed by both the NLSY79 respondent's father and mother.

- College – Equal to 1 if the individual has at least three years of post-secondary education.

Control Variables - YPSPS

- Turnout in 1992 (parents) – Equal to 1 if the individual reported voting in the 1992 presidential election. The variable is constructed from responses to the following question:

  Now, in 1992 you remember that Mr. Bush ran on the Republican ticket against Mr. Clinton for the Democrats and against Mr. Perot who ran as an Independent. Do you remember whether you voted in that election?

  Yes, voted

  No, didn't vote

- Turnout in 1992 (children) – Equal to 1 if the individual reported voting in the 1992 presidential election. The variable is constructed from responses to the question:

  Did you vote for President in 1992?

  Yes, voted

  No, didn't vote

  Too young to vote

- Turnout in 1996 (parents) – Equal to 1 if the individual reported voting in the 1996 presidential election. The variable is constructed from responses to the question:

  In talking with people about the 1996 presidential election between Clinton, Dole, and Perot, we found that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't registered

or they were sick or they just didn't have time. How about you, did you vote or did something keep you from voting?

Voted

Did not vote

- Turnout in 1996 (children) – Equal to 1 if the individual reported voting in the 1996 presidential election. The variable is constructed from responses to the question:

  Did you vote for President in 1996?

  Voted

  Did not vote

  Too young to vote

Control Variables

In the main regressions, we control for a rich set of dummy variables for geographic region of residence, child's race, child's sex, child's age, and mother's age.

- Parental region of residence in 1979, NLSY sample – Four categories: Northeast (1); North Central (2); South (3); West (4).
- Parental region of residence in 1973, YPSPS sample – Nine categories: New England (1); Middle Atlantic (2); East North Central (3); West North Central (4); Solid South (5); Border States (6); Mountain States (7); Pacific Coast (8); External States and Territories (9).
- Age, NLSY sample – Separate dummy variable for each year of birth.
- Age, YPSPS sample (parents) – Five age cohorts: aged 48 in 1997 (1); aged 49 in 1997 (2); aged 50 in 1997 (3); aged 51 in 1997 (4); aged 52 in 1997 (5).
- Age, YPSPS sample (children) – Dummy variables for each of the following cohorts: born -1965 (1); 1966-1970 (2); 1971-1975 (3); 1976-1980 (4); 1981- (5).

- Race, NLSY sample – Dummy variables for each of the following categories: Black (1); Hispanic (2); Other (3).
- Race, YPSPS sample – Dummy variables for each of the following categories: White (1); Black (2); Other (3).

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the main variables in the NLSY and YPSPS samples are reported in Table S3. We do not report college rates for the children in the YPSPS sample or the children born to the NLSY respondents, because these children were surveyed at an age when only a small fraction had attained their highest degree of education.

[Table S3 about here]

References

Berry, William D., Jacqueline H.R. DeMeritt and Justin Esarey. 2010. "Testing for Interaction in Binary Logit and Probit Models: Is a Product Term Essential?" *American Journal of Political Science* 54(1): 248–266.

Björklund, Anders, Mikael Lindahl and Erik Plug. 2006. "The Origins of Intergenerational Associations. Lessons from Swedish Adoption Data." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(3): 999–1028.

Denny, Kevin and Orla Doyle. 2009. "Does Voting History Matter? Analysing Persistence in Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(1): 17–35.

Elliot, Patrick. *Three Generations Combined*, 1965-1997. 2006. ICPSR04532-v1. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina [producer]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2007-03-23. doi:10.3886/ICPSR04532.v1.

Hjalmarsson, Randi and Matthew Lindquist. 2013. "The Origins of Intergenerational Associa-

tions in Crime. Lessons from Swedish Adoption Data." *Labor Economics* 20: 68–81.

Jennings, Kent, Laura Stoker and Jake Bowers. 2009. "Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined." *Journal of Politics* 71:782–799.

Lindquist, Matthew J., Joeri Sol and Mirjam Van Praag. 2012. "Why Do Entrepreneurial Parents Have Entrepreneurial Children?" *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 6740.

Nordlöf, Barbro. 2001. *Svenska adoptioner i Stockholm 1918–1973.* FoU-rapport 2001:8, Socialtjänstförvaltningen, Stockholms stad.

Plutzer, Eric. 2002. "Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 41–56.

Table S1: Comparison of Probit and Baseline Model Predictions

	Linear Maternal ΔP		Non-linear Maternal ΔP		Linear Paternal ΔP		Non-linear Paternal ΔP	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Probit	LPM	Probit	LPM	Probit	LPM	Probit	LPM
$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_j^{bp}}$	0.043**	0.044**	0.043**	0.043**	0.162***	0.112***	0.160***	0.115***
	[0.020]	[0.020]	[0.020]	[0.020]	[0.059]	[0.040]	[0.061]	[0.040]
$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_i^{rp}}$	0.049	0.051*	0.045	0.045	-0.012	-0.011	-0.013	-0.013
	[0.033]	[0.031]	[0.032]	[0.030]	[0.040]	[0.055]	[0.087]	[0.058]
$\frac{\Delta^2 \mathbf{E}[Y_i^{ac}]}{\Delta Y_j^{bp} \Delta Y_i^{ap}}$	-0.008	-	-0.163**	-0.150**	0.020	-	0.051	0.017
	[0.007]	-	[0.080]	[0.076]	[0.040]	-	[0.251]	[0.171]
N	2021	2021	2021	2021	602	602	602	602

Estimated change in child's turnout induced by discrete changes of the covariates; * significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Standard errors are obtained using a bootstrap procedure (sampling with replacement from clusters defined by household parent). All specifications include controls for child's gender, child birth-year dummies, 25 dummies for parents' region of residency, and 8 dummies for parents' age.

Table S2: Estimates of Untransformed Parameters

	Linear Maternal Coefficients		Non-linear Maternal Coefficients		Linear Paternal Coefficients		Non-linear Paternal Coefficients	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Probit	LPM	Probit	LPM	Probit	LPM	Probit	LPM
Biological Father	0.202**	0.044**	0.721***	0.184**	0.668***	0.131***	0.445	0.103
	[0.083]	[0.019]	[0.257]	[0.074]	[0.177]	[0.046]	[0.694]	[0.156]
Adoptive Father	0.214*	0.051*	0.583***	0.159**	-0.055	-0.011	-0.227	-0.035
	[0.127]	[0.031]	[0.216]	[0.068]	[0.314]	[0.060]	[0.596]	[0.148]
Adoptive× Biological	-	-	-0.575**	-0.152**	-	-	0.233	0.030
	-	-	[0.272]	[0.076]	-	-	[0.712]	[0.161]
N	2010	2010	2010	2010	526	526	526	526

OLS and probit regressions of child's turnout on parent's turnout; * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Standard errors clustered by household parent. The (untransformed) coefficient estimates from the original probit and OLS models. All specifications include controls for child's gender, child birth-year dummies, 25 dummies for parents' region of residency, and 8 dummies for parents' age.

Table S3: Summary Statistics for the NLSY and YPSPS Samples

	NLSY					YPSPS		
	(1) Children of NLSY79	(2) NLSY79 Women	(3) NLSY79 Mothers	(4) Mothers of NLSY79	(5) Fathers of NLSY79	(6) Children	(7) Mothers	(8) Fathers
Turnout 1992	-	-	-	-	-	0.72/0.45	0.95/0.21	0.96/0.21
N						375	241	205
Turnout 1996	-	-	-	-	-	0.64/0.48	0.88/0.33	0.88/0.32
N						584	241	206
Turnout 2006	0.39/0.49	0.67/0.47	0.75/0.43	-	-	-	-	-
N	1466	3931	1348					
College	-	0.23/0.42	-	0.09/0.28	0.16/0.36	-	0.42/0.49	0.53/0.50
N		6283		11878	10880		238	206

Summary statistics for some key variables in the US transmission models. Each column corresponds to a specific sample: own-birth children of women in the NLSY79 (column 1); women in the NLSY79 (column 2); women in the NLSY79 with own-birth children (column 3); mothers of the NLSY79 respondents (column 4); fathers of the NLSY79 respondents (column 5); children born to the YPSPS high school seniors from 1965 (column 6); female YPSPS high school seniors from 1965 (column 7); male YPSPS high school seniors from 1965 (column 8).