Factors of Success for Libraries on the Ballot

VALERIE McNUTT, JIEQING "LETTY" YANG, AND JOHN CHRASTKA

ABSTRACT

There is a tremendous amount of speculation and hearsay about the internal and external factors that potentially influence the outcome for a library on Election Day - even before the campaign starts. In this report the authors analyze over 700 library elections between 2014 and 2018 across 50 variables taken from the IMLS Public Library Survey for each library and the American Community Survey (ACS) for each locality to try and dispel the conventional wisdom for library leaders.

This study demonstrates what library-level activities and/or community-level characteristics can be correlated to a library ballot question's success or failure. Its approach is focused on both intrinsic and extrinsic factors to understand two things: 1) Is there a set of conditions that will largely pre-determine the results on election day? and 2) Are there any specific management-choices that can be made in the lead-up to a campaign to create those conditions? It seeks to understand what influences the outcomes for public libraries on their election days and what are the factors of succcess for Libraries on the ballot.

More than 90% of library funding is determined at the local level, either by the will of elected officials or by voters themselves (Sweeney, 2016). In the ten years since the Great Recession, more than 1,400 ballot measure questions about public library funding or building projects have been placed before the voters on local Election Days.

Annually, hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake for operations, collections, staffing, facilities, technology, and other services. Since 1988, our Library Journal colleagues have tracked library ballot results via library surveys. In 1994, they began tracking high-level capital funding referenda and eventually all capital and operations initiatives (Hall, 1997).

Since 2002, Library Journal has actively surveyed and collected Election Day results from contemporary news reports, local Clerks of Elections, and state library reports to provide a comprehensive annual understanding of libraries and library issues on the ballot. With more than 30 years of data, to the best of our knowledge, no one has ever tied the campaign passage or failure information to voter characteristics and library behaviors until now. This study aims to demonstrate what library-level activities and/or community-level

Originally published January 2021 at EveryLibrary Institute: https://www.everylibraryinstitute.org/factors_of_success_report.

The Political Librarian, vol. 6.1 (Spring 2023).
ISSN: 2471-3155.

characteristics can be correlated to a library ballot question's success or failure. Our approach focused on both intrinsic and extrinsic factors to understand two things:

1. Is there a set of conditions that will largely pre-determine the results on Election Day?
2. Are there any specific management-choices that can be made in the lead-up to a campaign to create those conditions?

We chose to focus on intrinsic library-level activities like programs, collections, hours, technology, and staffing levels because — to a large extent — these factors are controlled by the library leadership team. We also looked at community-level demographics and characteristics like wealth, education, and tax rates to learn if there were any determinants of the outcome that were simply beyond the control of library leadership.

Ballot questions for libraries are generally sorted into three categories, funding questions, debt or capital (buildings), and governance or structure. From 2014 to 2018, Library Journal and EveryLibrary collected and reported annual outcomes of 751 funding or building-focused ballot questions for libraries. These library questions appeared on Election Days administered by Clerks of Elections or by the library itself as a local government unit. Each state has its own laws concerning how public libraries are funded, structured, and governed, and each state has its own rules regarding the conduct of elections (Courtney et al., 2016). Forty-one states had at least one library measure on the ballot, while nine states ad no library ballot measures during the review period.

The ballot measures included in this study were questions placed before voters at a regular or special election. They did not include measures decided by a municipal council or town hall meeting. While town hall meetings are a form of participatory decision making, the framework of the annual Library Journal and EveryLibrary referendum review focuses on direct elections. Actions by town, city, or county councils were reported separately and not included in this review.

Over the five-year period of this study, approximately 60% of the ballot questions considered were placed on the ballot by the library district's board or other independent self-governing body. Close to 30% of the questions were authorized to be placed on the ballot by a municipal authority like a city council, county commission, or town board. For the remaining 10%, the measure was placed on the ballot through a citizens' petition or judicial order—usually to create or otherwise modify a library district.

Each year, a significant number of funding-focused ballot measures are made up of renewals or reauthorizations of a previous levy, ad valorem, parcel, or other tax. In every year in recent memory, renewals have passed at rates of 85% or higher. While Election Day results are never assured, a renewal or reauthorization of a library's current tax rate provides some degree of operational stability. That said, a simple renewal of the tax rate without an increase in the cost of living or an index to inflation is, essentially, a budget cut.

Overall, during the 2014 to 2018 period, 81% of the library funding and building ballot measures passed and 19% failed. Annually, in 2018, 79% passed; in 2017, 90% passed; in

2016, 79% passed; in 2015, 88% passed; in 2014, 78% passed. Please see Appendix A for a detailed chart of passage and failure rates by type.

Study Criteria and Methodology

While 751 ballot measures were eligible for inclusion, we also overlayed three verification factors to improve the data's reliability. These were the ability to verify the results of each election retrospectively; the ability to accurately match the library on the ballot with an administrative unit's statistics compiled by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) in its annual Public Libraries Survey (PLS); and the ability to match the library to specific community-level demographic information compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau in its American Community Survey (ACS). Of the 751 library ballot questions available between 2014 and 2018, only 560 were verified, matched to the IMLS PLS and the ACS,and are included in this report.

The federal Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) produces the Public Libraries Survey (PLS). Collected since 1988 with data files available from 1992, the survey tracks more than 100 data points for nearly all library administrative units in the United States. According to the IMLS, "[a]t the state level, PLS is administered by Data Coordinators, appointed by the chief officer of the state library agency from each state or outlying area. State Data Coordinators collect the requested data from local public libraries and report them to us via a web-based reporting system" (IMLS, 2020).

For the sake of this study, we chose to look specifically at 40 data points concerning: the nature of the library's service area and hours; the size and comportment of the staff; the available revenue by category; the types of expenditures by category; the number of programs by the audience; the size and formats of the collection; and the counts of top-level activities like circulations, door counts, staff interactions, and interlibrary loans. The full list of factors from the PLS is available in Appendix B.

The American Community Survey (ACS) from the U.S. Census Bureau is the leading source of large- and small-area socioeconomic and demographic statistics for every community in the U.S. and Puerto Rico. The ACS is intended to augment the decennial census through an annual survey using a standard set of questions and a five-year study of greater length and breadth.

For our study period, we reviewed and included demographic and community characteristics that were available annually at the county-level, including:

- Percent of households with children
- The ratio of men to women
- Median age
- Percent of the population that are veterans
- Percent of the population that is foreign-born Median household income
- Percent of the population with a high school education
- Percent of the population with less than a high school education

- Employment rates
- Percent of the population that fell into defined race/ethnicity categories

With all of these community-level and library-level variables in mind, we scored the data to determine what factors, if any, were influential or determinant on the outcomes of the ballot questions. With 50 total variables, we chose to apply a fisher scoring algorithm to conduct a multi-variable linear analysis. As demonstrated in Appendix D, we determined whether any independent variables provided a statistically significant correlation.

Top-Level Findings

The most surprising outcome was that most of the 40 IMLS PLS variables and 10 ACS variables did not significantly influence the odds of a ballot initiative passing. Of the 50 variables included, only seven had any significant correlation that increased or decreased the odds of a campaign passing or failing (see Appendix). At the library-level, these were:

- Visits to the library
- Programming for children
- The available technology
- The extent of electronic collections
- The library's total revenue

At the community level, these factors were:

- the median income of the community
- the education level, particularly high school graduation rates

However, significant factors like the demographics of a community and its current tax burden, the number of library staff, the size and scope of a collection, and overall engagements with the community had little to no influence on election outcomes. While the number of children programs appear to have a negative influence on the odds of passing a library measures, it is important to note that none of the other PLS-described library programmatic or services areas had any apparent influence in our analysis. This directly contradicts much of the conventional wisdom in our sector.

These findings are important because if the factors of success or failure of library ballot measures are not tied to existing characteristics of a community or, in the main, to how the library is used, then we must as a sector improve the type and quality of our campaigning and communications in order to influence voters on Election Day.

Visits Appear to Matter

The IMLS PLS data included many variables related to in-person services, including programming attendance for all programs; the number of public service hours per year; the

total annual reference transactions; the number of internet-enabled computers for public use; and the total number of visits per year. Of all the library-level factors that appeared to matter on Election Day, the leading odds-increasing factor was the total number of visits per year.

As detailed in Appendix A, when a library had a higher number of visits reported in the IMLS PLS, it had a slightly higher likelihood of passing a ballot measure. In other words, the more in- person traffic or footfalls at the library, the higher the odds of success.

This is cause for some concern for our sector because even before the current COVID-19 crisis, visits were down. Volume II of the IMLS Public Library Survey (2017) showed that while, "[p]ublic library staff offered an increasing number of programs attended by increasing numbers of patrons (at libraries serving varied population sizes and in various locales), even as the use of traditional library services—circulation, library visits, reference transactions, have declined since 2008" (IMLS, 2020). Likewise, OCLC reported that the average number of library visits dropped from 13.2 in 2008 to 8.6 in 2018 (OCLC Summary, 2018). Following COVID-19, no one can predict when regular visits to the library will involve more than curbside pick-ups and virtual programming. Given the relationship between visits and success at the polls, it is crucial to market the library so that when patrons can come back in person, they will actually come back.

For more successful campaigns, there may have been a "virtuous circle" at work; that is, people tend to vote for candidates representing their personal value system and political ideology (Westen, 2008). More community engagement and communications efforts may result in more visits to the library while also improving the awareness of the library and understanding of the library's staff among the community. For whatever the reason, personal visits may work to validate a voter's understanding of the library's current situation and, therefore, the question's legitimacy on the ballot. If research about voter behavior is correct, staff-driven relationships should translate to more success at the polls.

Demographics Don't Matter

Our analysis matched county-level breakdowns for each library ballot initiative with the Census Bureau's six primary race and ethnicity categories: American Indian/Native American, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Two or more ethnicities, and White. None of these variables showed any statistically significant impact on the odds of a campaign passing or failing. Likewise, ACS data points like gender ratios, median age, rates of households with children in a home, percentage of foreign-born, and percentage of veterans in the community did not appear to influence the odds of either passage or failure.

Our findings corroborate the findings from OCLC in their From Awareness to Funding reports. In 2008 and again in 2018 (in conjunction with ALA), OCLC found that voter demographics did not drive voter support. This is a significant shift from some earlier studies. For example, a 1997 study of California library initiatives found that, "there were, also, important variations by race and ethnicity, with Black and Asian areas having been more supportive of library measures than white or Latino areas" (Cain et al. 1997). Perhaps our data combined with OCLC's insights can put to rest any lingering thoughts that race or ethnicity demographics matter in relation to voter support for libraries.

Community Wealth and Library Income are Negative Factors

Income is often lumped in with race, ethnicity, and gender demographics and viewed as something that is not a factor at the ballot box. Still, we found that as the average median household income increased, the odds of a campaign passing decreased. This is in contrast to earlier research and surveys like OCLC's. Likewise, the 1997 report (Cain et al.) on library supporters in California found that, "highly educated communities (i.e., those with a high percentage of college-educated persons) were more likely to vote for library measures, as were commuities with higher median household incomes" (Cain et al. 1997).

Roughly ten years later, the 2008 OCLC From Awareness to Funding report found income to be a non-factor for library funding support. The 2018 OCLC report reiterated the finding that income was a non-factor even among the "super supporter" group. A group that is likely to be made up of homeowners and have more education, both hallmarks of higher-income households. This evolution of higher-income groups, from increased support in the '90s to non-factor in the '00s and seemingly decreasing support in the '10s, is concerning.

Outside of household incomes, we found that increases in total income for libraries lead to slightly lower campaign passing odds. With that said, this is an area that would be well-served by more research. Our data included several variables from the IMLS data related torevenue, including state and federal funding.

None of those variables had a significant impact on whether a campaign would pass or fail. Library financing has not been deeply researched, but a 2019 study on public library funding and spending found that greater sources of income from federal, state, and "other" sources hurt per capita library spending. The authors of that study posited that "this might be due to a form of "crowding-out" of local sources when funding is received from other sources" (Ebdon et al., 2019, pp. 540).

The authors of that same paper found that libraries with taxing authority had higher per capita spending and suspected that "voters may be willing to support specific activities with additional tax dollars. This may particularly be the case when taxpayers see a relatively small tax bill for library services compared with a general city or county tax bill that aggregates all service functions" (Ebdon et al., 2019, pp. 540).

While no definitive conclusions can be drawn, all of this points to the impact of voters' perceptions about a library's revenue. Suppose they know (or at least perceive) that a library's total income is high, perhaps compared to other neighboring libraries. In that case, they are less likely to support a campaign, but their willingness to support a campaign may change if they are given a broader picture of spending in comparison to other local services.

Kids May Not Win at the Ballot Box

Anecdotally, library staff and supporters have stated for years that children and children's services matter when it comes to winning at the polls. When reflecting on why her 2003 ballot initiative passed, one library director said, "she believes people are more persuaded to support the library for children's sake than for abstract ideals like the common good" (Pierce, 2003). A 2005 wrap-up of ballot initiatives in the Library Journal

surmised that, "elected officials know that libraries are one of the public services most likely to attract voter support, as the willingness for governing boards to put library measures before voters indicate. It's a feel-good opportunity for communities—and elected officials—to support their libraries at the polls, linking investments in kids, education, and reading" (Gold, 2005).

But that may not be true. Our data found that when children's programming increased, the odds of a campaign passing decreased. Other variables related to kids, such as percent of households with children, circulation of children's materials, and total audiences at children's programming, did not have an impact one way or another on the odds of a campaign passing or failing. Given the lack of impact of other kid-related variables, it's hard to draw any conclusions about whether focusing on kids' offerings is good for a campaign.

Looking at this result from a programming perspective also yielded some interesting findings. In 2018, OCLC's report found that the community aspect of the library was important to voters and that 33% had attended a library program or event within six months of the survey date (OCLC & ALA, 2018). The report also recommended that libraries use programming to reach out to voters who were not currently supporters, specifically urging libraries to highlight their role in the digital space. While the availability of technology is important, as we'll discuss later, our data showed that programming might not be as important as previously thought. We included three other variables from the Public Library Survey data related to programming: total programming, programming for young adults, and attendance at all library programs. None of those variables had a significant influence on the odds of a campaign passing or failing, and as mentioned earlier, as the amount of kids' programming increased the odds of a campaign passing actually decreased.

Education Levels Do Factor

The impact of education levels is something that comes up frequently when discussing both voters and library supporters. The 2018 OCLC and ALA study found that "super supporters" of libraries were likely to have more education (OCLC & ALA, 2018). In 2014, the Milken Institute found that higher education levels correlated strongly to economic prosperity in a community (DeVol, 2013). However, our findings are mixed regarding how the local educational attainment level influenced the odds of passage or failure.

Concerning education, we considered three variables from the ACS in understanding the local (county-level) community: the percent of the population with less than a high school degree; the percentage of the people with a bachelor's degree or higher; and the percentage with only a high school diploma. Of those three variables, the only one that had a significant influence on the odds of a campaign passing or failing was the percentage of the population with only a high school diploma. As that percentage increased, the odds of campaign passage decreased. On the one hand, a higher percentage of the population with only a high school diploma may have indicated a lower dropout rate, but it also indicated a lower percentage of the population with a bachelor's degree or higher. This could support OCLC's (2018) finding that more education equals more support, but this area would benefit from more research.

Investments in Technology May Up the Odds

Two of the intrinsic variables that appeared to influence the odds of passing a library ballot measure are centered around electronics and computing. While we cannot definitively point to a cause or effect, our data did show that the higher the number of internet-connected terminals that a library possessed, the greater the odds that their campaign would pass. In addition, a higher number of electronic resources provided through the state library (as defined by the IMLS Public Library Survey) also increased the odds of a campaign passing.

This finding aligns with the data from OCLC and ALA, which found that 66% of voters placed high importance on free access to books and technology from the library. Specifically, 65% emphasized providing free access to computers and the internet, while 64% placed high importance on providing WIFI access. That said, the report also found that "only 48% of voters today agree that the public library has done a good job of keeping up with changing technology" (2018). Voters are not the only ones who think that libraries have not done a good job keeping up with technology. A 2012 study on public library funding and technology found that, "over 65% of libraries report an insufficient number of public computers to meet demand some or all of the time. Overall, 41.4% of libraries report that their Internet connection speeds are insufficient some or all of the time" (ALA, 2012).

With hard choices brought on by budget constraints, focusing on areas like technology that have repeatedly been shown to be important to library supporters and voters may be an easier (and wiser) choice.

Existing Tax Rates Do Not Pre-Determine Success or Failure

The overall tax rate in a community did not appear to have any measurable influence on the odds of success or failure of a library ballot measure. This finding is important because it dispels the conventional wisdom that voters will not differentiate the library from other taxing bodies like schools, public safety, infrastructure, and recreation, while also dispelling the notion that voters believe they are over-taxed. While our analysis of the tax rate variable showed that there was neither a positive or negative influence on the outcome of the election, we did not look at more detailed questions like the margin of victory or defeat in relation to that variable. This finding was consistent across both operating and funding questions as well as building initiatives. For capital projects particularly, a detailed look at the 2016 election year results failed to show any relationship between the overall cost of a project in real dollars and whether it passed or failed (Chrastka & Hart, 2017).

If the current local tax rate does not appear to influence voter behavior in any way, then it is important for library leaders to question the conventional wisdom that communities with higher taxes are disinclined to vote for more taxes. Likewise, it is important to dispel uninformed opinions about voter attitudes toward the library related to other taxes. Instead of these common assumptions, it is vitally important that library leaders ask specific questions of their own community and voters about their interest in the library and their tolerance for new taxes.

Staffing Should Be of Influence but Isn't

Nothing in our analysis indicated that any aspect of "staffing," as reported in the Public Library Survey, had any positive or negative influence on library ballot measures. This finding is a real concern for our sector. We know from the political sciences that voters look to support candidates who share a similar set of values (Westen, 2008) and support issues on the ballot that are values-aligned (Jankowski, 2002). By definition, librarians and library staff are the people who operationalize the organizational values, vision, and mission of a library. However, in our analysis, staffing levels and the staff's professional competencies appeared toplay little to no role in the outcome of library measures.

This apparent lack of influence may be tied to an overall decline in the perception of librarians and other staff among the public. The 2018 From Awareness to Funding report (OCLC & ALA) showed that the enthusiasm for library staff decreased in the decade since 2008. 53% of their respondents rated librarians as "friendly and approachable" in 2018 as opposed to 67% in 2008. Only 42% of respondents rated librarians as "knowledgeable about their communities" as opposed to 54% in 2008. In 2018, only 31% of respondents said thatlibrarians were "well-known in the community," down from 40% in 2008.

With librarians and library staff polling poorly, it is not surprising that librarians and other staff were non-factors on Election Days. Staffing levels and the professional competency of staff are a through-line to the number of programs libraries can offer, as well as the type and focus of their programming. In Public Library Survey Data: Some Answers, Many Questions, Jill Hurst-Wahl (2020) looked specifically at the effects of staffing size and the ratio of degreed librarians to non-degreed staff in the measurable outputs from public libraries. While refraining from making any strong conclusions, she described the need for libraries to be properly staffed in relation to the size and make-up of the communities they served.

An appropriate number of staff members is important; however, if voters are values-aligned and the frequency of visits establishes or deepens a relationship between the library and the voting public, then library leaders must be more focused on enhancing the visibility of their staff in their community.

Conclusion

From what we have seen in this study, the factors that underpin voter support for libraries were not driven by voter demographics or community characteristics. However, our findings from hundreds of library campaigns indicate that library leaders who are planning a ballot measure should engage their communities to create a current (and accurate) awareness of the library and particularly of individual staff. Increased library visibility and meaningful library visits that demonstrate how tax dollars are being used increase the chances of a successful Election Day. It is important to note that there were few if any indicators in the data about what specific activities by the staff helped or hindered the chances for success on Election Day. While we have seen that an overabundance of children's' programming may create too narrow of a perception of the library and that new technology may show that the library is spending its budget on higher-value items, there is

not enough evidence in the data to recommend any ready-to- implement programming, collections, facilities, or other feature that, if adopted, could smooth the path to Election Day success.

With this new data-driven understanding that the odds of a library winning or losing on Election Day are not largely contingent on factors like the activities of users and the existing budget for the library (intrinsic factors), or the nature and characteristics of the community (extrinsic factors). It is clear that library leaders must focus on how to communicate with voters and campaign in a way that influences results. It is true that when factors like programs and visits appear to make some difference in the odds, library leaders need to place their staff in front of the voting public through marketing and outreach. When all other factors are held equal, as our colleagues at OCLC and Library Journal have reported—and we here at EveryLibrary and the EveryLibrary Institute have experienced time and again—it is an attitude or a belief in libraries and librarians that cuts acrossdemographics and personal benefit that motivates voters at the polls.

References

American Libraries Association. (2012, Summer). Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study - Executive summary. *American Libraries Magazine*. http://www.ala.org/tools/sites/ala.org.tools/files/content/initiatives/plftas/2011_2012/plftas12_execsummary.pdf.

Cain, B., Cooper, E., Ferejohn, S., & Potter, C. (1997). California library referenda: the determinants of success and failure. The Bottom Line: *Managing Library Finances*. 10(2), 44-57.

Chrastka, J. (2020, March 2). Referenda report: Renewals up, New funding lagged in 2019. *Library Journal*. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=Referenda-Report-Renewals-Up-New-Funding-Lagged-in-2019.

Chrastka, J., & Marison, S. (2019, March 14). Stable support. *Library Journal*. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=Stable-Support.

Chrastka, J, & Findley, E. (2018, February 20). Breaking records at the polls: Budgets & funding. *Library Journa*l. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=breaking-records-polls-budgets-funding

Chrastka, J. & Hart, B.D. (2017, February 3). Measured success: Budgets & funding. *Library Journal*. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=measured-success-budgets funding.

Chrastka, J., & Korman, R. (2016, February 10). Constant campaign: Budgets & funding. *Library Journal*. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=constant-campaign-budgets-funding

Chrastka, J., & Korman, R. (2015, February 3). Winning all over the map: Budgets & funding. *Library Journal*. https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=winning-all-over-the-map-budgets-funding

Courtney, K., Kilcer, E., & Racicot, S. (2016). The fifty state library laws survey. *The Political Librarian*, 2(2), Article 8. https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/pollib/vol2/iss2/8

DeVol, Ross C., Shen, I., Bedroussian, A., & Zhang, N. (2013). A matter of degrees: The effect of educational attainment on regional economic prosperity. Milken Institute.

https://milkeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/reports-pdf/Matter-of-Degrees-FR.pdf

Ebdon, C., Park, J., Franklin, A., & Moore, J. (2019, February). Institutional arrangements for public library funding and spending. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 49(5),532-544.https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0275074018785449.

Gold, A. M. (2005, March 15). The good fight: Competition at the polls calls for creative marketing and new tactics. *Library Journal*, 130(5), 32.

Hall, R. B. (1997, June 15). A decade of solid support. *Library Journal*, 122(11), 41.

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). (2014). F.Y. 2014 Public Library Survey (PLS). Retrieved December 15, 2020, from https://www.imls.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey.

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). (2015). F.Y. 2015 Public Library Survey (PLS). Retrieved December 15, 2020, from https://www.imls.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey.

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). (2016). F.Y. 2016 Public Library Survey (PLS). Retrieved December 15, 2020, from https://www.imls.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey.

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). (2017). F.Y. 2017 Public Library Survey (PLS). Retrieved December 15, 2020, from https://www.imls.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey.

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). (2018). F.Y. 2018 Public Library Survey (PLS). Retrieved December 15, 2020, from https://www.imls.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey.

Ishizuka, K. (2004). Voters support libraries at the ballot. *School Library Journal*, 50(12), 17. Jankowski, R. (2002). Buying a lottery ticket to help the poor: Altruism versus self-interest in the decision to vote. *Rationality and Society* 14, 55–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043463107075107.

OCLC. (2008). From awareness to funding: A study of library support in America. https://www.oclc.org/research/publications/2008/funding.html.

OCLC & American Library Association (ALA). (2018). From awareness to funding: Voter perceptions and support of public libraries in 2018. https://doi.org/10.25333/C3M92X.

Pierce, J. B. (2003, March). A tale of two levies: The divergent outcomes of two Montana ballot measures offer lessons for libraries. *American Libraries Magazine*, 34(3), 40+.

Sweeney, P.C. (2016). The growing necessity of radicalism in library advocacy and political outreach. *The Political Librarian* 2(1), Article 6 http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/pollib/vol2/iss1/6

Westen, D. (2008). The political brain: The role of emotion in deciding the fate of the nation. PublicAffairs.

Appendix A

Passage and Failure Rates

Passage and failure rates by year and by type of ballot question (excluding "governance" questions). Taken from Library Journal's "Measured Success" report concerning results from 2002 to 2016 and augmented with original reporting by the authors. Fields in BOLD denote the study period of 2014 to 2018.

TABLE 1 - PASS/FAIL RATES

	Operations and Funding			Buildings and Bonds		
YEAR	Count	PERCENTAGE		Count	PERCENTAGE	
		PASS	FAIL		PASS	FAIL
2019	124	93%	7%	24	70%	30%
2018	**94**	**88%**	**12%**	**41**	**61%**	**39%**
2017	**85**	**96%**	**4%**	**39**	**73%**	**27%**
2016	**121**	**86%**	**14%**	**47**	**68%**	**32%**
2015	**123**	**94%**	**6%**	**21**	**43%**	**57%**
2014	**147**	**81%**	**19%**	**33**	**73%**	**27%**
2013	146	88%	12%	30	63%	37%
2011	96	88%	12%	18	44%	56%
2010	220	87%	13%	29	55%	45%
2009	123	84%	16%	28	54%	46%
2008	42	74%	26%	27	67%	33%
2007	29	69%	31%	46	74%	26%
2006	69	74%	26%	36	64%	36%
AVERAGE	**109**	**85%**	**15%**	**32**	**62%**	**38%**

Appendix B

Intrinsic Factors

The authors compiled and normalized library administrative unit-level data from the 2014 to 2018 Public Library Survey by the Institute of Museum and Library Services found at https://www.imls.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey to create a dataset of "intrinsic factors" considered in this study. Please see the IMLS PLS for a full and extensive set of definitions for the following fields included in the study.

POPU_LSA - the population of the legal service area
POPU_UND - the unduplicated population of the legal service area
BRANLIB - the number of branch libraries
MASTER - the number of FTE paid librarians with MLIS degrees from an ALA-accredited school
LIBRARIA - the total number of employees holding the title of librarian
OTHPAID - All other paid staff
TOTSTAFF - total paid FTE employees
LOCGVT - operating revenue from local government
STGVT - operating revenue from state government
FEDGVT - operating revenue from the federal government
OTHINCM - any other operating revenue not from local, state or federal sources
TOTINCM - total operating revenue
PRMATEXP - operating expenditures for print materials
ELMATEXP - operating expenditures for electronic/digital materials
OTHMATEX - operating expenditures for all other materials
TOTEXPCO - total expenditures on the library collection
TOTOPEXP - total operating expenditures
LCAP_REV - local government capital revenue
SCAP_REV - state government capital revenue
FCAP_REV - federal government capital revenue
OCAP_REV - other capital revenue
CAP_REV - total capital revenue
CAPITAL - total capital expenditures
AUDIO_PH - audio physical units
VIDEO_PH - video physical units
EC_ST - state electronic collections
SUBSCRIP - current print serial subscriptions
HRS_OPEN - total annual public service hours
VISITS - total annual library visits
REFERENC - total annual reference transactions
REGBOR - registered users

KIDCIRCL - total annual circulation for all children's materials

LOANTO - total annual loans to other libraries

LOANFM - total annual loans from other libraries

TOTPRO - total library programs

KIDPRO - total children's programming

YAPRO - total young adult programs

TOTATTEN - total audience at all library programs

KIDATTEN - total audience at all children's programs

GPTERMS - Internet computers used by the general public

Appendix C

American Community Survey

The American Community Survey (ACS) from the U.S. Census Bureau tracks hundreds of community characteristics on an annual and a 5-year basis to augment and deepen the understanding of the population between decennial censuses. The study's authors compiled and normalized county-level data for the study period 2014 - 2018 to create a data set of "extrinsic factors." Please see the ACS itself at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs for detailed definitions of the fields used in this study:

Percent of households with people under 18. ACS Table DP02

Ratio of men to women (per 100). ACS Table S0101

Median age. Source: ACS Table S0101

Percent of veterans. ACS Table S2101

Percent of foreign-born population. ACS Table DP02

Median household income. ACS Table S1901

Percent of the population 25+ with a high school diploma or equivalent. ACS Table S1501 Percent of the population 25+ with some high school education but no diploma. ACS Table S1501

Percent of the population with a bachelor's degree or higher. ACS Table S1501

Median amount paid in property taxes. ACS Table B25103

Employment rate. ACS Table DP03

Race_BOAA; Race_AIAN; Race_Asian; Race_HOL; Race_TWO; Race_White. ACS Table DP05

Appendix D

Linear Regression Analysis

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	Void	1	-0.7505	0.5789	1.6805	0.1949
Intercept	Pass	1	2.7430	0.4714	33.8530	<.0001
Intercept	Fail	1	3.1881	0.4746	45.1147	<.0001
Intercept	1	1	4.3101	0.4903	77.2788	<.0001
KIDPRO		1	-0.00019	0.000053	13.3949	0.0003
Median_Household_Inc		1	-0.00002	4.201E-6	33.6411	<.0001
High_School_Graduati		1	-0.0352	0.00849	17.2367	<.0001
TOTINCM		1	-6.6E-8	2.039E-8	10.4755	0.0012
VISITS		1	9.672E-7	2.297E-7	17.7299	<.0001
GPTERMS		1	4.885E-6	2.054E-6	5.6539	0.0174
EC_ST		1	0.00393	0.00194	4.0823	0.0433

The odds ratio of KIDPRO was EXP(-0.00019) = 0.999810018 (less than one). It indicated that for every increase of 1 in KIDPRO the odds of passage increased by a factor of 0.999810018, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with low odds of passage.

The odds ratio of Median_Household_Inc was EXP(-0.00002) = 0.99998 (less than one). It indicated that for every increase of 1 in Median_Household_Inc the odds of passage increased by a factor of 0.99998, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with low odds of passage.

The odds ratio of High_School_Graduation was EXP(-0.0352) = 0.965412314 (less than one). It indicated that for every increase of 1 in High_School_Graduation the odds of passage increased by a factor of 0.968216074, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with low odds of passage.

The odds ratio of TOTINCM was EXP(-6.6E-8) = 1 (equal to one). It indicated that for every increase of one in TOTINCM the odds of passage increased by a factor of one, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with low odds of passage.

The odds ratio of VISITS was EXP(9.672E-7) = 1.000000967 (greater than one). It indicated that for every increase of one in VISITS, the odds of passage increased by a factor of 1.000000967, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with high odds of passage.

The odds ratio of GPTERMS is EXP(4.885E-6) = 1.000004885 (greater than one). It indicated that for every increase of 1 in GPTERMS the odds of passage increased by a factor of 1.000004885, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with high odds of passage.

The odds ratio of EC_ST is EXP(0.00397) = 1.003977891 (greater than one). It indicated that for every increase of 1 in EC_ST the odds of passage increased by a factor of 1.003977891, holding everything else fixed, which was associated with high odds of passage.

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information		
Data Set	WORK.TOTAL	
Response Variable	LJ_Pass_Fail	LJ Pass Fail
Number of Response Levels	5	
Model	cumulative probit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number of Observations Read	560
Number of Observations Used	560

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	**LJ_Pass_Fail**	**Total Frequency**
1	Void	1
2	Pass	339
3	Fail	80
4	1	114
5	0	26

Probabilities modeled are cumulated over the lower Ordered Values.

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Score Test for the Equal Slopes Assumption		
Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
191.1036	159	0.0420

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	1194.863	1126.176
SC	1212.174	1372.868
-2 Log L	1186.863	1012.176

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	174.6871	53	<.0001
Score	154.4933	53	<.0001
Wald	146.1239	53	<.0001

Note: the following parameters have been set to 0, since the variables are a linear combination of other variables as shown

TOTSTAFF =	LIBRARIA + OTHPAID
TOTINCM =	-0.00001 * Intercept_Void - 0.00001 * Intercept_Pass - 0.00001 * Intercept_Fail - 0.00001 * Intercept_1 + LOCGVT + STGVT + FEDGVT + OTHINCM
TOTEXPCO =	-2.38E-6 * Intercept_Void - 2.38E-6 * Intercept_Pass - 2.38E-6 * Intercept_Fail - 2.38E-6 * Intercept_1 + PRMATEXP + ELMATEXP + OTHMATEX
CAP_REV =	LCAP_REV + SCAP_REV + FCAP_REV + OCAP_REV

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	Void	1	8.6980	4.0281	4.6627	0.0308
Intercept	Pass	1	12.6744	4.0221	9.9303	0.0016
Intercept	Fail	1	13.1876	4.0238	10.7414	0.0010
Intercept	1	1	14.5225	4.0359	12.9482	0.0003
Education_Attainment		1	0.00278	0.0159	0.0307	0.8609
Local_Property_Tax		1	7.752E-6	0.000050	0.0236	0.8779
Households_w_childre		1	-0.0212	0.0170	1.5511	0.2130
Ratio_of_Men_to_Wome		1	0.0249	0.0140	3.1822	0.0744
Median_Age		1	0.0393	0.0198	3.9147	0.0479
Veterans		1	-0.0241	0.0371	0.4202	0.5169
Foreign_Born		1	0.0221	0.0169	1.7090	0.1911
Median_Household_Inc		1	-0.00004	8.484E-6	20.9402	<.0001
High_School_Graduati		1	-0.0400	0.0182	4.8532	0.0276
Drop_Out_Rates		1	0.0111	0.0465	0.0567	0.8117
Employment		1	0.0231	0.0149	2.4056	0.1209
Race_BOAA		1	-0.1490	0.0313	22.6664	<.0001
Race_AIAN		1	-0.1491	0.0456	10.6804	0.0011
Race_Asian		1	-0.1169	0.0380	9.4813	0.0021
Race_HOL		1	-0.1972	0.0375	27.6367	<.0001
Race_TWO		1	-0.1387	0.0782	3.1474	0.0760
Race_White		1	-0.1367	0.0298	21.0526	<.0001
POPU_LSA		1	-0.00002	0.000021	0.5501	0.4583

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
POPU_UND		1	0.000016	0.000021	0.5965	0.4399
BRANLIB		1	0.00859	0.0545	0.0249	0.8746
MASTER		1	-0.0140	0.0137	1.0444	0.3068
LIBRARIA		1	0.0104	0.0107	0.9517	0.3293
OTHPAID		1	0.00120	0.00682	0.0312	0.8598
TOTSTAFF		0	0	.	.	.
LOCGVT		1	-1.27E-7	1.162E-7	1.2008	0.2732
STGVT		1	-1.18E-7	1.353E-7	0.7637	0.3822
FEDGVT		1	-8.94E-7	1.406E-6	0.4041	0.5250
OTHINCM		1	-4.62E-7	2.532E-7	3.3334	0.0679
TOTINCM		0	0	.	.	.
PRMATEXP		1	5.632E-7	6.385E-7	0.7781	0.3777
ELMATEXP		1	-1.66E-7	5.408E-7	0.0942	0.7589
OTHMATEX		1	1.087E-6	8.732E-7	1.5489	0.2133
TOTEXPCO		0	0	.	.	.
TOTOPEXP		1	3.117E-9	1.211E-7	0.0007	0.9795
LCAP_REV		1	-5.25E-8	1.14E-7	0.2122	0.6450
SCAP_REV		1	1.976E-6	4.419E-6	0.1999	0.6548
FCAP_REV		1	-1.82E-7	5.442E-7	0.1118	0.7381
OCAP_REV		1	-5.58E-8	1.622E-7	0.1182	0.7309
CAP_REV		0	0	.	.	.
CAPITAL		1	-4.38E-8	1.658E-7	0.0699	0.7915
AUDIO_PH		1	-2.57E-6	9.978E-6	0.0665	0.7965
VIDEO_PH		1	-2.01E-7	7.991E-6	0.0006	0.9799
EC_ST		1	0.00505	0.00230	4.8336	0.0279
SUBSCRIP		1	0.000144	0.000169	0.7301	0.3928
HRS_OPEN		1	-9.87E-6	0.000027	0.1303	0.7181
VISITS		1	2.152E-6	4.688E-7	21.0765	<.0001
REFERENC		1	-2.52E-7	9.501E-7	0.0703	0.7909
REGBOR		1	-1.91E-6	2.523E-6	0.5717	0.4496
KIDCIRCL		1	-3.99E-7	4.464E-7	0.7982	0.3716
LOANTO		1	4.775E-6	3.125E-6	2.3357	0.1264
LOANFM		1	-3.63E-6	3.149E-6	1.3299	0.2488
TOTPRO		1	0.000167	0.000171	0.9494	0.3299
KIDPRO		1	-0.00036	0.000271	1.7435	0.1867

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
YAPRO		1	0.000684	0.000391	3.0630	0.0801
TOTATTEN		1	-0.00002	9.961E-6	3.0115	0.0827
KIDATTEN		1	9.961E-6	0.000013	0.5470	0.4595
GPTERMS		1	6.275E-6	2.557E-6	6.0201	0.0141

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	75.9	Somers' D	0.522
Percent Discordant	23.7	Gamma	0.524
Percent Tied	0.5	Tau-a	0.298
Pairs	89303	c	0.761