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Table A1: Extended Results By Gender - Impact of Mendez v. Westminster on Hispanic Educational Attainment for Post-Mendez Cohorts (1941-1945 Birth Cohorts) Relative to 1931-1935 Birth Cohorts

|  | Panel A: Hispanic Sample (same as Table 2, Panel A) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | 0.900** | 0.153*** | 0.090* |
|  | (0.337) | (0.035) | (0.044) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 11.10 | 0.872 | 0.599 |
| Number of observations | 5,630 | 5,630 | 5,630 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.107 | 0.103 | 0.069 |
|  | Panel B: Hispanic Men |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | 1.112*** | 0.167*** | 0.132 |
|  | (0.304) | (0.031) | (0.080) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 11.47 | 0.887 | 0.641 |
| Number of observations | 2,721 | 2,721 | 2,721 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.102 | 0.106 | 0.063 |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | Panel C: Hispanic Women |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
|  | 0.740* | 0.139** | 0.063 |
|  | (0.372) | (0.059) | (0.043) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 10.75 | 0.857 | 0.559 |
| Number of observations | 2,909 | 2,909 | 2,909 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.104 | 0.105 | 0.069 |
| Birth Cohort Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: High segregation (HiSeg) indicates that the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio is above the 75\% level of all California counties based on 1940 full-count Census. Post-Mendez Cohort is an indicator for birth year being 1941 or later. Other controls include indicator for female (panel A only), and in all panels an indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively, in addition to fixed effects noted in Table A1. Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses in California whose birth cohorts are between 1941 and 1945 (treatment group) and birth cohorts between 1931 and 1935 (comparison group), and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (above the $75 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: high segregation) or very low (below the $25 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: low segregation). Robust standard errors, clustered at county level, in parentheses. Statistical significance levels: ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.10$.

Table A2: Impact of Mendez v. Westminster on Non-Hispanic Whites with Alternative Comparison Group,
Post-Mendez Cohorts (1941-1945 Birth Cohorts) Relative to 1921-1930 Birth Cohorts

| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | Panel A: Non-Hispanic White Sample |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
|  | -0.311** | -0.003 | -0.031** |
|  | (0.117) | (0.006) | (0.012) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 13.25 | 0.982 | 0.873 |
| Number of observations | 34,783 | 34,783 | 34,783 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.061 | 0.015 | 0.031 |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | Panel B: Non-Hispanic White Men |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
|  | -0.330* | -0.002 | -0.033 |
|  | (0.167) | (0.007) | (0.020) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 13.53 | 0.979 | 0.872 |
| Number of observations | 16,798 | 16,798 | 16,798 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.062 | 0.018 | 0.041 |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | Panel C: Non-Hispanic White Women |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
|  | -0.310*** | -0.005 | -0.029*** |
|  | (0.094) | (0.008) | (0.010) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 12.98 | 0.984 | 0.875 |
| Number of observations | 17,985 | 17,985 | 17,985 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.043 | 0.014 | 0.024 |
| Birth Cohort Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: High segregation (HiSeg) indicates that the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio is above the 75\% level of all California counties based on 1940 full-count Census. Post-Mendez Cohort is an indicator for birth year being 1941 or later. Other controls include indicator for female (panel A only), and in all panels an indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively, in addition to fixed effects noted in Table A2. Sample is limited to non-Hispanic white men and women from $5 \%$ samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses in California whose birth cohorts are between 1941 and 1945 (treatment group) and birth cohorts between 1921 and 1930 (comparison group), and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (above the $75 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: high segregation) or very low (below the $25 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: low segregation). Robust standard errors, clustered at county level, in parentheses. Statistical significance levels: *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.10$.

Table A3: Robustness Analysis of the Impact of Mendez v. Westminster - Using Alternative Definitions of High and Low Segregated Counties

|  |  | Panel A: Hispa |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | 0.897*** | 0.152*** | 0.092** |
|  | (0.313) | (0.032) | (0.042) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 11.16 | 0.877 | 0.604 |
| Number of observations | 7,068 | 7,068 | 7,068 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.103 | 0.099 | 0.067 |
|  | Panel B | Sample (Hispan | 21-1930) |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
| High Segregation x Placebo Post-Mendez Cohort | -0.329 | -0.013 | -0.130* |
|  | (0.408) | (0.062) | (0.070) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 9.127 | 0.688 | 0.358 |
| Number of observations | 4,372 | 4,372 | 4,372 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.072 | 0.078 | 0.039 |
|  |  | el C: Non-Hispan |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | -0.403*** | -0.010*** | -0.030*** |
|  | (0.082) | (0.003) | (0.010) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 13.50 | 0.986 | 0.897 |
| Number of observations | 34,545 | 34,545 | 34,545 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.058 | 0.006 | 0.019 |
| Birth Cohort Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |

[^0]Table A4: Impact of Mendez v. Westminster with Alternative High and Low Segregation Definitions,
Post-Mendez Cohorts (1941-1945 Birth Cohorts) Relative to 1921-1930 Birth Cohort Comparison Group

|  | Panel A: Hispanic Sample |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | 1.900*** | 0.231*** | 0.181*** |
|  | (0.304) | (0.038) | (0.029) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 10.42 | 0.810 | 0.517 |
| Number of observations | 8,609 | 8,609 | 8,609 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.173 | 0.149 | 0.131 |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | Panel B: Hispanic Men |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
|  | 1.957*** | 0.215*** | 0.118** |
|  | (0.317) | (0.043) | (0.042) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 10.79 | 0.830 | 0.554 |
| Number of observations | 4,077 | 4,077 | 4,077 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.172 | 0.140 | 0.134 |
| High Segregation x Post-Mendez Cohort | Panel C: Hispanic Women |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Years of education | Jr. High School | High School |
|  | 1.965*** | 0.241*** | 0.245*** |
|  | (0.393) | (0.051) | (0.042) |
| Mean (y-variable) | 10.10 | 0.792 | 0.484 |
| Number of observations | 4,532 | 4,532 | 4,532 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.168 | 0.162 | 0.126 |
| Birth Cohort Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| County Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: High segregation (HiSeg) indicates that the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio is above the $67 \%$ level of all California counties based on 1940 full-count U.S. Census. Post-Mendez Cohort is an indicator for birth year being 1941 or later. Other controls include indicator for female (panel A only), indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively, in addition to fixed effects noted in Table A4. Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from $5 \%$ samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (above the $67 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: high segregation) or very low (below the $33 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: low segregation). Samples in panels A and C include only those individuals with birth cohorts between 1941 and 1945 (treatment group) or birth cohorts between 1931 and 1935 (comparison group). Sample in panel B includes only those individuals with birth cohorts between 1926 and 1930 (placebo treatment group) or birth cohorts between 1921 and 1925 (placebo comparison group). Robust standard errors, clustered at county level, in parentheses. Statistical significance levels: ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.10$.

> Figure A1: Event Study Analysis Educational Attainment for Hispanics, Years of Education Outcome
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Notes: Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

Figure A2: Event Study Analysis Educational Attainment for Hispanics, High School Outcome
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1. Difference Between High and Low Likelihood Segregated Counties (Hi-Lo)

Notes: Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

Figure A3: Event Study Analysis with 1930 County Segregation Data Educational Attainment for Hispanics, Years of Education Outcome
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Notes: Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

Figure A4: Event Study Analysis with 1930 County Segregation Data Educational Attainment for Hispanics, Junior High School Outcome
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Notes: Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

Figure A5: Event Study Analysis with 1930 County Segregation Data Educational Attainment for Hispanics, High School Outcome
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Notes: Sample is limited to Hispanic men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

Figure A6: Event Study Analysis with 1930 County Segregation Data Educational Attainment for Non-Hispanic Whites, Years of Education Outcome
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Notes: Sample is limited to non-Hispanic white men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

# Figure A7: Event Study Analysis with 1930 County Segregation Data Educational Attainment for Non-Hispanic Whites, Junior High School Outcome 
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Notes: Sample is limited to non-Hispanic white men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.

Figure A8: Event Study Analysis with 1930 County Segregation Data Educational Attainment for Non-Hispanic Whites, High School Outcome
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Notes: Sample is limited to non-Hispanic white men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (i.e., above the $75 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: high segregation) or very low (i.e., below the $25 \%$ level for all 1930 counties: low segregation). Graph shows the difference-in-differences coefficient estimate on birth year interacted with high segregation county indicator. Reference category is the 1931 birth year (age 16 at the time of the Mendez decision). All regression models also include birth year fixed effects, county fixed effects, indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively. Shaded areas indicate the $90 \%$ confidence intervals, where standard errors are clustered at county level.


[^0]:    Notes: High segregation (HiSeg) indicates that the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio is above the $67 \%$ level of all California counties based on 1940 full-count U.S. Census. Post-Mendez Cohort is an indicator for birth year being 1941 or later. Other controls include indicator for female, indicator for 1990 Census observation and indicator for 2000 Census observation, respectively, in addition to fixed effects noted in Table A3. Sample is limited to men and women from 5\% samples of 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses who were born in California and who reside in a county where the Hispanic to non-Hispanic population ratio was either very high (above the $67 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: high segregation) or very low (below the $33 \%$ level for all 1940 counties: low segregation). Samples in panels A and C include only those individuals with birth cohorts between 1941 and 1945 (treatment group) or birth cohorts between 1931 and 1935 (comparison group). Sample in panel B includes only those individuals with birth cohorts between 1926 and 1930 (placebo treatment group) or birth cohorts between 1921 and 1925 (placebo comparison group). Robust standard errors, clustered at county level, in parentheses. Statistical significance levels: ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.10$.

