

# Appendix: For Online Publication Only

Table A1: Rejection Rates by Agencies, States, and Cities

	Rejection Rate	No. of Filings	Mean Response Time (Days)
<i>Panel A: Federal Agencies (Top 10)</i>			
Federal Bureau of Investigation	0.380	2598	304
Central Intelligence Agency	0.669	725	342
Department of Justice	0.256	712	319
Department of Homeland Security	0.330	409	282
Department of Defense	0.253	367	484
National Security Agency	0.633	343	410
United States Army	0.213	291	309
Federal Communications Commission	0.062	274	51
Federal Trade Commission	0.121	239	45
Immigration and Customs Enforcement	0.212	222	338
Environmental Protection Agency	0.162	191	386
<i>Panel B: States (Aggregation of Agencies)</i>			
New York	0.236	817	104
Massachusetts	0.157	796	104
California	0.172	458	95
Texas	0.092	294	43
Washington	0.060	282	110
Florida	0.108	268	112
Virginia	0.321	265	46
Pennsylvania	0.316	225	61
New Jersey	0.472	212	102
Illinois	0.180	206	65
Michigan	0.259	185	55
Arizona	0.061	179	110
Tennessee	0.438	178	96
North Carolina	0.045	155	124
Ohio	0.162	154	62
Georgia	0.160	150	56
Rhode Island	0.043	140	31
Connecticut	0.097	134	115
Wisconsin	0.141	128	134
Delaware	0.452	126	116
Vermont	0.056	125	63
Colorado	0.080	125	62
Maryland	0.177	124	69
Missouri	0.187	123	95
Arkansas	0.570	114	75
Utah	0.286	105	83
Indiana	0.162	105	158
North Dakota	0.125	104	29
New Mexico	0.060	100	73

*continues on the next page*

Table A1: Rejection Rates by Agencies (cont.)

	Rejection Rate	No. of Filings	Mean Response Time (Days)
South Carolina	0.242	99	84
Nevada	0.141	99	121
Louisiana	0.250	96	128
Oklahoma	0.226	93	317
Iowa	0.120	92	61
Kentucky	0.270	89	68
New Hampshire	0.191	89	71
Kansas	0.352	88	78
Minnesota	0.070	86	95
South Dakota	0.429	84	67
Alabama	0.602	83	124
Oregon	0.171	82	60
Idaho	0.114	79	52
West Virginia	0.320	75	37
Maine	0.187	75	102
Wyoming	0.111	72	57
Alaska	0.188	69	147
Nebraska	0.232	69	79
Montana	0.059	68	67
Mississippi	0.263	57	215
Hawaii	0.135	52	127
District of Columbia	0.091	11	20
<i>Panel C: Cities (Top 15)</i>			
New York City, NY	0.461	818	144
Chicago, IL	0.137	591	66
Boston, MA	0.101	427	103
San Francisco, CA	0.071	350	99
Seattle, WA	0.087	231	119
Los Angeles, CA	0.301	216	126
Washington, DC	0.343	140	183
Los Angeles County, CA	0.269	134	138
San Diego, CA	0.073	123	52
Somerville, MA	0.082	122	60
Denver, CO	0.105	114	32
Cambridge, MA	0.136	103	70
Philadelphia, PA	0.500	96	109
Austin, TX	0.118	85	101
Portland, OR	0.635	85	179

Table A2: State Level Corruption and Alternative FOIA Response Measure

This table reports the relationship between state level corruption and the average FOIA rejection rate by the given state where we use an alternative measure of rejection rate, in which we include partial completions as completed requests, and “no document” responses as effectively the same as rejection. Columns 1 to 4 report the results using state-year level data, whereas columns 5 and 6 report the results using data at the state level. We require that the given FOIA filing is either rejected or accepted (i.e., removing, for instance, ongoing or appealed cases). We use the corruption measure of Campante and Do (2014), whereas the outcome variable, *Alternative Rejection Rate*, is an alternative measure of rejection rate in which we include partial completions as completed requests, and “no document” responses as effectively the same as rejection. The mean of the dependent variable, *Alternative Rejection Rate*, is 0.47, whereas the standard deviation of *Corruption Rate* is 0.12. Standard errors are clustered at the state level and reported in parantheses. \* indicates significance at the 10% level, \*\* at the 5% level, and \*\*\* at the 1% level.

	Dependent Variable: <i>Alternative Rejection Rate</i>					
	State–Year Level				State Level	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.376*** (0.128)	0.384*** (0.134)	0.352*** (0.115)	0.341*** (0.114)	0.389*** (0.124)	0.358*** (0.110)
<i>Log(Income)</i>			-0.200* (0.108)	-0.200* (0.110)		-0.201* (0.106)
<i>Log(Population)</i>			-0.0165 (0.0129)	-0.0141 (0.0135)		-0.00971 (0.0128)
<i>Average FOIA Score</i>				-0.0054 (0.0064)		
<b>Fixed Effects</b>						
Year		X		X		
<i>N</i>	477	477	477	477	50	50
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.041	0.257	0.278	0.281	0.214	0.292

**Table A3: State Level Corruption and Time to Complete FOIA Request**

This table reports the relationship between state level corruption and the average FOIA rejection rate by the given state. Columns 1 to 4 report the results using state-year level data, whereas columns 5 and 6 report the results using data at the state level. We require that the given FOIA filing is either rejected or accepted (i.e., removing, for instance, ongoing or appealed cases). We use the corruption measure of Campante and Do (2014), whereas the outcome variable, *Rejection Rate*, is the average FOIA rejection rate by the given state. The mean of the dependent variable, *Rejection Rate*, is 0.19, whereas the standard deviation of *Corruption Rate* is 0.12. Standard errors are clustered at the state level and reported in parentheses. \* indicates significance at the 10% level, \*\* at the 5% level, and \*\*\* at the 1% level.

	Dependent Variable: <i>Log(Time to Response)</i>					
	State–Year Level				State Level	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.300 (0.547)	0.294 (0.552)	0.224 (0.509)	0.559 (0.526)	0.229 (0.556)	0.223 (0.519)
<i>Log(Income)</i>			-0.0670 (0.490)	-0.419 (0.574)		0.0150 (0.504)
<i>Log(Population)</i>			0.113* (0.0651)	0.184*** (0.0669)		0.116 (0.0699)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>						
Year		X		X		
<i>N</i>	459	458	459	458	50	50
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.002	0.060	0.018	0.123	0.004	0.065

**Table A4: Matched Sample Analysis of Corruption and FOIA Response – Only Police Departments**

This table presents the association between the average corruption rate and the average FOIA responses by a given city during a given date when we match identical FOIA requests that were filed to a given city’s department by the same person during the same period. The data is, therefore, at the date  $t$  and agency  $i$  of city  $c(k)$  – agency  $i$  of city  $d(l)$  pair level. In columns 4, 5, and 6, we require that the standard deviation of corruption within a pair should be greater than 0, whereas we do not put such a condition in columns 1, 2, and 3. Standard errors are double clustered at the state and pair level.

	Dependent Variable: <i>Rejection Rate</i>					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.437*	0.434**	0.480**	0.524**	0.419**	0.420**
	(0.219)	(0.210)	(0.216)	(0.198)	(0.170)	(0.173)
<i>Log(Income)</i>			-0.0999	-0.0691	-0.119	-0.118
			(0.129)	(0.146)	(0.137)	(0.132)
<i>Log(Population)</i>			-0.0255*	-0.0389**	-0.0340**	-0.0340**
			(0.0146)	(0.0172)	(0.0152)	(0.0151)
<i>Average FOIA Score</i>						-0.000355
						(0.00814)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>						
Year		X	X	X	X	X
Pair-ID					X	X
<b>Condition</b>						
Pair-level $\sigma(\text{Corruption Rate}) > 0$				X	X	X
$N$	5,640	5,640	5,640	3,582	3,550	3,550
$R^2$	0.016	0.063	0.070	0.051	0.292	0.292

**Table A5: Matched Sample Analysis of Corruption and Failure to Response Around City Mayoral Elections - Latest Year**

This table presents the test of whether cities with a mayoral election failure to response, defined as either a rejection or failure to response prior to an election, during the year prior to the city's mayoral election when we match the given FOIA request to other identical FOIA requests that were filed to a different city's department by the same journalist during the same period. The variable  $\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$  takes the value of one if the FOIA request was filed with a department in a city that had a mayoral election one year prior to the election date. Standard errors are double clustered at the pair and state level.

38

	Dependent Variable								
	$\mathbb{1}(\text{Failure})$			$\mathbb{1}(\text{Rejected})$			$\mathbb{1}(\text{No Decision})$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$	-0.0659** (0.0258)	-0.178** (0.0692)	-0.148** (0.0625)	-0.0258* (0.0144)	-0.120*** (0.0388)	-0.0826** (0.0337)	-0.0501** (0.0240)	-0.119 (0.0716)	-0.0952 (0.0686)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.113 (0.226)	0.0433 (0.203)		0.308* (0.180)	0.250 (0.172)		-0.0928 (0.186)	-0.136 (0.165)	
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election}) \times \text{Corruption Rate}$		0.422 (0.252)	0.287 (0.235)		0.353** (0.143)	0.217* (0.119)		0.259 (0.271)	0.148 (0.269)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>									
Pair-ID	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
State			X			X			X
<i>N</i>	3,086	3,086	3,086	3,086	3,086	3,086	3,086	3,086	3,086
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.341	0.342	0.387	0.257	0.258	0.326	0.365	0.365	0.404

Table A6: Matched Sample Analysis of Corruption and Failure to Response Around City Mayoral Elections - 360 Days Cutoff

In this Appendix Table we use our alternative measure of rejection rate, in which we include partial completions as completed requests, and “no document” responses as effectively the same as rejection. We obtain similar though marginally weaker results, perhaps as expected given that we believe that many “no document” responses reflect a genuine lack of relevant material or expertise in obtaining the relevant documents rather than willful non-transparency. The variable  $\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$  takes the value of one if the FOIA request was filed with a department in a city that had a mayoral election one year prior to the election date. Standard errors are double clustered at the pair and state level.

	Dependent Variable: $\mathbb{1}(\text{Failure})$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$	-0.0530** (0.0249)	-0.151** (0.0596)	-0.150*** (0.0543)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.102 (0.231)	-0.000301 (0.203)	
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election}) \times \text{Corruption Rate}$		0.370 (0.231)	0.389* (0.201)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>			
Pair-ID	X	X	X
State			X
$N$	3,512	3,512	3,512
$R^2$	0.260	0.261	0.306

Table A7: Matched Sample Analysis of Corruption and Failure to Response Around City Mayoral Elections - 270 Days Cutoff

In this Appendix Table we use our alternative measure of rejection rate, in which we include partial completions as completed requests, and “no document” responses as effectively the same as rejection. We obtain similar though marginally weaker results, perhaps as expected given that we believe that many “no document” responses reflect a genuine lack of relevant material or expertise in obtaining the relevant documents rather than willful non-transparency. The variable  $\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$  takes the value of one if the FOIA request was filed with a department in a city that had a mayoral election one year prior to the election date. Standard errors are double clustered at the pair and state level.

	Dependent Variable: $\mathbb{1}(\text{Failure})$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$	-0.0398 (0.0248)	-0.141** (0.0663)	-0.135** (0.0543)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.0833 (0.235)	0.00254 (0.204)	
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election}) \times \text{Corruption Rate}$		0.379 (0.248)	0.348* (0.203)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>			
Pair-ID	X	X	X
State			X
<i>N</i>	3,386	3,386	3,386
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.245	0.246	0.295

Table A8: Matched Sample Analysis of Corruption and Failure to Response Around City Mayoral Elections - 150 Days Cutoff

In this Appendix Table we use our alternative measure of rejection rate, in which we include partial completions as completed requests, and “no document” responses as effectively the same as rejection. We obtain similar though marginally weaker results, perhaps as expected given that we believe that many “no document” responses reflect a genuine lack of relevant material or expertise in obtaining the relevant documents rather than willful non-transparency. The variable  $\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$  takes the value of one if the FOIA request was filed with a department in a city that had a mayoral election one year prior to the election date. Standard errors are double clustered at the pair and state level.

	Dependent Variable: $\mathbb{1}(\text{Failure})$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$	-0.0620* (0.0309)	-0.233*** (0.0640)	-0.186*** (0.0527)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	0.0566 (0.281)	-0.0383 (0.257)	
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election}) \times \text{Corruption Rate}$		0.641** (0.270)	0.443* (0.249)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>			
Pair-ID	X	X	X
State			X
<i>N</i>	2,930	2,930	2,930
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.232	0.234	0.283

Table A9: Matched Sample Analysis of Corruption and Failure to Response Around City Mayoral Elections - 120 Days Cutoff

In this Appendix Table we use our alternative measure of rejection rate, in which we include partial completions as completed requests, and “no document” responses as effectively the same as rejection. We obtain similar though marginally weaker results, perhaps as expected given that we believe that many “no document” responses reflect a genuine lack of relevant material or expertise in obtaining the relevant documents rather than willful non-transparency. The variable  $\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$  takes the value of one if the FOIA request was filed with a department in a city that had a mayoral election one year prior to the election date. Standard errors are double clustered at the pair and state level.

	Dependent Variable: $\mathbb{1}(\text{Failure})$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election})$	-0.033 (0.0364)	-0.247*** (0.0825)	-0.216*** (0.0757)
<i>Corruption Rate</i>	-0.00741 (0.296)	-0.107 (0.267)	
$\mathbb{1}(\text{Election}) \times \text{Corruption Rate}$		0.802** (0.335)	0.662* (0.345)
<b>Fixed Effects</b>			
Pair-ID	X	X	X
State			X
<i>N</i>	2,607	2,607	2,607
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.220	0.223	0.271