Supplementary Materials

Legislative Term Limits and Ideological Representation

Michael P. Olson

Contents

A	Desc	criptive Information	SM—2
В	Add	itional Results	SM—3
	B.1	Full Fixed Effects Model Results	SM—3
	B.2	Fixed Effects Professionalism Models	SM—
	B.3	Fixed Effects Chamber Models	SM—
	B.4	Fixed Effects Region Models	SM—5
C	Rob	ustness Checks	SM—6
	C.1	Third-Order Polynomial	SM—
	C.2	Lagged Dependent Variable Models	SM—6
	C.3	Contested Elections	SM—7
	C.4	Term-Limitedness	SM—8
	C.5	Matched Sample	SM—9

A Descriptive Information

TABLE A.1: Term Limit Impact Years

State	House	Senate
Arkansas	1998	2000
\mathbf{A} rizona a		2000
California	1996	1998
Colorado	1998	1998
Florida	2000	2000
Maine	1996	1996
Michigan	1998	2002
Missouri	2002	2002
Montana	2000	2000
Nevada	2010	2010
Ohio	2000	2000
Oklahoma	2004	2004
Oregon ^b	1998	2000
South Dakota	2000	2000

Note: Table presents first year of impact for termlimits for state-chambers in my data. Information primarily from National Conference of State Legislatures.¹ ^aNo Arizona House elections are included in my data due to that chamber's use of multi-member districts. ^bOregon's term limits were overturned in 2002.

TABLE A.2: Summary Statistics

Statistic	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Min	Max	N
Democratic Two-Party Vote Share	0.517	0.503	0.335	0.000	1.000	59,298
Democrat Wins	0.504	1	0.500	0	1	59,298
Ideal Point Estimate	-0.037	0.002	0.902	-3.211	3.408	59,298
Term Limits	0.207	0	0.405	0	1	59,298
Upper Chamber	0.211	0	0.408	0	1	59,298
South	0.359	0	0.480	0	1	59,298
Contested Election	0.610	1	0.488	0	1	59,298

B Additional Results

B.1 Full Fixed Effects Model Results

TABLE B.1: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Full Model Results

	Dependent variable:				
		Shor	-McCarty	Score	
Dem. Wins	-1.441**	-1.438**		-1.310**	
	(0.060)	(0.062)		(0.050)	
Term Limits	0.205**	0.139**	0.034	0.052*	0.043**
	(0.068)	(0.052)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.019)
Dem. Two-Party Share - 0.5	-0.095	0.119**	0.033	0.130**	0.076**
·	(0.067)	(0.058)	(0.026)	(0.016)	(0.009)
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits	-0.411**	-0.378**	-0.086	-0.184**	-0.086**
	(0.107)	(0.104)	(0.060)	(0.057)	(0.024)
Dem. Wins \times Dem. Share	-0.054	-0.327**	-0.366**	-0.028*	-0.059**
	(0.116)	(0.063)	(0.059)	(0.016)	(0.013)
Term Limits × Dem. Share	-0.048	0.093	-0.069	0.034	0.029
	(0.163)	(0.167)	(0.067)	(0.036)	(0.019)
Dem. Wins \times Dem. Share \times Term Limits	0.626*	0.118	0.145	0.096**	0.028
	(0.361)	(0.139)	(0.099)	(0.035)	(0.027)
Constant	0.681**	,	, ,	, ,	, ,
	(0.046)				
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P
Observations	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year:" **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10 (two-tailed).

B.2 Fixed Effects Professionalism Models

TABLE B.2: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Professionalism Heterogeneity

	Dependent variable: Shor-McCarty Score					
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits	-0.290**	-0.266**	-0.054	-0.179**	-0.092**	
	(0.093)	(0.094)	(0.044)	(0.065)	(0.020)	
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits \times Professionalism	-0.099**	-0.106**	0.025	-0.038	0.002	
	(0.041)	(0.037)	(0.023)	(0.032)	(0.008)	
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P	
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P	
Observations	45,330	45,330	45,330	45,330	45,330	

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p<0.05, *p<0.10 (two-tailed).

B.3 Fixed Effects Chamber Models

TABLE B.3: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Chamber Heterogeneity

	Dependent variable:						
	Shor-McCarty Score						
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits	-0.396**	-0.380**	-0.083	-0.190**	-0.084**		
	(0.130)	(0.127)	(0.071)	(0.066)	(0.027)		
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits \times Senate	-0.063	0.015	-0.014	0.029	-0.012		
	(0.198)	(0.192)	(0.110)	(0.127)	(0.060)		
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P		
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P		
Observations	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298		

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p<0.05, *p<0.10 (two-tailed).

B.4 Fixed Effects Region Models

TABLE B.4: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Regional Heterogeneity

	Dependent variable:						
	Shor-McCarty Score						
Dem. Wins × Term Limits	-0.339**	-0.357**	-0.060	-0.203**	-0.104**		
	(0.120)	(0.122)	(0.085)	(0.065)	(0.030)		
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits \times South	0.182	0.166	-0.067	0.079	0.053		
	(0.191)	(0.180)	(0.100)	(0.122)	(0.043)		
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P		
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P		
Observations	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298		

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." $*^*p < 0.05, *p < 0.10$ (two-tailed).

C Robustness Checks

C.1 Third-Order Polynomial

TABLE C.1: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Third-Order Polynomial of Running Variable

		Dependent variable:						
	Shor-McCarty Score							
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits	-0.174**	-0.226**	-0.064	-0.151**	-0.052*			
	(0.088)	(0.080)	(0.058)	(0.074)	(0.027)			
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P			
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P			
Observations	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298	59,298			

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p<0.05, *p<0.10 (two-tailed).

C.2 Lagged Dependent Variable Models

TABLE C.2: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Lagged Dependent Variable

	D	Dependent variable:						
	Shor-McCarty Score							
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits	-0.253** (0.060)	-0.250** (0.060)	-0.243^{**} (0.063)					
Lagged DV	√	✓	√					
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P					
Observations	40,181	40,181	40,181					

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p<0.05, *p<0.10 (two-tailed).

C.3 Contested Elections

TABLE C.3: Local Linear RD Results: Contested Elections

	Shor-McCarty Score					
	With Term Limits	Without Term Limits				
Democrat Wins	-1.559 (0.071)	-1.329 (0.051)				
Bandwidth Effective Observations	0.15 5891	0.099 11574				

Note: Entries are local linear regression coefficients with standard errors clustered by state-chamber in parentheses. Observations are at the election level. Estimated using the rdrobust package in R.

TABLE C.4: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Contested Elections

	Dependent variable:							
	Shor-McCarty Score							
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits	-0.301** (0.094)	-0.262** (0.087)	-0.097^* (0.058)	-0.190** (0.065)	-0.101^{**} (0.029)			
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P			
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P			
Observations	36,176	36,176	36,176	36,176	36,176			

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p<0.05, *p<0.10 (two-tailed).

C.4 Term-Limitedness

TABLE C.5: Term Limitedness and Leapfrog Representation

	Dependent variable:						
	Shor-McCarty Score						
Dem. Wins \times Term Limitedness	-0.357^* (0.205)	-0.348^{*} (0.180)	-0.044 (0.106)	-0.055 (0.096)	-0.070** (0.031)		
Unit Fixed Effects Time Fixed Effects		S-C Y	S-C-P Y-P	D Y	D-P Y-P		
Observations	58,549	58,549	58,549	58,549	58,549		

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10 (two-tailed).

C.5 Matched Sample

TABLE C.6: Local Linear RD Results: Matched Sample of States

	Shor-McCarty Score				
	With Term Limits	Without Term Limits			
Democrat Wins	-1.558 (0.071)	-1.453 (0.053)			
Bandwidth Effective Observations	0.158 6154	0.133 8817			

Note: Entries are local linear regression coefficients with standard errors clustered by state-chamber in parentheses. Observations are at the election level. Estimated using the rdrobust package in R.

TABLE C.7: Term Limit Adoption and Leapfrog Representation: Matched Sample of States

	Dependent variable:						
	Shor-McCarty Score						
Dem. Wins \times Term Limits							
	(0.121)	(0.115)	(0.070)	(0.062)	(0.024)		
Unit Fixed Effects		S-C	S-C-P	D	D-P		
Time Fixed Effects		Y	Y-P	Y	Y-P		
Observations	35,817	35,817	35,817	35,817	35,817		

Note: Table presents linear regression coefficients, with standard errors, clustered by state-chamber, in parentheses. Lower-order terms are suppressed for clarity. In the fixed effects labels, "S" indicates "state," "D" indicates "district," C" indicates "chamber," "P" indicates "party," and "Y" indicates "year." **p<0.05, *p<0.10 (two-tailed).