

Common-Space Ideal Points, Committee Assignments, and Financial Interests for the State Legislatures

James Coleman Battista, University at Buffalo, SUNY

Michael Peress, University of Rochester

Jesse Richman, Old Dominion University

Codebook and User Guide

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE:

Users should cite the companion paper in *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, INFO HERE

Additionally, because our dataset builds upon datasets collected by others, users should also cite the underlying source material:

Wright, Gerald. 2004. "Representation in America's Legislatures." Indiana University: National Science Foundation Grant.

Clark, Jennifer Hayes, Tracy Osborn, Jonathan Winburn and Gerald C. Wright. 2009. "Representation in U.S. Legislatures: The Acquisition and Analysis of U.S. State Legislative Roll-Call Data," *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 9(3): 356-370.

Project Vote Smart. 1998. "Issue Positions (Political Courage Test)." http://www.votesmart.org/npat_about.php, accessed May 2008.

Center for Public Integrity. 1999. "Hidden Agendas: How State Legislators Keep Conflicts of Interest Under Wraps." <http://www.publicintegrity.org/oi/report.aspx?aid=617>, accessed 9 November 2006.

Portions of this research were performed using cluster supercomputer resources of the University at Buffalo's Center for Computational Research, and portions of the data were collected with support from the Old Dominion University Research Foundation.

SUMMARY:

This dataset combines new preference estimates, that are comparable between chambers, for legislators in all 99 state legislative chambers in (with a few exceptions) 1999-2000 with information on their committee assignments and their financial connections to different industries. We offer pooled, comparable one-dimensional ideal points and standard errors for virtually all state legislators and all other candidates for state legislative office who responded to Project Vote Smart's National Political Awareness Test or NPAT, based on a combination of NPAT responses and Wright's dataset of roll-call votes. We also offer two-dimensional ideal points and standard errors for all NPAT respondents based solely on their NPAT responses. We combine these preference estimates with information on the financial interests and connections of state legislators, originally compiled by the Center for Public Integrity from mandatory conflict-of-interest filings. Finally, we also include wholly original data on committee assignments for all committees and state legislators in the US.

UNIVERSE: All state legislators in all 99 chambers who were serving at the point in time at which committee assignment information was released, and all other candidates for state legislative office who responded to the NPAT.

SAMPLING: Full universe. A very small number of legislative seats were vacant at the point in time at which committee assignment data was released, so the number of legislators in our dataset is slightly fewer than the full number of legislators in 1999—2000.

RESTRICTIONS: Users should abide by any terms of use issued by Project Vote Smart for their NPAT, Gerald Wright for his roll-call data, and the Center for Public Integrity for their financial interest data.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION: One PDF documentation file, one plaintext ASCII version of the documentation file, 102 comma-delimited ASCII files holding data. Data file structure varies by file.

DISCLAIMER AND WARNING: While we have taken many steps to remove errors from this dataset, the probability that the dataset as released contains exactly zero errors is surely small. We would be grateful if users who find errors notify us.

Common-Space Ideal Points, Committee Assignments, and Financial Interests for the State Legislatures

We present a dataset that builds upon already existing data and some entirely new data to provide the opportunity to intensely examine the 1999-2000 sessions of the US state legislatures. This dataset combines two different estimates of legislator preferences that are fully comparable between chambers with information on state legislators' committee assignments and state legislators' financial interests and connections.

Committee Assignments

The data on committee assignments are an original collection. We gathered assignment information using a priority scheme of sources. First, we used any electronic directory or assignment sheet that provided a full list of committee assignments, using www.archive.org to access pages that had been removed by the legislatures or other state agencies. If this was unavailable, we accessed online electronic versions of the chamber's journal and searched through the early days of the session for the vote, if any, that ratified the committee assignments. If this was unavailable, we contacted the legislature directly and requested the assignment information; there were no chambers for which we could not find committee assignments.

The committee assignment data condition the rest of the data: each set of committee assignments represents a snapshot of the legislature as it stood at some point during the session, and we carry this snapshot through the rest of the data. Users should be aware that the membership of the legislature at other points during the session might differ due to death, resignation, and replacement. Users should likewise be aware that committee memberships need not be set in stone for the entire session, and that memberships at some other point during the session might differ from those we report.

The committee assignment data record only full committee assignments, not subcommittees. They include whichever committees the chamber listed in the information they provided, which may include committees that do not deal with bills. The data record only committee membership and do not indicate committee leadership.

Preference Estimates

Method of Estimation: The "Big Matrix" Approach

With the growth in electronic publication of state legislative information and the collection of roll-call datasets by Wright (2004) and Shor, McCarty, and Berry (2010), with more data forthcoming, and the growth in tools such as W-NOMINATE (Poole and Rosenthal 1997, Poole 2005), DW-NOMINATE (Poole and Rosenthal 1991), and IDEAL (Clinton, Jackman, and Rivers 2004), estimating the ideal points that are most consistent with an observed set of roll-call votes has become relatively simple. The problem state legislative scholars face is connecting estimates derived from one chamber's roll-calls to those from another. Without further work, the scores cannot be compared. What is needed is bridging data – either legislators that are common to more than one chamber, or votes that are common to more than one chamber. Shor, McCarty, and Berry use bridge actors by linking from one state legislature up to the US Congress, using members who had moved from one to the other, and then

linking from Representatives from another state who had served in their state legislature back down to that legislature.

Another approach is to use bridge votes (or vote-like responses) that are common among states. If everyone casts a vote on some set of votes across all chambers, we can use their responses on those bridge votes to normalize their responses on non-bridge votes. We use Project Vote Smart National Political Awareness Test (NPAT) responses as bridge data, as does Shor (2009). There are two ways to approach bridge votes. One way is to treat the roll-call votes and bridge data as separate things and then link between the two using regression; this is the linear mapping approach. Shor (2009) uses this linear mapping approach. To do this, a researcher creates separate and not-comparable ideal point estimates for Legislatures A, B, and C based solely on their roll-call votes. Then, the researcher estimates ideal points in a common policy space by using solely the bridge data, in this case NPAT responses which are only available for those legislators who choose to respond to the NPAT. Third, in each chamber, the researcher uses vote-based ideal points to predict common-space ideal points among those legislators who responded, establishing a connection between the two. Finally, the resulting regression equation is then used to impute the common-space ideal points of legislators who did not respond to the NPAT.

Another approach to bridge votes, and the one we take here, is the “big matrix” approach. In this approach, researchers create a single very large vote matrix encompassing all legislators of Legislatures A, B, and C. This matrix includes the roll-calls of Legislature A (where legislators from B and C are recorded as not voting), the roll-calls from Legislatures B and C (with legislators from other chambers recorded as not voting), and the bridge data, where some subset of legislators from Legislatures A, B, and C all cast votes. The resulting “big matrix” is then fed to an ideal-point estimator that proceeds as usual. While the linear mapping approach produces common-space ideal estimates that should be valid and reliable, there are some advantages to using the big matrix approach. The primary advantages of the big matrix approach are efficiency and symmetry. Using the big matrix approach, each ideal point is estimated using all of the available data, increasing the efficiency of the algorithm. Further, both bridge legislators and non-bridge legislators are treated symmetrically. A further advantage of the big matrix approach is that it allows for standard errors of ideal point estimates to be relatively easily calculated.

The disadvantage of the big matrix approach is computational cost. As chambers are added to the matrix, it grows multiplicatively. Our final matrix of votes is 9885 voters by 43262 votes or responses, or about 428 million observations. Iterating over such a large matrix takes a very long time, even though the overwhelming majority of the data must by its nature consist of abstention. Our ideal point estimator takes a standard item-response based model of voting but maximizes the likelihood function using an algorithm that takes advantage of the sparse nature of the matrix and iterates only over those observations where there is, conceivably, voting or NPAT response data. The savings in computational cost are enormous. By our best estimate from test runs using W-NOMINATE, computing ideal points with standard errors for our full dataset would take approximately three years of continuous computation, assuming that a machine that met the very large memory requirements could be found. In contrast, our algorithm returns results with standard errors in five to six hours.

To illustrate the computational problem with the big matrix approach, consider the following illustrative example. There are J legislative chambers, each with N legislators taking T votes. In addition, $M < N$ legislators from each chamber participate in B bridge votes. Notice that in total, we have JN legislators and $JT + B$ votes. From this, we have a roll call voting matrix with $E_1 = (JN)(JT + B)$ elements. However, a large number of these entries correspond to missing votes.

The number of non-missing entries in this matrix is $E_2 = JNT + NMB$. If we assume that MB is small relative to JT (which is likely to be the case in applications such as ours), we have $E_1 \approx J^2NT$ and $E_2 \approx JNT$, so that, $E_1/E_2 \approx J$. In other words, the cost per iteration of the naïve methods is a factor of J slower than the sophisticated approach.

We can also compare this to the cost of estimating the ideal points on J chambers individually, as would be required for the decomposition and linear mapping approaches. The number of voters is N and the number of votes is T implying that the cost per iteration per chamber is NT . Since there are J chambers, the total cost per iteration is given by JNT . Notice that this is approximately the same cost as the sophisticated big matrix approach and a factor of J faster than the naïve big matrix approach.

Now, the number of iterations may grow with problem size, but it will grow fairly slowly with problem size- the big matrix approach may require 2 to 3 times more iterations than the linear mapping or decomposition approaches require per chamber. If this is the case, this implies that if we can efficiently implement the big matrix approach, it should require about 2 to 3 times more computation time than the alternative approaches and vastly less than the naïve big matrix approach. In our final implementation, we were able to estimate ideal points for all 9886 legislators and other candidates in about 5-6 hours. Using W-NOMINATE, computing two-dimensional ideal points and standard errors for just the NPAT responses took approximately 45 hours on a 3.0 GHz or better computation node in the University at Buffalo Center for Computational Research's cluster supercomputer. A W-NOMINATE estimation of NPAT responses and votes for only ten chambers *without* standard errors took just over 36 hours to run on the same cluster, and we estimate that including standard errors for those ten chambers would have increased the computation time beyond 90 days.

Now, we are in a position to describe our approach in more detail. Specifically, we index legislators by n and we index voters by t . We let $y_{n,t} = 2$ denote a yea, we let $y_{n,t} = 1$ denote a nay, and we let $y_{n,t} = 0$ denote a missing vote. Our statistical model follows the model employed by Clinton, Jackman, and River's (2004) and the Quadratic-Normal model described in Poole (2001). We can write the computed likelihood function as,

$$L(\alpha, a, b) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \mathbb{1}\{y_{n,t} = 2\} \log \Phi(a_t + b_t' \alpha_n) + \mathbb{1}\{y_{n,t} = 1\} \log [1 - \Phi(a_t + b_t' \alpha_n)] \right\}$$

Following Peress and Spirling (2010), we employ a penalized-likelihood approach to deal with finite sample identification problems and we apply the zig-zag algorithm to optimize the (penalized) likelihood. We depart from conventional techniques by storing the roll call voting matrix in compressed-row and compressed-column formats (Golub and Van Loan, 1996). This approach allows us to skip over the missing entries when computing the likelihood function and its' derivatives.

Source Data

For roll-call votes, we rely on Wright's dataset. We collected NPAT responses directly from Project Vote Smart. An obvious concern is that NPAT response rates tend to be low and vary strongly across states. In chambers with fewer legislators who responded to the NPAT, roll-calls and NPAT responses will be bound together less firmly. Tables 1 and 2 report the NPAT response rates for each party in each chamber for lower and upper chambers (including Nebraska) respectively. While we are confident that our unidimensional ideal point estimates are reliable, users may choose to examine only

a subset of chambers where they deem the NPAT response rates to be sufficiently high. For example, users might choose to examine only lower chambers, where response rates tend to be higher.

NPAT responses come in two varieties. In one, respondents are presented with a series of statements (NPAT refers to them as “principles”) and asked to indicate which they support. On these statements, there is no option to indicate which statements the respondent opposes, and nonresponse and nonsupport for any particular statement are unavoidably pooled. We coded these as simply binary responses; either an NPAT respondent chose to support the statement, or did not. In some instances, the wording of these statements varied across states. In some of these cases, the wording merely includes the state name. In others, the wording makes some reference to existing state policy, if one exists. For example, the statement about support for the death penalty varies in this way. In states without the death penalty, it appears as “Support the use of the death penalty” or “Reinstate the death penalty in Iowa.” In states with the death penalty, it appears as “Expand the use of the death penalty for additional circumstances relating to murder.” Another example is the statement regarding providing health care for uninsured children. In states with no such program, it appears most frequently as “Provide health care to uninsured children by expanding Medicaid,” though it also appears in other related forms. In states with an existing program, however, the question explicitly asks about support for that program. Appendix 1, which lists all of the principles and questions coded as votes, indicates which ones had wording that varied (beyond minor punctuation changes) and the manner in which they varied. As a test to see whether including these responses biased our results in any way, we used W-NOMINATE to quickly generate ideal points based only on NPAT responses, first with all principles and statements and then using only those principles and statements whose wording did not vary. The two scores were correlated at 0.9985, implying that our use of the varying-wording questions caused no problems. Users particularly concerned with this issue should contact the authors, who can supply the exact wording and punctuation used in any given state’s NPAT.

In the other variety, legislators are asked to respond to a question, either with responses of “Yes,” “Uncertain,” and “No,” or with a six-point scale for taxes and spending that runs from “Great Increase” to “Eliminate.” We coded each of these responses as a series of votes, using N-1 votes to code N levels. In each case, the votes asked the questions “Was the respondent’s answer at least as large numerically as 2? Was the respondent’s answer at least as large numerically as 3?” and so on until the categories were exhausted. Essentially, this creates a series of “votes” where we impose the separating hyperplane on the voters. The first vote imposes a separating hyperplane between responses of 1 and 2 (great increase and small increase), the second imposes a separating hyperplane between response of 2 and 3 (small increase and maintain current level), and so on. Because each response appears as more than one vote, these responses constitute 61 percent of our NPAT bridge data. We also tested for bias here by estimating NPAT-only ideal points with and without the multiple-response questions, and the scores were correlated at 0.933. Graphical examination of the data indicated that the missing-data scores were essentially noisier versions of the full-data scores, as one would expect when dropping more than half of the votes.

Table 1: NPAT Response Rates in Lower Chambers

State	D	D %	R	R%	Overall	Overall %	State	D	D %	R	R%	Overall	Overall %
AK	7	50.0	12	46.2	19	47.5	MT	15	36.6	23	39.7	39	39.0
AL	17	25.0	11	29.7	28	26.7	NC	16	24.6	7	13.2	24	20.0
AR	15	21.4	16	53.3	31	31.0	ND	12	35.3	23	35.9	35	35.7
AZ	7	35.0	20	50.0	27	45.0	NH	35	23.2	44	18.1	79	20.0
CA	18	38.3	8	25.0	26	32.5	NJ	2	6.3	10	20.8	12	15.0
CO	11	44.0	17	42.5	28	43.1	NM	9	22.5	11	36.7	20	28.6
CT	27	28.1	17	30.9	44	29.1	NV	7	25.0	5	35.7	12	28.6
DE	3	20.0	6	23.1	9	22.0	NY	35	36.5	12	23.1	47	31.3
FL	10	21.7	19	25.7	29	24.2	OH	12	30.0	18	30.5	30	30.3
GA	20	19.2	26	34.7	46	25.6	OK	13	21.3	15	37.5	28	27.7
HI	16	42.1	7	53.8	23	45.1	OR	20	80.0	22	62.9	42	70.0
IA	9	20.5	34	60.7	43	43.0	PA	14	14.0	23	22.3	37	18.2
ID	8	66.7	12	20.7	20	28.6	RI	15	17.2	2	15.4	17	17.0
IL	16	25.8	4	7.1	20	16.9	SC	8	13.6	19	29.2	27	21.8
IN	15	28.3	15	31.9	30	30.0	SD	9	47.4	22	43.1	31	44.3
KS	7	14.6	14	18.2	21	16.8	TN	9	15.3	18	45.0	27	27.3
KY	16	24.6	13	37.1	29	29.0	TX	18	23.1	14	19.4	32	21.3
LA	3	3.9	5	17.2	8	7.6	UT	3	14.3	17	31.5	20	26.7
MA	36	27.3	8	29.6	44	27.5	VA	10	20.0	16	32.7	26	26.0
MD	14	13.2	7	20.0	21	14.9	VT	10	12.8	14	22.2	29	19.3
ME	23	29.1	34	47.9	58	38.4	WA	11	22.4	10	20.4	21	21.4
MI	27	51.9	23	39.7	50	45.5	WI	9	20.0	15	27.8	24	24.2
MN	22	34.9	23	32.4	45	33.6	WV	14	18.7	8	32.0	22	22.0
MO	18	20.7	25	32.9	43	26.4	WY	11	64.7	14	32.6	25	41.7
MS	4	4.7	14	41.2	20	16.4							

Table 2: NPAT Response Rates in Upper Chambers and Nebraska

State	D	D %	R	R%	Overall	Overall %	State	D	D %	R	R%	Overall	Overall %
AK	2	40.0	3	20.0	5	25.0	MT	4	22.2	6	18.8	10	20.0
AL	5	20.8	3	27.3	8	22.9	NC	3	8.6	6	40.0	9	18.0
AR	3	11.1	1	12.5	4	11.4	ND	3	16.7	12	38.7	15	30.6
AZ	5	35.7	7	43.8	12	40.0	NE	2	10.5	9	32.1	11	22.4
CA	4	16.0	2	13.3	6	15.0	NH	6	46.2	1	10.0	7	29.2
CO	3	20.0	3	15.0	6	17.1	NJ	5	33.3	8	32.0	13	32.5
CT	6	31.6	2	11.8	8	22.2	NM	8	32.0	2	11.8	10	23.8
DE	4	30.8	3	37.5	7	33.3	NV	1	11.1	3	25.0	4	19.0
FL	2	13.3	1	4.0	3	7.5	NY	8	32.0	5	13.9	13	21.3
GA	7	20.6	8	36.4	15	26.8	OH	5	41.7	1	4.8	6	18.2
HI	5	21.7	1	50.0	6	24.0	OK	3	9.1	1	6.7	4	8.3
IA	5	25.0	6	20.0	11	22.0	OR	8	61.5	3	17.6	11	36.7
ID	2	50.0	11	35.5	13	37.1	PA	3	15.0	4	13.3	7	14.0
IL	2	7.4	3	9.4	5	8.5	RI	6	14.3	2	25.0	8	16.0
IN	6	31.6	3	9.7	9	18.0	SC	3	12.5	4	19.0	7	15.2
KS	5	38.5	4	14.8	9	22.5	SD	7	53.8	14	63.6	21	60.0
KY	2	11.1	1	5.0	3	7.9	TN	3	16.7	4	26.7	7	21.2
LA	1	4.2	2	13.3	3	7.7	TX	3	20.0	1	6.3	4	12.9
MA	4	12.1	1	14.3	5	12.5	UT	3	27.3	4	22.2	7	24.1
MD	8	24.2	3	21.4	11	23.4	VA	4	21.1	3	14.3	7	17.5
ME	7	35.0	9	64.3	16	45.7	VT	3	17.6	1	7.7	4	13.3
MI	6	40.0	15	65.2	21	55.3	WA	4	14.8	3	13.6	7	14.3
MN	13	32.5	3	12.0	16	23.9	WI	2	11.8	2	12.5	4	12.1
MO	3	16.7	2	12.5	5	14.7	WV	4	13.8	4	80.0	8	23.5
MS	4	11.8	6	33.3	10	19.2	WY	2	20.0	4	20.0	6	20.0

Common Space Scores

We report two different preference estimates. Our primary estimate is a set of ideal points (and their standard errors) in a one-dimensional policy space. The common space scores are provided for all legislators and all other candidates who responded to the NPAT. In a few chambers with very few NPAT respondents, we supplemented the 1998 NPAT with responses to identical or highly similar questions from NPATs of other years; these legislators are clearly identified by a legislator identifier that begins with “ZZZ.” In chambers that did not have elections in 1998, we used the NPAT responses for the election year preceding the legislative term for 1999. Overall, the model predicts 85.9% of votes and responses correctly, with an APRE of 57.1% and geometric mean probability of 79.0%.

Cautionary Notes For Common-Space Scores

While we hope that the common-space scores for losing candidates might prove useful to researchers, users *should not* assume that a major-party candidate who lost to the eventual legislator

was necessarily the candidate who actually appeared on the ballot. Candidates may have lost at the primary election stage, or may have been write-in candidates who reported a major-party affiliation to Project Vote Smart when returning their NPAT. Likewise, minor-party candidates may or may not have appeared on the ballot.

In the Rhode Island House, common-space scores for Democrats and the few Republicans show a very wide range of overlap, and the median Republican is actually slightly to the left of the median Democrat. This seems to be a consequence of the one of the two Republican NPAT respondents (of just thirteen Republican legislators) being quite liberal while the other is only moderately conservative. Since their common-space ideal points accurately reflect their NPAT-derived preferences, we are confident that this apparent aberration is due to surprising source data, not a problem with the scaling algorithm. Because the available data it relies on contains this quirk, users might be cautious in using the common-space scores for the RI House.

NPAT-only scores

Additionally, we provide estimated ideal points and their standard errors in a two-dimensional issue space for all NPAT respondents. We computed these estimated ideal points using only NPAT responses. We normalized the ideal points by setting the Democratic average to (-1,0), the Republican average to (1,0), and the Libertarian average to (1,1). Thus, the first dimension divides Democrats from Republicans, while the second divides both from Libertarians. These ideal points are not bounded by a unit hypersphere. Overall, the model predicts 82.0% of NPAT responses correctly with an APRE of 58.9% and a geometric mean probability of 75.2%.

In practice, which preference estimates users should use depends on their particular inferential goals and their tolerance for sometimes small and nonrandom samples. The common space scores are available for all actors, but their use of roll-call votes means that (like NOMINATE scores) voting agendas, party whipping, and so on can have an effect on estimated preferences. In this respect, common-space scores are very similar to DW-NOMINATE scores in the Congressional world, and users who would be satisfied with DW-NOMINATE scores should be satisfied with our common-space scores. NPAT-only scores are available for only NPAT respondents, but should be logically and causally prior to roll-call votes. If a user is interested in making inferences about how underlying preferences or electorally-induced preferences play a role in voting or other legislative behavior, he or she might consider using the NPAT-only scores.

Financial interests and connections

The financial interest data we report are a subset of data originally collected by the Center for Public Integrity, who manually coded all conflict-of-interest filings. To be clear, these are not campaign donation data, though those are available from the National Institute on Money in State Politics. The data we report indicate where a legislator's extralegislative income, if any, comes from, and other financial connections. Financial interests should be linked to legislator preferences, and tell us something about the set of interests, preconceptions, skills, biases, and knowledge that legislators bring to their service.

The data we present are based on the following connections or interests: employment income, income from government entities, income from sale of property or crops, retirement income, profit, officer or director fees, property rental income, agricultural property income, holding an officer or director position, personal business interests, memberships, and income from sales or commissions. In the data, the membership category is nearly entirely limited to the "political affiliation" connections.

The original data collected by the Center contains additional types of connections, such as a variety of investments and investment income, that we do not report. The full data, along with data from 2006, are available online from the Center. As of October 2010, the home page for the 1999 and 2006 projects was <http://projects.publicintegrity.org/oi/> .

The interest data are binary; a legislator either has or does not have a given financial connection. While it would be desirable to be able to report that a legislator's interest in crop production was \$37845 instead of merely that it exists, amounts are generally not present in the original filings. Even with the Center for Public Integrity's truly massive data-collection effort, fully 83.8% of the 25128 reported legislator-interests have no scale whatsoever, and in 25 states no legislator-interests have any scale reported. A further 6.2 percent of observations include only extremely rough categories (ie, more than \$0 but less than \$50000, or more than \$10000 but less than \$1000000).

The interest data include interests reported for the legislator him- or herself, for the legislator's spouse, and for the legislator's dependents (but only 284 of the 25128 legislator-interests are identified as dependents'). We have included all of these interests for two reasons. First, the outside financial connections held by the legislator's immediate family also provide a clue to the preferences, biases, and knowledge that a legislator brings to the statehouse. Second, and more practically, the original filings themselves are often unclear about exactly who a given financial interest belongs to. Overall, 13.2% of legislator-interests do not indicate whether the interest is the legislator's, spouse's, or a dependent's. Moreover, in nine states at least 25% of legislator-interests lack this information in the original conflict of interest filings.

The requirements for reporting outside income or interests vary from state to state. Idaho, Michigan, and Vermont do not require their legislators to report conflicts of interest. Utah also received the lowest possible score from the Center. Accordingly, we do not report interests for those four states. As part of their original data collection, the Center for Public Integrity also collected information about reporting requirements and summarized this in an "openness" rating ranging from one to 100. The Center interprets these ratings as if they were academic grades, with scores over 60 being "passing." These scores are included in a separate file in the dataset.

References

- Clinton, Joshua, Simon Jackman, and Douglas Rivers. 2004. "The Statistical Analysis of Roll-Call Data." *American Political Science Review* 98: 355-370.
- Golub, Gene, and Charles F. Van Loan. 1996. *Matrix Computations*, 3d ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Peress, Michael, and Arthur Spirling. 2010. "Scaling the Critics: Uncovering Latent Dimensions of Movie Criticism with an Item Response Approach." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105:71-83.
- Poole, Keith T. 2001. "The Geometry of Multidimensional Quadratic Utility in Models of Parliamentary Roll Call Voting." *Political Analysis* 9:211-226.
- Poole, Keith T. 2005. *Spatial Models of Parliamentary Voting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Poole, Keith T., Jeffrey Lewis, James Lo, and Royce Carroll. 2007. "Scaling Roll Call Votes With wnominate in R." *Journal of Statistical Software* 22: 1-23.
- Poole, Keith T., and Howard Rosenthal. 1991. "Patterns of Congressional Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 35: 228-278.
- Poole, Keith T., and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll-Call Voting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shor, Boris. 2009. "101 Chambers Bridged: Congress and 50 State Legislatures in Common Space." Working paper.
- Shor, Boris, Nolan McCarty, and Christopher Berry. 2010. "A Bridge to Somewhere: Mapping State and Congressional Ideology on a Cross-Institutional Common Space." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 35: 417--448.
- Wright, Gerald C. 2004. "Representation in America's Legislatures." Indiana University: National Science Foundation Grant.

FILES:

The following files are included in the dataset. All are comma-delimited plain ASCII.

1MERGED_NOCOMMITTEES.CSV : Preference and interest information for all legislators, but no committee assignments.

2MERGED_NIRC.CSV : Preference information for NPAT respondents who are not present in the roll-call votes used for scaling. The overwhelming majority of these observations are candidates who lost in the 1998 (or other relevant) election, but by our best count two (Paul Oshiro in Hawaii and Virginia Casady in Wyoming) are candidates who won their election in 1998 but left office before whatever time the committee assignment information we coded was generated by the chamber.

3CPI_OPENNESS_SCORES.CSV : The openness or stringency-of-reporting scores generated by the Center for Public Integrity. The Center interprets these broadly as academic grades, with scores over 60 being “passing.”

99 files with filenames such as “ak_h.CSV” and “wa_s.CSV” : Preference, interest, and committee assignment information for legislators in that chamber, where “ak_h” denotes the lower chamber of Alaska’s legislature, “wa_s” the upper chamber of Washington’s, and so on. Nebraska’s single chamber appears in “ne_u.CSV”.

VARIABLES:

The following variables or subsets thereof appear in 1MERGED_NOCOMMITTEES.CSV , 2MERGED_NIRC.csv, and the various chamber-specific files:

IDENTIFIERS AND PREFERENCES

legislatorid: A unique identifier for each legislator or other candidate. Where a legislator is an NPAT respondent, their legislatorid is the same as the candidate identifier used by Project Vote Smart. Otherwise it is a simple combination of state, chamber, and a counter. An exception are legislators for whom we coded non-1998 NPAT responses in chambers with very low response rates; these identifiers and only these identifiers start with “ZZZ.”

state: The state the legislator or other candidate represents (or ran in). Two-letter postal abbreviation.

chamber: “h” for lower chamber, “s” for upper chamber, “u” for unicameral.

district: District name or number. Users should note that several chambers use, in whole or in part, multi-member districts.

cham.dist: Combination of state code plus numeric identifier of the district. In chambers where district names are entirely numerical, the numerical part of the identifier is the district's number. In other chambers, districts were numbered alphabetically.

surname: The legislator or candidate's family name.

firstname: The legislator or candidate's personal name.

partyname: The name of the legislator or candidate's party, if any. In some states, Democrats appear as "D" in this variable and Republicans as "R."

party: Numerical party coding scheme as follows:

100 Democratic

101 Other clearly left-leaning party (ie, Progressives in Vermont, Socialists)

200 Republican

201 Other clearly right-leaning party (ie, Alaska Independent, Conservative, Right to Life)

300 Libertarian

400 Green

500 US Taxpayers / Constitution

600 Reform

700 Natural Law

997 Nonpartisan/no recorded party (Nebraska only)

998 Other

999 None/independent

npatonly.d1: Legislator or candidate's estimated ideal point, first dimension, computed over NPAT responses only. Missing for legislators who did not respond to 1998 NPAT.

npatonly.d2: Legislator or candidate's estimated ideal point, second dimension, computed over NPAT responses only. Missing for legislators who did not respond to 1998 NPAT.

npatonly.d1.SE: Standard error for npatonly.d1 .

npatonly.d2.SE: Standard error for npatonly.d2 .

commonsplace.final : Legislator or candidate's estimated ideal point, unidimensional, computed using Peress algorithm over all NPAT responses and roll-call votes.

NOTE: USERS SHOULD APPROACH THE COMMONSPACE.FINAL ESTIMATES IN THE FOLLOWING CHAMBERS WITH CAUTION:

RI H: common-space scores show Republicans to the left of Democrats. This seems to be a consequence of the few Republican NPAT respondents being quite liberal. Since those respondents really do appear to be generally liberal in their NPAT responses, we are satisfied that this apparent aberration is due to aberrant source data, not a problem with the scaling algorithm. Because the available data it relies on contains this quirk, users might be cautious in using the common-space scores for the RI House.

commonsplace.final.SE: Standard error of commonsplace.final

surname.interests: Legislator's family name as it appeared in original financial-interest database. Used for matching and crosschecking.

firstname.interests: Legislator's personal name as it appeared in original financial-interest database. Used for matching and crosschecking.

FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Coded as dummies; 1 if legislator reports a direct, spousal, or familial interest in that area. Each financial interest variable name combines a general area with a more specific code. The general areas are:

AGRI: Agriculture

COMMELEC: Communications and electronics

CONSTR: Construction

DEFENSE: Defense

ENR: Energy, natural resources, and environment

FIRE: Finance, insurance, and real estate

GOV: Government NOTE: THIS CATEGORY SOMETIMES CASTS A VERY WIDE NET AND OCCASIONALLY INCLUDES LEGISLATORS RECEIVED SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS, LEGISLATORS IN ALASKA RECEIVING PERMANENT FUND PAYMENTS, PAYMENT AS A STATE LEGISLATOR, UNSPECIFIED "STATE GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT," AND SO ON. USERS SHOULD APPROACH THIS CATEGORY WITH CARE.

HEALTH: Health care

LEGAL: Law and lobbying firms

TRANS: Transportation

GENLBUS: General business

UNION: Unions

POLITICAL: Connections to political entities NOTE: THIS CATEGORY CONSISTS PRIMARILY OF DIRECTORSHIPS AND MEMBERSHIPS, THOUGH A FEW LEGISLATORS RECEIVED EMPLOYMENT INCOME.

OTHER: Other

The specific industrial codes and some examples of legislator-interests so coded are:

AGRI.cropproduction: Farmers, crop production, and basic processing. Examples: "John R. Gregg Farm," "Mid-Continent Co-op," "Farm."

AGRI.tobacco: Tobacco and tobacco products. Examples: "RJR Nabisco," "Carolina Tobacco Farmers Warehouse," "Locust Hill Farm."

AGRI.dairy: Milk and dairy producers. Examples: "Agri-Mark," "Glaze Dairy Inc," "Wardland Inc."

AGRI.poultryeggs: Poultry and eggs. Examples: "Perdue, Inc," "Evans Poultry," "Con Agri Poultry."

AGRI.livestock: Livestock, feedlots, and related services. Examples: "Ellis Quarter Horses," "Tyson Ranch," "Athens Livestock and Auction."

AGRI.agri_svcs: Agricultural services and products. Examples: "Agribiotech, Inc," "Hartzler Equipment Co.," "Berkshire Florist."

AGRI.foodprocessing: Food and beverage products and services. Examples: "Giant Food," "Black Hills Honey, LLC," "Hartung Meat Co."

AGRI.forestproducts: Forestry, forest products, and paper. Examples: "Georgia-Pacific," "Floyd Timber Co," "Unnamed timber land."

AGRI.misc: Agriculture miscellaneous. Examples: "Unnamed entity," "Unnamed agricultural interest," "Musgrove Bale Service."

COMMELEC.publishing: Printing and publishing. Examples: "Tallahassee Tribune, Inc," "Hallmark Cards," "West Publications."

COMMELEC.tv_movies_music: Television, movies, and music. Examples: "KTLG Radio," "Capitol Cinemas, Inc," "20th Century Fox."

COMMELEC.telephone: Telephone utilities. Examples: "Bell Atlantic," "AT&T pension," "US West."

COMMELEC.telecom_svcs equip: Telecommunications services and equipment. Examples: "Clear Channel," "Nokia," "Lucent."

COMMELEC.computer_svcs equip: Computer services and equipment. Examples: "Dell computer," "IBM," "PC Installations, Inc."

CONSTR.genlcontractor: General contractors, construction, and public works. Examples: "Alpha construction Co.," "American Subcontractors Association of Maine," "Waterman contracting."

CONSTR.homebuilder: Home builders. Examples: "Lux-Klinker Homes," "LDW Custom Homes, Inc," "Hearthstone Inc."

CONSTR.specialtradecontractor: Specialist contractors and trade subcontractors. Examples: "7-Electric," "Woodchuck Ditch Company," "Principal occupation/source of income: craftsman."

CONSTR.construction_svcs: Construction services. Examples: "Little and Assoc. Architects," "Alpine Engineering," "Don's Fence Company."

CONSTR.buildingmatls: Building materials and equipment. Examples: "Picture perfect landscape supplies," "Martin-Marietts Corp.," "Builders Supply Co."

DEFENSE.aerocontractors: Military aerospace contractors. Examples: "EG & G Florida," "Lockheed Martin," "Allied Signal Engines, Inc."

DEFENSE.electronics: Military electronics. Examples: "Raytheon Inc.," "Litton Industries retirement," "DRS Technologies."

DEFENSE.misc: Other unspecified defense. Examples: "General Dynamics pension."

ENR.oilgas: Oil and gas. Examples: "Merrimack Plaza mobil," "Rolling Plains Well service, Inc.," "Mustang Mud."

ENR.mining: Mining. Examples: "Echo Bay Minerals," "Dakota discount gold," "Arch Coal."

ENR.nuclearenergy: Nuclear power. Examples: "Nuclear Fuel Services," "Fluor Daniel Hanford Inc."

ENR.energymisc: Other unspecified energy, natural resources, and environment. Examples: "Washington water power," "Hutmacher Drilling Inc.," "Wave Energy Corporation."

ENR.electricutil: Electric utilities. Examples: "Delmarva Power," "Board of public works," "Duke energy."

ENR.enviro_svcs: Environmental services, equipment, and consulting. Examples: "Seattle Audubon Society," "ECOTEK," "BCM Engineers."

ENR.wastemgmt: Waste management. Examples: "Consolidated Disposal," "A W Disposal," "Browning-Ferris industries Inc."

ENR.fisherieswildlife: Fisheries, wildlife, and hunting. Examples: "Dawn Treader Fishing Venture," "Westslope Trout Co.," "F/V Redwing."

FIRE.commercialbanks: Commercial banks. Examples: "Key Bank," "Wells Fargo Bank," "Frost National Bank."

FIRE.savingsloans: Savings and loans. Examples: "Medford savings bank," "PSB financial Corp.," "Buffalo federal savings bank."

FIRE.creditunions: Credit unions. Examples: "AREA Schools CU," "Credit Unions," "Northland Credit Union."

FIRE.financecredit: Finance companies and credit agencies. Examples: "Option one mortgage Corp.," "Fannie Mae," "C&L Equities."

FIRE.securitiesinvestments: Securities, investments, and commodities. Examples: "Fidelity Investments," "Pension funds," "Nova Trust."

FIRE.insurance: Insurance. Examples: "State Farm Insurance," "Kysar Insurance agency," "Title and Escrow Company."

FIRE.realestate: Real estate. Examples: "Ladwiv & Vos," "Tuscaloosa Properties LLC," "Rogers Realty Services."

FIRE.accountant: Accountancy. Examples: "Carolyn C. Belcher, CPA," "Unnamed accounty firm," "Arthur Anderson."

FIRE.misc: Other unspecified FIRE. Examples: "H&R Block," "Estate of A.R. Royal," "Equifax Inc."

FIRE.propertyrental: Property rental. Examples: "RP," "Cain/Nixon," "Stonewall Apartments."

FIRE.realpropertymisc: Other unspecified real estate. Examples: "RP," "LLR & MSR Revocable Trust," "Equity Properties LLC."

GOV.gov_fed: Federal government. Examples: "US House of Representatives," "US military Retired," "USDA/FSA."

GOV.gov_state: State government. Examples: "State of Wisconsin Assembly," "Teacher's retirement," "State of North Carolina."

GOV.gov_local: Local government. Examples: "Norden Township," "Chicago housing authority," "City of Pawtucket."

GOV.gov_misc: Other unspecified government. Examples: "Department of Human Resources," "Principal occupation/source of income: government," "Department of Education," "Government pension."

HEALTH.healthprofessional: Health care professionals. Examples: "Dental practice," "North Dakota Nurses Assoc.," "Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons."

HEALTH.hospitalsnursinghomes: Hospitals and nursing homes. Examples: "Heritage Manor nursing home," "Trinity Medical Center," "Genesis Treatment Center."

HEALTH.health_svcs: Health services. Examples: "NHC Homecare," "Pathology Lab Consultants," "Kulm Ambulance/Rescue."

HEALTH.pharmhealthproducts: Pharmaceuticals and health products. Examples: "Eli Lilly & Co.," "Medtech Investments Inc.," "California Lithotripters III."

HEALTH.health_misc: Other unidentified health care. Examples: "DARE Foundation," "E-911-Talladega," "March of Dimes, Central MA."

LEGAL.lawfirms: Law firms. Examples: "Dvorak & Dvorak," "Sherry Gregg Atty," "Unnamed practice of law."

LEGAL.lobbyists: Lobbying firms. Examples: "American Conservative Union," "Natl Strategies Inc.," "YD Associates."

TRANS.airtransport: Air transport. Examples: "TWA Pension," "Boeing pension," "UPS."

TRANS.automotive: Automotive. Examples: "Ford Motor Co.," "Spradley Chevrolet," "Parts Plus Auto Store."

TRANS.trucking: Trucking. Examples: "Rentra, Inc.," "High Mesa Trucking," "Big Orange Trailers."

TRANS.railroads: Railroads. Examples: "Union Pacific Railroad," "CSX Call Options," "Pension."

TRANS.seatransport: Sea transport. Examples: "Tartan Terminal Inc.," "Universal maritime Serv. Corp.," "Meyer Marine."

TRANS.misc: Transport miscellaneous. Examples: "Cosco Harley Davidson," "Carriage association of America," "South Texas Executive Vans."

GENLBUS.businessassns: Business associations. Examples: "Bexley Area Chamber of Commerce," "Downtown Franklin Assoc.," "RI Economic Development."

GENLBUS.foodbeverrestaurants: Food, Beverage, and Restaurants. Examples: "Hank's Root Beer Co.," "Friendly's," "Dairy Queen."

GENLBUS.beerwineliquor: Beer, wine, and liquor. Examples: "Seagram's," "Malik's Liquors," "New Mexico Vineyards, Inc."

GENLBUS.retail: Retail sales. Examples: "Sears Roebuck," "Variety Jewelers," "Lynnwood Books."

GENLBUS.miscservices: Miscellaneous services. Examples: "Turner Funeral Home," "Service Master," "Rugrats Day Care."

GENLBUS.businessservices: Business services, advertising, and consulting. Examples: "Creative Sign Co.," "Cary Public Relations," "Mactemps."

GENLBUS.recreation: Recreation and live entertainment. Examples: "Wild Rockies Tours," "Ronnie Miller – umpire," "Elkhorn Valley golf Course."

GENLBUS.gambling: Casinos, race tracks, and gambling. Examples: "Dave's Casino Inc.," "Intl Game Technology," "RST Gaming Commission."

GENLBUS.lodgingtourism: Lodging and tourism. Examples: "Avalon travel," "Bents Fort Inn," "Kootznoowoo Inlet Lodge."

GENLBUS.business_unidentifiable: Unidentifiable business. Examples: "Bruning Holdings, LLC," "Somet Co.," "Kresbach's Inc."

GENLBUS.business_misc: Miscellaneous business. Examples: "Jail Industries Board," "Rocky Flats Local Imports Initiative," "Atlanta Export Import Company."

GENLBUS.chemicals: Chemicals. Examples: "Hermitage Explosives Corp.," "Dow Chemical pension," "DuPont."

GENLBUS.steel: Steel. Examples: "ARMCO pension," "Gulf States Steel," "NUCOR, Inc."

GENLBUS.mfgdistrib_misc: Miscellaneous manufacturing and distribution. Examples: "Gillette Co.," "Alumex," "Federal Mogul."

GENLBUS.textiles: Textiles. Examples: "Culp Inc.," "Hostal Cleemore (sp?)," "Reltex Corp. COM"

UNION.bldgtradeunion: Building trade unions. Examples: "Bricklayer Pension Fund," "Carpenters Local #606," "Carpenters union."

UNION.industrialunions: Industrial unions. Examples: "United Steelworkers of America," "UMWA," "IBEW loca 48."

UNION.transportunions: Transportation unions. Examples: "Brotherhood of locomotive engineers," "United auto workers local 838," "Teamsters local union."

UNION.publicunions: Public unions. Examples: "NDEA-NEA," "WA State Council of Firefighters," "CSEA pension."

UNION.unions_misc: Miscellaneous unions. Examples: "SD AFL-CIO," "Utah AFL-CIO," "SEIU Retirement Fund."

POLITICAL.politaffiliation: Political affiliations. Examples: "Islip town Republican committee," "Missourians for Kit Bond," "National Order of Women Legislators."

POLITICAL.ideological: General ideology / single-issue groups. Examples: "Albany Senior Citizens," "Anti-Defamation League," "SPCA."

POLITICAL.environmental: Environmental groups. Examples: "South Valley Sanctuary," "Sothern Pine EPA," "March for Parks."

POLITICAL.nativeamerican: Native American groups. Examples: "Chugach Alaska Corporation," "Mississippi Band of Choctow Indians."

POLITICAL.proguns: Pro-gun groups. Examples: "NRA," "Second Amendment Foundation."

POLITICAL.prolife: Pro-life groups. Examples: "Tennessee Right to Life," "Natl Right to Life," "Ohio Right to Life."

POLITICAL.prochoice: Pro-choice groups. Examples: "MT NARAL," "Oregon Naral (sp?)," "2 to 1 Coalition."

OTHER.nonprofits: Nonprofits. Examples: "United Way of Delaware County," "YMCA," "MS Arts commission."

OTHER.educationtotal: Education. NOTE: THIS VARIABLE INCLUDES LEGISLATORS ORIGINALLY CODED WITH EDUCATION (CatOrder W04), AS WELL AS LEGISLATORS WITH INTERESTS CODED AS GOVERNMENT (CatOrder G01, G02, G03, G04) WHERE THE INTEREST NAME CONTAINED THE REGULAR EXPRESSIONS *EDUCATION*, *SCHOOL*, *COLLEGE*, *UNIVERSITY*, OR *TEACHER*. Examples: "Madison public schools," "Lexington Christian Academy," "Bd of Education."

OTHER.religion: Churches, clergy, and religious organizations. Examples: "Interfaith Ministries," "Springhill Baptist Church," "West Englewood United Methodist Church."

OTHER.welfmil: Welfare and military. Examples: “Naval reserves,” “US Army pension,” “Adelphi University School of Social Work.”

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS:

Coded as dummy variables; 1 if legislator is recorded as serving on the committee. Committee names vary from chamber to chamber and are generally recorded as presented in original documentary sources, sometimes including abbreviations.

Because committee jurisdictions and names are not comparable between chambers, committee assignments appear only in the chamber-specific files such as “ak_h.csv”. The first committee appears immediately to the right of the interest “OTHER.welfmil”.

Users should be aware that the legislatures of Massachusetts, Maine, and Connecticut use joint committees for all of their substantive committees (though they retain some single-chamber “housekeeping” committees), and that other chambers may use joint committees that are not clearly marked as joint.

Appendix 1 - NPAT Questions Used To Create Bridge Votes

The following questions were coded as a vote, or set of votes. The “principles” correspond to the section of the NPAT where respondents are presented with a list of principles or statements and asked to indicate which they support, with no option for those they oppose. “Y/N/U” indicates that respondents were asked to answer “Yes,” “No,” or “Uncertain” to a question (with nonresponse an additional option), and “1–6” indicates that respondents were asked to choose a category within that range, with nonresponse an additional option.

Abortion

Principles

Abortions should always be legally available.

Abortions should be legal only within the first trimester of pregnancy.

Abortions should be legal only when pregnancy resulted from incest, rape, or when the life of the woman is endangered.

Abortions should be legal only when the life of the woman is endangered.

Abortions should always be illegal.

Abortions should be limited by waiting periods and parental notification requirements.

Prohibit the late-term abortion procedure known as "partial-birth" abortion.

Support "buffer zones" by requiring demonstrators to stay at least 15 feet away from abortion clinic doorways and driveways.

Questions (Y/N/U)

Should (STATE NAME) government funding be provided to clinics and medical facilities that provide abortion services?

Affirmative action

Questions (Y/N/U)

Indicate the principles you support (if any) concerning affirmative action. State government agencies should take race and sex into account in the following sectors:

College and University admissions

Public employment

State contracting

Crime

Principles

Increase state funds for construction of state prisons and for hiring of additional prison staff.

Support contracting with private sector firms to build and/or manage state prisons.

End parole for repeat violent felons.

Support the use of the death penalty. (WORDING VARIES IN RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY)

Oppose the death penalty.

Implement penalties other than incarceration for certain non-violent offenders.

Inform communities when a convicted sex offender moves into the community.

Increase state funds for programs which rehabilitate and educate inmates during and after their prison sentences.

Decriminalize the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes.

Strengthen penalties and sentences for drug-related crimes.

Strengthen penalties and sentences for sex offenders.

Lower the blood-alcohol-content limit defining drunk driving. (WORDING VARIES IN RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY)

Prosecute juveniles who commit murder or other serious violent crimes as adults.

Economy and Unemployment

Principles

Provide low interest loans and tax credits for starting, expanding, or relocating businesses.

Reduce state government regulations on the private sector in order to encourage investment and economic expansion.

Support limits on cash damages in lawsuits against businesses and professionals for product liability or malpractice.

Increase funding for state job-training programs that retrain displaced workers or teach skills needed in today's job market.

Education

Principles

Increase state funds for professional development of public school teachers and administrators.

Encourage private or corporate investment in public school programs.

Provide parents with state-funded vouchers to send their children to any participating school (public, private, religious).

Favor charter schools where independent groups receive state authorization and funding to establish new schools.

Support sex education programs which stress abstinence.

Support sex education programs which stress safe sexual practices.

Increase state funds for school construction and facility maintenance.

Increase state funds for hiring of additional teachers.

Endorse teacher-led voluntary prayer in public schools.

Environment

Principles

Require the use of cleaner burning fuels in order to prevent pollution.

Support "self-audit" legislation which creates incentives for industries to audit themselves and clean up pollution.

Require a cost/benefit analysis to determine the economic impact of proposed environmental regulations before they are implemented.

Require the state to fully compensate citizens when environmental regulations limit uses on privately owned land.

Provide funding for recycling programs in [STATE].

Request added flexibility from the federal government in enforcing and funding federal environmental regulations.

Suspend participation in unfunded, federally mandated environmental protection legislation.

Restructure the electric utility industry to allow consumers to choose their power company.

Questions (Y/N/U)

State environmental regulations should not be stricter than federal law. (WORDING VARIES; IN SOME STATES THIS APPEARS AS "SHOULD BE STRICTER" AND WE REVERSED THE POLARITY IN OUR CODING)

Government reform

Questions (Y/N/U)

Do you support limits on the number of terms of the following [STATE] officials?

State Representatives and Senators (WORDING VARIES IN RELATION TO LEGISLATIVE TITELS OF STATE)

Governor

Do you support limiting the following types of contributions to state legislative candidates?

Individuals

PACs

Corporations

Do you support requiring full and timely disclosure of campaign finance information?

Do you support imposing spending limits on state level political campaigns?

Do you support partial funding from state taxes for state level political campaigns?

Would you vote to ratify an amendment to the U.S. Constitution requiring an annual balanced federal budget?

Firearms

Principles

Ban the sale or transfer of all forms of semi-automatic weapons.

Increase state restrictions on the purchase and possession of firearms.

Maintain state restrictions on the purchase and possession of firearms.

Ease state restrictions on the purchase and possession of firearms.

Repeal state restrictions on the purchase and possession of firearms by law-abiding citizens.

Favor allowing citizens to carry concealed firearms.

Require manufacturers to provide child-safety locks with firearms.

Health care

Principles

Provide tax incentives to small businesses that provide health care to their employees.

Ensure that citizens have access to basic health care, through managed care, insurance reforms, or state funded care where necessary.

Provide health care to uninsured children by expanding Medicaid. (WORDING VARIES IN RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY)

Transfer more existing Medicaid recipients into managed care programs. (WORDING VARIES IN RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY)

Use state funds to continue some Medicaid coverage for legal immigrants.

Limit the amount of damages that can be awarded in medical malpractice lawsuits.

Guaranteeing medical care to all citizens is not a responsibility of state government.

Social issues

Principles

Increase state funding for programs to prevent teen pregnancy.

Provide tax credits for businesses that provide child care for their employees.

Increase state funds to provide child care to children in low-income working families.

Deny or suspend state-issued permits and licenses to parents who are delinquent in paying court-ordered child support.

Favor banning smoking in public places. Increase state funding for Head Start in order to serve additional children and/or increase services from a half to a full day.

Increase state funding for community centers and other social agencies in areas with at-risk youth.

Support state funding of programs for at-risk youth such as guaranteed college loans and job training and placement.

Questions (Y/N/U)

Do you believe that the [STATE] government should include sexual orientation in [STATE]'s anti-discrimination laws?

Do you believe that the [STATE] government should recognize same-sex marriages?

Welfare

Principles

Maintain the current time limits on welfare benefits. (WORDING VARIES IN RELATION TO EXISTING POLICY)

Require that able-bodied recipients participate in work activities in order to receive benefits.

Increase employment and job training programs for welfare recipients.

Provide tax incentives to businesses that hire welfare recipients.

Provide child care for welfare recipients who work.

Increase access to public transportation for welfare recipients who work.

Allow welfare recipients to remain eligible for benefits while saving money for education, starting a business, or buying a home.

Limit benefits given to recipients if they have additional children while on welfare.

Eliminate government-funded welfare programs.

Spending (1—6)

Agriculture

Education (K-12)

Education (Higher)

Environment

Health care

Law enforcement

Transportation infrastructure (highways, roads, bridges)

Welfare

Taxation (1—6)

Alcohol taxes

Capital gains taxes

Cigarette taxes

Corporate taxes

Gas taxes

Income taxes (incomes below \$75,000)

Income taxes (incomes above \$75,000)

Property taxes

Sales taxes