Appendix

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics: The percentages of legislators from insurance backgrounds and the ratio of insurance bills to the overall size of the legislative agenda.

State	Pct. Legislators			Agenda Ratio		
	2007	*2009*	*2011*	*2007*	*2009*	*2011*
AK	1.67	1.67	1.67	0.33	0.20	0.24
AZ	4.44	4.44	4.44	0.13	0.13	0.16
CA	0	1.67	0.83	0.40	0.44	--
CO	0	0	0	0.63	0.53	0.32
CT	1.07	0.53	1.07	0.14	0.17	0.16
FL	4.38	3.13	2.5	0.46	0.33	0.34
GA	4.66	4.66	5.08	0.32	0.32	0.38
ID	3.81	4.76	3.81	0.15	0.15	0.13
IL	3.39	2.82	2.26	0.12	0.14	0.09
IN	4.00	2.67	4.00	0.17	0.18	0.41
IA	4.00	4.00	3.33	0.18	0.33	0.24
KS	1.21	1.21	1.82	0.37	0.29	0.31
KY	4.35	3.62	2.90	0.26	0.17	0.22
MD	2.13	2.13	2.66	0.16	0.19	0.21
MA	1.50	1.50	2.00	0.07	0.09	0.09
MI	2.70	2.03	2.70	0.23	0.23	0.15
MN	1.00	2.49	2.99	0.12	0.14	0.15
NE	4.08	2.04	2.04	0.21	0.32	0.29
NV	1.59	1.59	0	0.22	0.27	0.24
NJ	2.5	0.83	0.83	0.15	0.16	0.16
NY	0.47	0.47	0.94	0.11	0.12	0.09
NC	2.35	1.76	1.18	0.14	0.21	0.24
ND	3.55	3.55	2.84	0.22	0.30	0.35
OK	2.01	2.68	3.36	0.90	1.10	1.11
PA	2.37	1.98	1.58	0.13	0.16	0.11
SC	4.71	4.12	4.12	0.22	0.18	0.32
TN	6.06	6.82	6.82	0.09	0.13	0.11
TX	3.31	3.31	2.21	0.16	0.23	0.19
WI	0.76	0.76	2.27	0.25	0.19	0.14
WY	1.11	1.11	1.11	0.16	0.46	0.22

*Note*s: Percent legislators is the number of state legislators with work experience in the insurance industry divided by the total number of legislative seats in both chambers. Agenda ratio the count of insurance-related bills and amendments in the state from Lexis-Nexis divided by the count of introduced bills from the *Book of the States*. Because these data are from different sources, the agenda ratio score should be interpreted as an indicator of relative attention rather than a percent of the state's total agenda devoted to insurance.

Table A2: Negative Binomial Regression Models Relating the Volume of Insurance Legislation to the Share of State Lawmakers from Insurance Backgrounds for 2007

	(1)	(2)
Percent of lawmakers from insurance	-0.14* (0.07)	-0.05 (0.05)
Percent of population employed in insurance	-0.14* (0.06)	0.01 (0.07)
Democratic control of state legislature (ind.)	-0.49+ (0.28)	-0.37 (0.23)
Number of insurance lobbying groups	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Legislative professionalism	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.00 (0.05)
Year fixed effects	Yes	n/a
Total # of bills (offset)	Yes	Yes
Intercept	4.40* (0.59)	3.49 (0.41)
Data Source	Authors	NCSL
Years	'07, '09, '11	'07
N	83	49
BIC	1163.97	692.17

Source: Authors' data collection and NCSL.
Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Nebraska is excluded in both models because party control cannot be measured in its nonpartisan legislature. Missing observations in Model 1 are due to missing data for legislative professionalism.
+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, two tailed.

Table A3: Models Replicating Model 3 in Table 1 Using Alternatives to Negative Binomial Regression

	Negative Binomial	Ordinary Least Squares	Poisson	Neg. Bin. (Omitting Potential Outliers)
Percent of lawmakers	-0.14*	-16.63	-0.16*	-0.14*
from insurance	(0.07)	(18.66)	(0.08)	(0.07)
Percent of population	-0.14*	-6.85	-0.11	-0.14*
employed in insurance	(0.06)	(22.58)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Democratic control of	-0.49+	-86.52	-0.68*	-0.47+
state legislature (ind.)	(0.28)	(114.48)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Number of insurance	0.00	3.32*	-0.00	0.00
lobbying groups	(0.00)	(1.23)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Legislative	-0.04	55.50	-0.05	-0.05
professionalism	(0.06)	(39.39)	(0.09)	(0.06)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total # of bills	Offset	Control	Offset	Offset
Intercept	4.40*	287.30	4.38**	4.34*
	(0.59)	(208.69)	(0.69)	(0.60)
N	83	83	83	80
BIC	1163.97		13367.24	1090.28
R-squared		0.68		

Source: Authors' data collection.
Notes: Models use robust standard errors clustered by state. Nebraska is excluded because party control cannot be measured in its nonpartisan legislature.
+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, two tailed

Table A4: Models Replicating Models 2 and 3 of Table 1 including a Lagged DV

	(2)	(3)
Percent of lawmakers	-0.02	-0.13*
from insurance	(0.06)	(0.07)
Percent of population		-0.12*
employed in insurance		(0.05)
Democratic control of		-0.41*
state legislature (ind.)		(0.19)
Number of insurance		-0.00
lobbying groups		(0.00)
Legislative		-0.16*
professionalism		(0.07)
Volume of legislation	0.00	0.00
in previous term	(0.00)	(0.00)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Total # of bills (offset)	Yes	Yes
Intercept	3.06*	4.02*
	(0.25)	(0.39)
N	89	83
BIC	1243.07	1153.03

Source: Authors' data collection.
Notes: Models use robust standard errors clustered by state.
Missing observations in Model 3 are due to missing data for
party control in Nebraska and legislative professionalism.
$+ p < 0.10$, $* p < 0.05$, two tailed

Table A5: Bivariate Models for Each Year of Observation Using Negative Binomial Regression

	(2007)	(2009)	(2011)
Percent of lawmakers	-0.16*	-0.08	-0.06
from insurance	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Intercept	6.67*	6.54*	6.23*
	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)
N	30	30	29
BIC	437.55	444.87	413.14

Source: Authors' data collection.
Notes: Missing data for California in 2011. * $p < 0.05$, two tailed

Table A6: Direction of Introduced Bills by Sponsors' Professional Backgrounds in Human Coded Data

	Insurance Professional	No Insurance Professional
Pro-industry	32 (54.2%)	165 (45.2%)
Anti-industry	27 (45.8%)	200 (54.8%)
Unknown	15 (20.3%)	61 (14.3%)
Total	74	426

Source: Author's data collection. Column percentages reported under bill counts. $\chi^2 = 3.31$, p = 0.19.

Table A7: Are Insurer-Legislators More Involved in Insurance Bills? (Table 2, By State)

state	# ins. bills	% involving insurer	% insurer sponsored	% insurers in state leg
AK	20	10.0	5.0	1.67
AZ	84	8.3	8.3	4.44
CA	90	6.7	1.1	0
CO	13	0.0	0.0	0
CT	104	27.9	0.0	1.07
FL	133	6.8	6.8	4.38
GA	61	42.6	42.6	4.66
IA	52	46.2	11.5	4.00
ID	43	39.5	0.0	3.81
IL	60	8.3	8.3	3.39
IN	104	16.3	16.3	4.00
KS	49	42.9	2.0	1.21
KY	78	15.4	15.4	4.35
MA	248	0.8	0.0	1.50
MD	186	10.8	10.2	2.13
MI	157	13.4	13.4	2.70
MN	138	31.2	31.2	1.00
NC	23	26.1	26.1	2.35
ND	35	28.6	11.4	3.55
NE	34	2.9	2.9	4.08
NJ	232	0.4	0.4	2.5
NV	34	0.0	0.0	1.59
NY	796	1.1	1.1	0.47
OK	211	23.7	23.7	2.01
PA	180	26.1	26.1	2.37
SC	125	18.4	18.4	4.71
TN	160	26.3	26.3	6.06
TX	195	7.7	7.7	3.31
WI	37	54.1	54.1	0.76
WY	24	4.2	4.2	1.11

Source: Authors' data collection. Columns report state post abbreviations; the number of insurance-related bills in each state during the 2011-2012 legislative session; the percentage of insurance bills for which a former insurer was a sponsor, cosponsor, committee chair, or committee member (the "Total" row in Table 2); the percentage of insurance bills for which a former insurer was a sponsor; that were sponsored the state-level percentages of insurer-related bills (the "Primary sponsor" row in Table 2); and the percentage of state legislators who had worked in insurance.