

The Initiative Process and Policy Innovation in the American States*

October 2, 2019

Abstract

We utilize a new policy adoption database with over 500 policies to test whether the initiative process influences the timing of policy adoption. Prior studies have produced both supportive and null findings of the effect of the initiative, but typically examine policies one policy or a single composite score at a time. The theoretical literature argues that the initiative process should have heterogeneous effects based on the configuration of public and government preferences. By pooling hundreds of policies we are able to estimate the average effect of the initiative process on state policy adoption more systematically while also evaluating the variation of its effect. We find via a pooled Event History Analysis that the initiative on average increases innovativeness, but that this effect can be cancelled out by signature distribution requirements. We find that this effect varies substantially across policies and is more consistently positive on average in states with higher citizen liberalism. We also find evidence that the initiative process moderates the effect of ideology on policy adoption, while making the adoption of non-ideological policies more likely on average.

Keywords: Initiative, Innovation, Diffusion, State Politics, Policy

*Funding for this research provided by NSF grants #1558509 and #1637095. The authors would like to thank Daniel Lewis for valuable feedback at the 2018 Midwest Political Science Association Conference.

Does the initiative process influence legislatures and affect the policies being proposed and passed in the U.S. states? The initiative process has been theorized to act as a “gun behind the door”, pushing legislatures to adopt policies closer to median citizen preferences (Gerber 1996) and reducing “friction” in the legislature (Matsusaka 2004). With less friction, legislatures face fewer obstacles that can slow down or prevent policies from moving towards voters’ preferences. The initiative process therefore encourages the legislature to be more responsive to public opinion. Both the direct effect – voters passing initiatives – and indirect effect – legislatures responding to the threat of future initiatives – of the initiative process can increase responsiveness to the median voter and thereby alter policy choices.

As these arguments and the broader literature makes clear, the initiative process does not necessarily increase or decrease a state’s tendency to adopt a given policy or to choose a higher or lower level of that policy. Rather it encourages legislators to adopt policies more in line with the median voter’s preferred outcome. Depending on the relative location of their ideal points, this could mean that the initiative pushes policy to the right (or higher), to the left (or lower), or has no effect at all. Moreover, the direction could vary within a policy based on the actual configurations of preferences across states. Historically scholars have evaluated the effect of the initiative within a single policy by determining whether policy outcomes in initiative states appear to more closely reflect public opinion. For example, Matsusaka (2004) finds that the initiative decreased state spending in the late twentieth century while it increased it in the early twentieth century, both in line with contemporaneous public preferences.

The challenge in work along these lines, i.e., modeling outcomes as a function of preferences, involves knowing which direction the initiative might move policy given its multiple possible effects. Scholars have typically addressed this by remaining agnostic about the direction and then determining whether a difference exists or by hypothesizing a direction between opinion and outcomes and then evaluating whether the initiative leads to a quicker or larger movement in that direction (see Matsusaka (2001) for an extended discussion of this approach). Leemann and Wasserfallen (2016) approach this head-on by measuring binary policy outcomes along with survey data

on elite and public opinion on those policies across Swiss cantons. They find that policy tends to better reflect voters' wishes in cantons with more extensive direct democracy opportunities. Lupia et al. (2010) employ a similar approach to show that direct democracy institutions were critical for determining whether states translated opposition to same-sex marriage into an explicit ban on it.

The theoretical arguments and recent work therefore underscore that the initiative process can be both a driver of policy change and policy stasis. That is, it can lead to policy change either directly via the ballot or indirectly through legislative moderation or it can slow policy change by providing a brake on legislative attempts to change policy in a way that gets ahead of public opinion. Yet few studies attempt to assess or catalog these differing influences. In fact, we know of no study that systematically analyzes the full range of effects of the initiative on policy change. Matsusaka (2018) comes the closest by reviewing (and occasionally revisiting) the findings of multiple studies. He concludes that the initiative process consistently affects policy but does not focus on the range or direction of the findings.

This paper seeks to fill that gap more systematically by reviewing the theoretical predictions for the influence of the initiative process on policy change, with specific attention to the heterogeneous nature of the relationship. In particular, we consider the effect on the adoption of a binary policy outcome. Whereas Leemann and Wasserfallen (2016) focus on the tendency for the initiative to induce congruence between outcomes and voters' preferences, we focus on the possibly differential effects on policy adoption. That is, the initiative may make states either more or less likely to adopt a new policy. This integrates our study into the policy innovation and diffusion literature and its standard method of event history analysis (EHA), which since Berry and Berry (1990) has been used to model why some states adopt policies faster than others. This includes studies that use EHA to evaluate the effect of the initiative process on whether and when states adopt new policies (e.g. Schildkraut 2001; Boehmke 2005a). These questions go to a key debate regarding the initiative process and direct democracy more broadly: is it a progressive institution that encourages policy change or does it sometimes promote and sometimes limit policy change depending on the circumstances?

Conventional EHA methods offer a way to study policy adoption one policy at a time. Given our goal of evaluating the full range of the possible effects of the initiative process, however, a single-policy EHA offers little advantage. We therefore draw on new data and methods that allow us to examine these effects in a large number of policy areas within a fairly parsimonious model. We obtain data on the years of adoption for over five hundred policies from the State Policy Innovation and Diffusion (SPID) database (Boehmke et al. 2018), which allows us to examine the influence of the initiative on an unprecedented scale. The SPID database includes well-known, documented cases of the initiative's effect, such as tax and expenditure limitations arising from the Tax Revolt and emblemized by California's Proposition 13 in 1978, but it also includes many other cases less obviously suitable to influence by direct democracy, such as state regulations on licensing accountants. To manage the analysis of these data, we employ pooled event history analysis (PEHA) which brings together the estimation of multiple policies into a single model that can simultaneously account for heterogeneous effects across policies Kreitzer and Boehmke (2016).

Evaluating the effect of the initiative with so many policies offers three primary advantages. First, we avoid the idiosyncrasies inherent in single-policy studies: e.g., is the policy so salient that all states will adopt quickly and leave no opportunity for the initiative to matter? Are there sufficiently well-resourced advocates to propose or credibly threaten a ballot measure? Is there a gap between legislative preferences and the median voter for the initiative to correct? Second, using so many policies greatly increases our power to detect a possibly small but consistent average effect that might exist but be difficult to pin down with only one policy area. Third, combining the SPID data with PEHA allows us to capture the theoretically expected heterogeneous effect of the initiative across policies either by employing random coefficients or by subsample analysis for clusters of policies.

Using these methods we find consistent evidence of an average effect on the order of a one percentage point increase in the probability of adopting a new policy. This effect decreases from a little over 1.5 percentage points for states with modest signature requirements to nearly zero

percentage points for those with very large signature requirements or a distribution requirement. Moreover, and as expected, we find heterogeneity in the direction of the effect across groups of policies based on a general measure of citizen preferences. On a policy-by-policy basis we find that for the majority of policies initiative states are neither more nor less likely to adopt the policy. Yet when we group the policies by their ideological direction, i.e., does ideology matter and if so in what direction, we find that the initiative consistently increases the chance of adoption for ideologically neutral policies. For more ideologically oriented policies, we find symmetric effects based on the direction of influence: the initiative increases the change of adoption when the baseline chance of adoption is low but decreases the chance of adoption at the other extreme.

Theories of the Initiative Process and Policy Outcomes

Beginning in the late 1890s, Progressive reformers aggressively pushed states to adopt the initiative process. Reformers hoped that citizen-driven direct democracy would help reduce corruption by bypassing state legislatures and taking policy-making authority away from special interests (Bowler, Donovan and Tolbert 1998). Progressives initially had great success, with twenty states adopting the initiative from this period until the early 1920s. Today, twenty-four states have some form of the initiative process. Successful initiatives have restricted the legislature's ability to raise taxes, banned same-sex marriage, or legalized recreational marijuana. Despite these high-profile examples, citizens typically use this institution somewhat infrequently, with roughly 2500 measures in all states over the last one-hundred and ten years (Matsusaka 2017). This corresponds to between one and two initiatives per election for each initiative state, although the number of initiatives has increased in recent decades relative the middle of the twentieth century. A number of factors governing access to the ballot shape the frequency of use, most notably the magnitude of signature requirements and the presence of geographic distribution requirements (Boehmke 2005*b*). High signature requirements make it difficult for groups with limited resources to qualify initiatives on the ballot. Even initiatives that do qualify tend not to pass, with over sixty percent failing at the ballot box. Ballot initiatives can have a major effect on state policy, but successful adoption through this method is somewhat rare.

The initiative process has been shown to have a wide variety of effects on state politics and policy. Matsusaka's 2018 comprehensive survey of previous work on direct democracy found that overall, the initiative results in more socially and fiscally conservative policy in the US on average, and that policies are more congruent with public opinion in initiative states. This is because the initiative is theorized to give the median voter more power in determining state policy because their vote is crucial in determining whether an initiative can successfully override the legislature (Gerber 1996).

Researchers seeking to explore the effects of the initiative on policy outcomes typically rely on mathematical models of the state policymaking process. These models build on Romer and Rosenthal's (1979) setter model by allowing initiative proponents to select any policy to challenge the status quo via election. Gerber (1996) sets forth such a model with a one-dimensional policy space and three actors: the median Legislator, the initiative Proponent, and the median Voter. In states without the initiative process, the legislature chooses policy; in initiative states that policy can be challenged by an initiative subject to a cost. Subsequent models consider variations on the basic assumptions by adding uncertainty over voter preference (Matsusaka 2001) or by accounting for pivotal actors in government (Boehmke, Osborn and Schilling 2015).

These models generally conclude that the presence of the initiative process produces policy outcomes no further from the median voter's ideal point than expected without the initiative and sometimes closer.¹ Whether it does so depends on the location of players' ideal points and the cost of proposing an initiative. Collecting signatures and campaigning for an initiative is costly, so initiatives should only be proposed under the right conditions. If there is not a threat of an initiative being proposed, then the initiative process is unlikely to have an effect on the status quo. Typically the threat increases as policies deviate further from voters' preferences and as the cost of proposing an initiative decreases.

Models of the initiative identify legislative policy moderation as the primary mechanism for policy influence. Known as the indirect effect of the initiative process, legislative moderation oc-

¹See Matsusaka (2018) for a broad summary of models of the initiative process and related mechanisms like the referendum.

curs when the legislature passes a policy closer to voters than it otherwise would to avoid triggering an initiative proposal. In contrast, the direct effect occurs when the legislature does not completely deter a ballot measure that ultimately passes.² Through either mechanism, however, the moderating effect of the initiative produces greater congruence between policy outcomes and the median voter's preference. Importantly, the prediction of enhanced congruence does not mean that policy in initiative states will move in any particular direction. Moderation could mean moving policy leftwards or rightwards towards voters depending on the relative location of actors' ideal points in the policy space.

These predictions persist in models that focus on a binary policy space. This special case has received attention since tests of the effect of the initiative process often occur with binary policy data, e.g., does a state adopt a lottery or not?, since many policies are difficult to place precisely in a continuous space. Boehmke (2005a) focuses on the question of policy adoption when the legislature prefers the status quo of not adopting and finds that the chance of policy adoption increases with the probability that voters prefer the change and decreases with the cost of proposing an initiative. Leemann and Wasserfallen (2016) expand on this by exploring the case in which the legislature prefers adoption as well as when it does not. They confirm the findings from the continuous policy models that the presence of the initiative increases policy congruence and that that this tendency increases as initiatives become less costly.

Table 1 presents a summary of the four relevant scenarios in the binary policy context. We summarize the effect in terms of policy adoption rather than on policy congruence to highlight the range of effects the initiative might have on adoption. This treats the status quo as zero and asks whether policy moves or not. Consistent with Leemann and Wasserfallen (2016), when voter and legislative preferences coincide the ability to propose initiatives will not affect policy outcomes. But when they differ the initiative will matter. When voters want to adopt and the legislature does not, the initiative provides a motivation for the legislature to move policy, or a means for voters to do so when it does not. When the legislature wants to adopt the policy but voters do not the former

²While ballot measures do not occur in Gerber's (1996) original model, subsequent work shows they may happen via uncertainty about voters (Matusaka 2001) or legislative gridlock (Boehmke, Osborn and Schilling 2015).

could move policy with no hesitation in non-initiative states, but in initiative states the legislature knows that its decision could be subsequently reversed by voters. In a world of costless legislating this might not concern it, but if producing legislation is costly – whether on its own terms or in the opportunity cost of not revising other policies – then this threat of reversal may deter the legislature from acting. These predictions can be interpreted probabilistically since in both of the previously described models the location of voters is not known with certainty. Thus, as the probability that voters prefer a move from zero to one increases the presence of the initiative process makes such a move more likely. In contrast, as the probability that voters prefer a policy change decreases the initiative will lead to a small chance of policy adoption.

In sum then, despite a consistent effect on congruence the initiative process can have multiple effects on adoption depending on the configuration of preferences and the costs of proposal. In some cases it can promote adoption, in other cases it can slow or halt adoption, and in yet other cases it will have no effect. We emphasize adoption because empirical tests often rely on binary policy adoption data and many of these have merely tested whether the initiative increases the chance of adoption (e.g. Boehmke 2005a; Schildkraut 2001). While this may be appropriate for a given policy and preference configuration, it does not capture the full range of the possible effects of the initiative process on state policy adoption. We seek to address that by modeling the adoption of over 500 policies in order to evaluate the full range of initiative effects and the relative frequency of each. But first we review the literature conducting empirical evaluations of the influence of the initiative process on policy outcomes.

Policy Specific Findings

The effects of the initiative have been tested in a variety of contexts. Many studies have found that the initiative influences state policy outcomes. Researchers have found that states with the initiative process are more likely to have restrictive abortion laws (Gerber 1996, 1999; Arcenaux 2002; Burden 2005), ban same-sex marriage (Haider-Markel, Querze and Lindman 2007; Lupia et al. 2010; Lewis 2011; Hume 2011), and allow the death penalty (Gerber 1999; Boehmke 2005a). The initiative makes states much more likely to adopt term limits in both the legislature (Bowler,

Donovan and Tolbert 1998; Bowler and Donovan 2004) and the executive branch (Matsusaka 2008). Initiative states tend to be more reliant on fees rather than taxes for spending (Matsusaka 1995, 2004), which may be related to initiative states being more permissive of lotteries (Jensen 2003) and tribal gaming (Boehmke 2005a). This set of findings indicates that the initiative may be empowering citizens to restrict social policies while also limiting the legislature both politically (through term limits) and financially (taxing and spending caps). In his comprehensive survey of research on direct democracy Matsusaka (2018) argues that the literature over the past few decades has found that initiative states tend to have lower spending and taxation levels, more conservative social policies, and are more likely to have policies congruent with public preferences. These effects are not constant, in earlier eras the initiative process increased spending levels in the states (Matsusaka 2004). It is theorized that more liberal mass publics in initiative states pulled policy to the left in the early twentieth century, while more conservative publics pulled policy to the right.

At the same time, there is also a literature that has found the initiative has no effect on policy outcomes. Early research on fiscal policy finds that states with the initiative process do not differ in state spending and taxation levels compared to noninitiative states (Lascher, Hagen and Rochlin 1996; Camobreco 1998). More recently, scholars have evaluated the initiative's influence on policy liberalism to move beyond policy specific findings and evaluate whether the initiative changes state policies in the aggregate. Using this approach Monogan, Gray and Lowery (2009) find no evidence that the initiative moves policy liberalism closer to public preferences. Caughey and Warshaw (2017) use a similar approach and find that the initiative does not alter responsiveness when measured from an aggregate, policy liberalism perspective. A null relationship is also found at the municipal level (Tausanovitch and Warshaw 2014). Collectively, these results suggest that the initiative does not consistently have an effect on state policy. Others have critiqued this approach because measures of the public and policy are not typically on the same scale, so researchers cannot know the relative location of actors and identify the initiative's conditional effect (Matsusaka 2001, 2018). Scholars can identify differences in policy outcome between initiative and not states using continuous measures, but will not be able to identify the extent to which policy is moving

closer (or farther) to public preferences without policy and opinion being on the same scale. Additionally, if the initiative makes policies more liberal in some states, but more conservative in others, scholars may misidentify the initiative as having no effect on policy, when in fact it has counterbalancing effects.

Others have tried to address some of the concerns examining responsiveness in general by developing measures of public opinion on specific policies to evaluate whether policies are congruent with opinion. Rather than using a continuous measure of the relative location of actors, scholars measure whether policy is aligned with the majority public opinion. Lax and Phillips (2009) first focus on gay rights and then expand to multiple policy areas 2012 and find no relationship between the initiative process and policy congruence. Matsusaka (2010), on the other hand, finds higher rates of policy congruence in initiative states on 10 policy issues. Matsusaka (2018) examines the divergent findings through a replication of Lax and Phillips's (2012) results and finds that initiative states have higher levels of congruence on some issue areas, but not others.

As underscored earlier, theory and empirical research on direct democracy indicate that its effects depend on the institutional and political environment. Differences in findings across may result merely from this expected heterogeneity. Direct democracy will have its greatest positive effect on policy adoption when there is a large difference between public opinion and policy, and its largest negative effect on policy adoption when the status quo is very close to public preferences. To properly evaluate the effect of the initiative process on policy outcomes, then, requires calculating its effects across a wide range of policies. Yet despite the rich tradition of research in direct democracy, to our knowledge no study has tested the effect of ballot initiatives on a large number of policies. Only a select few studies (Lax and Phillips 2012; Matsusaka 2010) use more than a handful of policies to test the policy effects of direct democracy. We argue that a systematic study of hundreds of policies can allow us to identify the average effect of ballot initiatives on policy innovation, and the measure the heterogeneous effect of the initiative process in a single, unified sample.

Policy Database and Pooled Event History Analysis

To identify the heterogeneous effect of the initiative process across a large sample of policies we draw on the State Policy Innovation and Diffusion (SPID) database (Boehmke et al. 2018). SPID records state policy adoptions over the last two hundred years for over seven hundred policies and has broad, representative coverage of policy topic areas including criminal justice, health, education, commerce, civil rights (Boehmke et al. N.d.). This provides a systematic set of policies to evaluate the relationship between the initiative process and policy adoption. The database also incorporates policies that have widely diffused to all fifty states as well as policies that have only diffused to a few states. Given limitations arising from our control variables we restrict our analysis to observations between 1972 and 2014, resulting in five hundred forty-six policies and 12,164 policy adoptions across the fifty US states. To our knowledge this is roughly ten times larger than the current largest multiple-policy analysis of the initiative's effect (Lax and Phillips 2012). The number of adoptions by policy ranges from two to fifty.³

To analyze these data we employ a variant of event history analysis (EHA). EHA been the technique of choice for studying the timing of state policy adoption for nearly three decades since Berry and Berry (1990) first used to study the adoption of state lotteries. It is appropriate for examining the binary decision of whether to adopt or not to adopt a policy (Box-Steffensmeier and Jones 2004). Failing to incorporate the timing of policy change into models evaluating the effect of the initiative process (or any other factors) risks drawing faulty conclusions. For example, if initiative states adopt a given policy more quickly than other states, cross-sectional analyses done early on will find a large effect whereas those done later will find a smaller effect, if any, as more noninitiative states adopt. Further, failing to account for how the initiative and other covariates change over time can lead to misattribution of effects. While EHA has been employed in some studies (Schildkraut 2001; Boehmke 2005a), the majority of research has used cross-sectional approaches (Gerber 1999; Lascher, Hagen and Rochlin 1996, e.g.).

³We include any policy that starts diffusing in 1972 as well as policies that started before 1972 if they have at least 20 observations from 1972 on and at least one adoption each by initiative and non-initiative states. Models were also estimated using only policies that began diffusion in 1972 or later

In order to account for the possibility of heterogeneous effects of the initiative process, we turn to a recent variant of EHA, Pooled Event History Analysis (PEHA). PEHA joins multiple policies into one model to leverage the common features of adoption across policies while also providing opportunities to capture heterogeneity across policies (Kreitzer and Boehmke 2016). Casting PEHA as a multilevel model offers a variety of ways to account for heterogeneity across policies or states. Of most interest here, differences across policies can be permitted by random or fixed effects, random coefficients, or with explicit interactions (Kreitzer and Boehmke 2016). In contrast to standard EHA models, the unit of analysis is state-policy-year, so the dependent variable is the probability a state adopts a given policy in each year (adoption is a binary indicator). Similar to standard EHA, a policy does not enter the data set until the first state adoption of that policy. Once this occurs, all nonadopting states enter the risk set and with the adoption variable coded zero until the year they adopt the policy. After adoption all future state-policy-year observations are dropped as the state is no longer at risk of adopting the policy.

Our analysis of the data proceeds in three steps corresponding to increasingly heterogeneous PEHA specifications. Our first models assume a consistent, homogeneous effect of the initiative process. This allows us to recover an estimate of the average effect across policies: does the initiative generally tend to increase, decrease, or not influence the rate of policy adoption? We then allow the effect of the initiative to vary randomly across policies via a random coefficient. With this specification, we can identify the average effect of the initiative across hundreds of policies as well as the variation of this effect across policies. These quantities allow us to explicitly test for heterogeneity and then examine the estimated distribution to determine its range across policies. Finally, we allow the effect of the initiative process to vary with voter ideology. We do so both with separate EHA models and via a PEHA model that allows for three distinct effects of the initiative-ideology interaction: one for policies favored by conservative states, one for those favored by liberal states, and one for policies with no apparent ideological appeal. We do this to determine whether the initiative merely changes the average baseline chance of adoption or whether it enhances the effect of public opinion. A single interaction across all policies would tend

to average out such differences if they depend on the ideological appeal of a given policy.

Our primary variable for testing these effects is a binary indicator that distinguishes between initiative and non-initiative states, but we include additional variable to account for differences in the initiative process across states. To test the modifying effects of the costs of qualifying and passing a measure, we include the signature requirement for qualification and an indicator for geographic distribution requirements. The signature requirements variable is an average of the constitutional and statutory initiative signature requirements if states permit both. The lower the signature requirements, the easier it is for proponents to place an initiative on the ballot, making the threat of initiatives stronger and more credible.⁴ We expect the effect of signatures and distribution requirements to work in the opposite direction of the binary initiative indicator: a positive indicator should match with a negative effect of these cost variables that reduces the former towards zero.

We also include a series of controls common in the policy adoption literature. These fall into two categories: internal and external determinants. Internal determinants typically seek to capture the presence of resources that allow states to explore and adopt new policies (Berry and Berry 1990) as well as policy-specific measures of policy demand or need. Given our wide range of policies we focus on variables related to resources and need such as total population, state income per capita, and Squire's measure of state legislative professionalism, which is a based upon legislator salary, time demands such as the length of legislative sessions, and the number of staff available to assist with legislative duties (Squire 2007). Initiative signature and distribution requirements are from *The Book of the States*. To capture demand we account for citizen ideology (Berry et al. 2010) and unified control of state government (Klarner 2013). Since we expect ideology to have differing effects across policies (even when not incorporated into the effect of the initiative process) we follow Kreitzer and Boehmke (2016) by including a random coefficient for ideology.

Studies of policy diffusion have long acknowledged that states look to each other when determining what legislation to pass (Walker 1969). While not the focus of this study, we want to control for such forces in explaining adoption in order to estimate the effect of the initiative

⁴Models were also estimated using a 5-year rolling average of the number of initiatives being used. Both measures produced the same conclusions

process. Policy diffusion scholars have identified geographic contiguity as a strong proxy for the social learning and economic competition forces that underlie diffusion (Walker 1969; Berry and Berry 1990; Mooney 2001). Since initiative states exhibit positive spatial clustering, we want to rule out diffusion via contiguity as a cause of changes in adoption timing in initiative states. However, recent research finds that contiguity is an insufficient measure for representing all ties between states and identified a broader latent diffusion network that reflects state political and demographic similarity more so than contiguity Desmarais, Harden and Boehmke (2015). As with contiguity, we measure the influence of these persistent diffusion ties with a count of adoptions by connected states. Following Boehmke et al. (2017) we apply the decay parameter implied by the latent network estimates such that recent adoptions by a state's sources matter more than preceding adoptions.

In addition to these substantive and theoretically-motivated variables we include additional controls for time and policy differences. We account for time trends in two ways: an overall time effect via year fixed effects and duration dependence with a cubic polynomial of the duration for which a state has been at risk of adopting a policy. We model policy differences through random effects in all models to recognize that each policy has a different baseline probability of adoption.

Pooled Event History Analysis of Initiative's Effect

Average Effect of the Initiative

Table 2 reports the results from a series of PEHA models. The first two models capture the average effect of the initiative across policy areas while the second two models account for heterogeneity in this effect through a random coefficient for the initiative process indicator. Before moving to evaluate our hypotheses, we note that the control variables largely perform as expected, with evidence of internal variables measuring size and wealth increasing the chance of adoption and those for external forces indicating positive and significant state-to-state diffusion. Turning to our key variables, model one includes random coefficients by policy for citizen ideology and tests our first two hypotheses with controls for the initiative process and the signature requirement.

The second model adds in the presence of a distribution requirement. Both show positive and significant effects for the presence of the process and negative and significant coefficients for the cost of proposal variables (we use $\alpha = .01$ as our significance level for all tables). We run these models separately to highlight the effect of distribution requirements, which have been shown to greatly affect initiative use but have been rarely if ever been included in studies of the effect of the initiative process on policy outcomes. We find a large and negative effect that reduces much of the influence of the initiative. Further, adding this variable increases the coefficient for the initiative process since it now captures its influence among states without distribution requirements.

[Table 2 here.]

Fully interpreting the influence of the initiative process requires accounting for the multiple variables that measure its effect. To that end, Figure 1 plots the combined effect of the initiative process across the range of signature requirements and for a hypothetical state with and without a distribution requirement. The plot on the left shows the effect on the latent variable scale and its ninety-five percent confidence interval for non-distribution requirement states. This effect stays positive over all values of the signature requirement variable and the confidence interval excludes zero up to a requirement of about fourteen percent. As the bar plot of the joint distribution of signature and distribution requirements shows, nearly all of the state-year observations for these states fall below fourteen percent. The plot on the right conveys very different results. In states with distribution requirements, the effect of the initiative process as a whole is positive until signatures reach eight percent but its ninety-five percent confidence interval only excludes zero when signatures are either zero or above thirteen percent. The former never occurs in the data while the latter occurs for only four percent of initiative state-year observations in the sample.

[Figure 1 here.]

Initiative Heterogeneity via Random Coefficients

The next two models attempt to more fully capture the heterogeneity of the initiative process' effect across policies by adding random coefficients by policy for the initiative process indicator variable. Model three omits signature and distribution requirements to simplify interpretation of

the random coefficients in light of the effects of the initiative process captured through the cost variables. The initiative continues to exhibit a positive coefficient in both models, though the magnitude shrinks in the first random coefficients model since the indicator has to capture the average effect rather than the effect with a signature requirement of zero and no distribution requirement. The variance component for the model with signature and distribution requirements reveals a substantively and statistically significant variation in the estimated coefficient across policies with a large effect relative to the fixed coefficient. A ninety-five percent confidence interval for the distribution of the initiative coefficients across policies ranges from -.10 to 0.66 in the fourth model.

While these results support our argument that the initiative has heterogeneous effects, we also want to evaluate the substantive effect of the initiative process. To do so we ran a series of predicted value and first difference calculations based on the second model.⁵ These calculations put the probability of adoption without the initiative process at 5.6 percent and the probability of adoption with a five percent signature requirement and no distribution requirement at 6.7 percent; that drops to 6.3 percent when we set signatures to ten percent. Adding a distribution requirement leads to corresponding probabilities of 5.8 and 5.4 percent, respectively. The latter results confirm Figure 1's indication of a reduction in the probability of adoption for the one in ten initiative states with a distribution requirement and high signature requirements. For the other ninety percent the first difference corresponds to a fairly sizable ten to twenty percent increase relative the baseline in states without a distribution requirement. Additionally, this represents a single-year effect that will accumulate over successive years' time – as well as across states via diffusion effects – so a modest gap in the first year grows to become even more substantively important over multiple years measured by the cumulative probability of adoption. Overall, then, these results provide clear statistical evidence that the initiative increases innovativeness on average, but that its effect varies considerably by policy.

⁵We calculated the effect of the initiative by varying signature requirements from zero to fifteen percent with and without a distribution requirement (the maximum observed value in the data set). Other variables were set at their median values of the estimated sample data and we set the year to 2012, which had a moderate coefficient among the year indicators. We drew 1000 values of the parameters from their estimated distribution and then for each value we further drew 300 draws of the random effects to account for the uncertainty of their variance estimate. We then calculated the mean probability of adoption for each scenario.

Initiative Heterogeneity Based on Ideology

Our third approach also seeks to capture heterogeneity in the effect of the initiative across polices, but now takes a more parametric approach by focusing on how the initiative can moderate the effect of ideology on policy adoption. As discussed earlier, the initiative has the potential to increase ideological congruence between the public and state policy. While we do not have measures of ideal points for all relevant actors, we can evaluate the effect of ideology on the probability of adoption, and how the initiative may moderate that effect. If a state's policies are too conservative for the public, then the initiative should strengthen the effect of public liberalism on the probability of adoption as it pushes the state to become more in line with the public. Depending on the configuration of preferences, the initiative has the potential to strengthen or weaken the effect of ideology on policy adoption.

Testing the initiative's moderating effect on ideology requires us to account for the baseline effect of ideology and its possibly differing effect in initiative states for each policy. We continue to use a pooled logistic regression but incorporate separate effects for each policy of the initiative, ideology, and the initiative interacted with ideology. We include the same controls as the models in table 2. This allows us to evaluate the policy-specific effects of the initiative, as well as the initiative's potential moderating effect on citizen ideology while still estimating a pooled model to understand the initiative's overall effect.⁶ Rather than report these results in detail we summarize them by focusing on the significance of the initiative process, which depends on both the initiative process indicator and its interaction with ideology⁷. We estimate the marginal effect of the initiative at values of ideology ranging from ten (very conservative) to eighty-five (very liberal) by steps of fifteen. This covers the range of values in our sample. We then report for each value of ideology the proportion of policies for which the marginal effect produces a positive or negative and significant estimate, with the latter determined by its ninety-five percent confidence interval.

⁶We obtained similar results if we limited the sample here to policies with at least two adoption in initiative and non-initiative states (at least four total) and to policies that started diffusing after 1972 or with at least 30 observations if they started before 1972.

⁷See supplemental material for full specification

[Figure 2 here.]

Figure 2 reports our findings. Overall, the initiative's influence varies considerably between liberal, moderate, and conservative states. Conservative states have more balanced positive and negative shifts. Moderate and more liberal states exhibit a more consistently positive effect. The initiative process tends to increase the probability of adoption for any value of ideology; when it does deter policy change it does so disproportionately among conservative states. Overall, we find a significant effect for at least one of these six values of ideology for nearly fourteen percent of policies and a negative effect for nearly four percent, indicating that the initiative influences the adoption of almost one in five policies.

Our final approach seeks a middle ground between these policy-by-policy interactions and a single interaction. Since ideology itself has very different effects across conservative and liberal policies that tend to cancel out when pooled, merely adding an interaction with the initiative makes little sense since it could easily average out to zero as well. We therefore use the results from the interacted model to identify the effect of ideology on policy adoption. We create three categories corresponding to policies in which ideology (increased citizen liberalism) has a positive effect, a near-zero effect, and a negative effect on policy adoption. We then estimate a single PEHA model that allows ideology to have different effects across these three policy subsets and also include an interaction between ideology and the initiative process in each subset. This allows us to capture the underlying ideological appeal of a policy and to determine whether the initiative process has distinct effects based on that appeal.

[Table 3 here.]

Table 3 reports this results, but they are best interpreted graphically given the many interactions. Figure 3 therefore shows the predicted probability and ninety-five percent confidence interval of policy adoption for initiative and non-initiative states across all three policy categories: conservatism increases the baseline probability of adoption in the left panel while liberalism increases it in the right panel; citizen ideology has no effect in the middle panel. Below these probabilities we also plot the density of ideology within the subset of data used for each figure. We shade these

densities by whether the ninety-five percent confidence interval of the effect of the initiative given ideology excludes zero.⁸

[Figure 3 here.]

The graphs produce two interesting findings. First and foremost, the initiative significantly increases the chance of policy adoption in just over half the cases in our data. In contrast, it significantly decreases the chance of adoption in just thirteen percent of the cases. The latter may seem a small proportion, but the pattern of positive and negative effects points to the second interesting finding: among ideological policies the initiative tends to increase the chance of adoption when that chance is low or moderate and decreases it only when it is relatively large. One might suspect that functional form produces this feature, but additional analysis that allowed for nonlinear relationships recovered the same pattern. Among non-ideological policies the effect remains positive for all values of ideology. We return to this finding in our discussion.

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the theoretical literature, the initiative process ought to have a complex effect on policy adoption. It may increase, decrease, or have no effect on the probability of adoption. The precise effect varies with the configuration of voter and legislative preferences and with features of the initiative qualification process itself. Because previous studies typically rely on a single policy or a small, coherent group of policies they have produced divergent findings. We have attempted to bring this range of effects into a unified picture by modeling the initiative's effect across hundreds of policies. This allows us to capture the average effect and to let it vary systematically across policies. Our analysis produces a few important findings.

First, we find evidence of a positive average effect over the last forty years. This represents an important starting point since the possible range of predicted consequences includes both positive and negative effects and empirical evidence for even a single policy can produce different directions in different eras (Matsusaka 2004). Thus, over a long time period the initiative process

⁸We calculate the predicted probabilities using the `margins` command in Stata, which sets the random effect to zero and other variables to their mean values. Significance is based on the underlying coefficients in the latent variable scale: $\hat{\beta}_{Mit} + \hat{\beta}_{Mit*Ideo} \times Ideology$.

appears to have increased state policy innovativeness. And since policies tend to diffuse across states the presence of the initiative process in one state will increase the chance of adoption in connected states and will radiate further through those states' connections. Yet high hurdles for ballot qualification reduce and even eliminate this positive effect. Our results show that states with a distribution requirement or those without one that have a very large signature requirement experience no net increase in the rate of policy adoption relative to noninitiative states. Interest in such higher hurdles continues. Just last year, the Maine legislature narrowly failed to pass a constitutional amendment that would have created a new statewide distribution requirement.⁹ In 2018 a bill was introduced in Oklahoma to require that the statewide signature thresholds – currently eight percent for statutory and fifteen percent for constitutional measures – be met in every county.¹⁰ In contrast to these legislative efforts, studies of the effect of the initiative process on policy, citizen participation, or public opinion have tended to focus more on the signature effect alone. Our results indicate both matter and distribution requirements perhaps more so.

Second, we find evidence of extensive heterogeneity across policies underlying this positive average effect. We do so initially by estimating a multi-level model with a random coefficient for the presence of the initiative process and find that the standard deviation of this coefficient nearly matches its magnitude. Thus the effect varies from nearly zero to almost twice as large as the overall average across policies. Again, this underscores the prediction that the consequences of the initiative process will vary across policies and states based on their configuration of political preferences and fits with the empirical evidence's wide range of findings.

We further investigate this heterogeneity by estimating separate models for social or economic policies. Table ?? in the appendix shows the results for sub-samples of social and economic policies.¹¹ We find that the initiative has a positive and significant relationship with the adoption of

⁹See Maine LD 31 (HP 32): <http://legislature.maine.gov/LawMakerWeb/summary.asp?ID=280062465>.

¹⁰See Oklahoma HB1603: http://webserver1.lsb.state.ok.us/cf_pdf/2017-18%20FLR/hflr/HB1603%20HFLR.PDF.

¹¹We use the major topic area codes from the Comparative Agendas Project to distinguish between social and economic policies. Social Policies are from the following topic areas: civil rights, education, law and crime, and social welfare. Economic policies are from macroeconomics, agriculture, labor, transportation, energy, housing, domestic commerce, technology, government operations, foreign trade, public lands.

social policies, but not economic policies. Signature requirements again reduce the effect of the initiative process for social policies. These results highlight that policy characteristics play a role in the heterogeneous effects of the initiative process. The growth of large sample datasets such as SPID allows for more systematic analysis of conditions in which the initiative plays a role in diffusion, and those which it does not.

Lastly, we find that the heterogeneity in the effect of the initiative process arises in part through its dependence on public preferences. Policy adoptions reflect the general ideological proclivity of citizens in a state but the degree of reflection will change in states with the initiative process since it makes it harder for policymakers to maintain divergent policies. By varying the effect of preferences by policy and by the presence of the initiative process we find that about fourteen percent of policies show an increased chance of adoption in initiative states while four percent show a decreased chance. The increase tends to happen more with liberal preferences while the decrease occurs more often for conservative preferences.

We attempt to better understand this pattern by partitioning policies into liberal, nonpartisan, and conservative groupings based on the ideology of states most likely to adopt them. This analysis reconfirms the generally positive effect of the initiative, but reveals an intriguing pattern. For ideological policies the initiative process tends to reduce the influence of ideology on adoption: states that are less likely to adopt become more likely with the initiative whereas states that are more likely to adopt become less so. For nonpartisan policies the effect is already flat; adding the initiative produces a consistent increase in the probability of adoption for all values of ideology.

We find these results intriguing for two reasons. First, in the absence of ideological effects the initiative appears to increase policy innovativeness. When public opinion provides neither a push nor a check on a new policy, the initiative process makes it more likely that a state will experiment and try the new policy. In some sense one can think of this as a “pure” test of the effect of the initiative since it abstracts from its theorized role of bringing policy into line with opinion (Gerber 1996; Leemann and Wasserfallen 2016) thereby isolating its procedural function as one more way to change policy. Second, on ideological policies the initiative has generally been

thought of as a way to more quickly translate favorable preferences into policy change. Yet our results show that if anything the initiative tends to produce greater uniformity in policy adoptions across states by reducing the chance of adoption for ideologically favorable states and increasing it for ideologically unfavorable states. Our data do not tell us whether the difference constitutes an improvement or a deterioration in representation but the result warrants further exploration, both for its theoretical import and for its substantive policy implications for how the initiative changes state policies.

References

- Arcenaux, Krevin. 2002. "Direct Democracy and the Link between Public Opinion and State Abortion Policy." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 2(4):372–387.
- Berry, Frances Stokes and William D Berry. 1990. "State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis." *The American Political Science Review* 84(2):395–415.
- Berry, William D, Richard C Fording, Evan J Ringquist, Russell L Hanson and Carl E Klarner. 2010. "Measuring citizen and government ideology in the US states: A re-appraisal." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 10(2):117–135.
- Boehmke, Frederick J. 2005a. *The Indirect Effect of Direct Legislation: How Institutions Shape Interest Groups Systems*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Boehmke, Frederick J. 2005b. "Sources of Variation in the Frequency of Statewide Initiatives: The Role of Interest Group Populations." *Political Research Quarterly* 58(4):565–575.
- Boehmke, Frederick J, Abigail Matthews Rury, Bruce A Desmarais and Jeffrey J Harden. 2017. "The Seeds of Policy Change: Leveraging Diffusion to Disseminate Policy Innovations." *Journal of health politics, policy and law* 42(2):285–307.
- Boehmke, Frederick J., Mark Brockway, Bruce Desmarais, Jeffrey Harden, Scott LaCombe, Fridolin Linder and Hanna Wallach. N.d. "A New Database for Inferring Public Policy Innovativeness and Diffusion Networks." *Policies Studies Journal* (forthcoming).
- Boehmke, Frederick J., Mark Brockway, Bruce Desmarais, Jeffrey J. Harden, Scott LaCombe, Fridolin Linder and Hanna Wallach. 2018. "State Policy Innovation and Diffusion (SPID) Database v1.0."
- Boehmke, Frederick, Tracy Osborn and Emily Schilling. 2015. "Pivotal Politics and Initiative Use in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 68(4):665–677.
- Bowler, Shaun and Todd Donovan. 2004. "Measuring the Effect of Direct Democracy on State

- Policy: Not All Initiatives are Created Equal.” *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 4(3):345–363.
- Bowler, Shaun, Todd Donovan and Caroline Tolbert. 1998. *Citizens as Legislators*. Ohio State University Press.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M and Bradford S Jones. 2004. *Event History Modeling: A Guide for Social Scientists*. Cambridge Univ Press.
- Burden, Barry. 2005. “Institutions and Policy Representation in the States.” *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 5(4):373–393.
- Camobreco, John. 1998. “Preferences, Fiscal Policies, and the Initiative Process.” *The Journal of Politics* 60(3):819–829.
- Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2017. “Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936–2014.” *American Political Science Review* pp. 1–18.
- Desmarais, Bruce A., Jeffrey J. Harden and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2015. “Persistent Policy Pathways: Inferring Diffusion Networks in the American States.” *American Political Science Review* 109(02):392–406.
- Gerber, Elisabeth R. 1996. “Legislative Response to the Threat of Popular Initiatives.” *American Journal of Political Science* 40(1):99–128.
- Gerber, Elisabeth R. 1999. *The Populist Paradox: Interest Group Influence and the Promise of Direct Legislation*. Princeton University Press.
- Haider-Markel, D. P, Alana Querze and Kara Lindman. 2007. “Lose, Win or Draw? A Re-examination of Direct Democracy and Minority Rights.” *Political Research Quarterly* 60(2):304–314.
- Hume, R. J. 2011. “Comparing institutional and policy explanations for the adoption of state constitutional amendments: The case of same-sex marriage.” *American Politics Research* 39(6):1097–1126.

- Jensen, Jason. 2003. "Policy Diffusion through Institutional Legitimation: State Lotteries." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13(4):521–41.
- Klarner, Carl. 2013. "State Partisan Balance Data, 1937–2011." *Harvard Dataverse* 1.
- Kreitzer, Rebecca J. and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2016. "Modeling Heterogeneity in Pooled Event History Analysis." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 16(1):121–141.
- Lascher, Edward L, Michael G Hagen and Steven A Rochlin. 1996. "Gun behind the door? Ballot initiatives, state policies and public opinion." *The Journal of Politics* 58(03):760–775.
- Lax, Jeffery and Justin Phillips. 2009. "Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy Responsiveness." *American Political Science Review* 103(3):367–386.
- Lax, Jeffrey and Justin Phillips. 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1):148–166.
- Leemann, Lucas and Fabio Wasserfallen. 2016. "The democratic effect of direct democracy." *American Political Science Review* 110(4):750–762.
- Lewis, Daniel. 2011. "Direct Democracy and Minority Rights: Same-Sex Marriage Bans in the US States." *Social Science Quarterly* 92(2):364–383.
- Lupia, Arthur, Yanna Krupnikov, Adam Seth Levine, Spencer Piston and Alexander Hagen-Jamar. 2010. "Why State Constitutions Differ in their Treatment of Same-Sex Marriage." *The Journal of Politics* 72(4):1222–1235.
- Matusaka, J. 1995. "Fiscal effects of the voter initiative: Evidence from the last thirty years." *Journal of Political Economy* 103(3):587–623.
- Matusaka, J. 2001. "Problems with a Methodology Used to Evaluate the Voter Initiative." *The Journal of Politics* 63(4):1250–1256.
- Matusaka, J. 2004. *For the Many or the Few*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Matusaka, J. 2008. *Direct democracys impact on American political Institutions*. Palgrave

- MacMillan chapter Direct democracy and the executive branch.
- Matsusaka, J. 2018. "Public Policy and the Initiative and Referendum: A Survey with Some New Evidence." *Public Choice* 127:107–143.
- Matsusaka, John. 2010. "Popular Control of Public Policy: A Quantitative Approaches." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 5(2):133–167.
- Matsusaka, John. 2017. "Initiatives (number, approval rate) by state and year (1904-2010)." *Initiative and Referendum Institution* .
- Monogan, James, Virginia Gray and David Lowery. 2009. "Public Opinion, Organized Interests, and Policy Congruence in Initiative and Noninitiative U.S. States." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 9(3):304–324.
- Mooney, Christopher Z. 2001. "Modeling Regional Effects on State Policy Diffusion." *Political Research Quarterly* 54(1):103–124.
- Romer, Thomas and Howard Rosenthal. 1979. "Bureaucrats versus voters: On the political economy of resource allocation by direct democracy." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 93(4):563–587.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2001. "Official-English and the States: Influences on Declaring English the Official Language in the United States." *Political Research Quarterly* 54(2):445–457.
- Squire, Peverill. 2007. "Measuring state legislative professionalism: The squire index revisited." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 7(2):211–227.
- Tausanovitch, Chris and Christopher Warshaw. 2014. "Representation in municipal government." *American Political Science Review* 108(3):605–641.
- Walker, Jack L. 1969. "The Diffusion of Innovations Among the American States." *American Political Science Review* 63(3):880–899.

1 Tables and Figures

Table 1: Summary of Predictions across Combinations of Voter and Legislature Preferences

		Voter's Preference	
		0	1
Legislature's Preference	0	No Influence	Increases Pr(Adopt)
	1	Decreases Pr(Adopt)	No Influence

Table 2: Pooled Event History Analysis of the Effect of the Initiative Process on Policy Adoption

Initiative Process	0.1987*	0.2772*	0.0783*	0.2868*
	(0.0471)	(0.0487)	(0.0235)	(0.0502)
Signatures - Average	-0.0144*	-0.0138*		-0.0153*
	(0.0052)	(0.0053)		(0.0053)
Distribution Requirements		-0.1730*		-0.1767*
		(0.0287)		(0.0288)
Latent Decay	0.1344*	0.1340*	0.1346*	0.1344*
	(0.0061)	(0.0061)	(0.0061)	(0.0061)
Contiguity	0.1546*	0.1564*	0.1545*	0.1550*
	(0.0089)	(0.0090)	(0.0090)	(0.0090)
Citizen Ideology	0.0523	0.0403	0.0641*	0.0380
	(0.0219)	(0.0221)	(0.0213)	(0.0220)
Unified Control	0.0171	0.0180	0.0212	0.0188
	(0.0201)	(0.0201)	(0.0201)	(0.0201)
Real Income Per Capita	0.0749*	0.0871*	0.0717*	0.0866*
	(0.0184)	(0.0185)	(0.0183)	(0.0185)
Squire Professionalism	-0.0638*	-0.0633*	-0.0661*	-0.0641*
	(0.0161)	(0.0161)	(0.0161)	(0.0161)
Duration	-0.0309*	-0.0310*	-0.0304*	-0.0303*
	(0.0043)	(0.0043)	(0.0043)	(0.0043)
Duration Squared	0.0005*	0.0005*	0.0005*	0.0005*
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Duration Cubed	-0.0000*	-0.0000*	-0.0000*	-0.0000*
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Population	0.0873*	0.0785*	0.0935*	0.0792*
	(0.0134)	(0.0135)	(0.0133)	(0.0135)
constant	-2.0380*	-2.0471*	-2.0403*	-2.0459*
	(0.1271)	(0.1272)	(0.1272)	(0.1274)
<i>Policy Level Random Effects:</i>				
Var(constant)	1.1174*	1.1185*	1.1161*	1.1174*
	(0.0782)	(0.0783)	(0.0817)	(0.0818)
Var($\beta_{Ideology}$)	0.1387*	0.1397*	0.1359*	0.1374*
	(0.0134)	(0.0135)	(0.0133)	(0.0135)
Var($\beta_{Initiative}$)			0.0366	0.0390*
			(0.0144)	(0.0146)
Cov (constant, $\beta_{Ideology}$)	-0.0263	-0.0261	-0.0135	-0.0116
	(0.0233)	(0.0234)	(0.0237)	(0.0238)
Cov (constant, $\beta_{Initiative}$)			-0.0008	0.0016
			(0.0265)	(0.0266)
Cov ($\beta_{Ideology}$, $\beta_{Initiative}$)			-0.0211	-0.0249
			(0.0102)	(0.0103)
Observations	345,880	345,880	345,880	345,880


Note: Pooled Event History Analysis includes 594 policies with policies as the group level and fixed effects for year.
* indicates $p < .01$.

Table 3: Pooled Event History Analysis of the Effect of the Initiative Process by the Ideological Direction of Policies

Conservative	-3.9395*	(0.1338)
Conservative × Initiative Process	0.0678	(0.0380)
Conservative × Citizen Ideology	-0.4924*	(0.0292)
Conservative × Initiative Process × Citizen Ideology	0.3044*	(0.0411)
Nonpartisan	-3.4213*	(0.1267)
Nonpartisan × Initiative Process	0.0879*	(0.0309)
Nonpartisan × Citizen Ideology	-0.0029	(0.0224)
Nonpartisan × Initiative Process × Citizen Ideology	0.0136	(0.0318)
Liberal	-3.8717*	(0.1288)
Liberal × Initiative Process	0.0733	(0.0371)
Liberal × Citizen Ideology	0.5282*	(0.0255)
Liberal × Initiative Process × Citizen Ideology	-0.1110*	(0.0367)
Latent Decay	0.1346*	(0.0061)
Contiguity	0.1501*	(0.0089)
Population	0.0822*	(0.0135)
Unified Control	0.0183	(0.0202)
Real Income Per Capita	0.0819*	(0.0185)
Squire Professionalism	-0.0594*	(0.0162)
Duration	-0.0294*	(0.0043)
Duration Squared	0.0004*	(0.0001)
Duration Cubed	-0.0000*	(0.0000)
<i>Policy Level Random Effects:</i>		
Var(constant)	0.9086*	(0.0659)
Observations	316,555	


Note: Pooled Event History Analysis includes 487 policies with policies as the group level and fixed effects for year.
* indicates $p < .01$.

Figure 1: Marginal Effect of the Initiative Process by Signature and Distribution Requirements




Note: Plot depicts the marginal effect of the initiative process on the latent scale of the probability of adoption: $\hat{\beta}_I + \hat{\beta}_{Sigs} \times Sigs + \hat{\beta}_{Dist} \times Dist$. Shaded area represents a 95% confidence interval. Bar plot depicts the joint distribution of signatures and distribution requirement.

Figure 2: Proportion of Policies with Significant Estimated Effects of the Initiative by State Ideology and Sign of the Effect



Note: Results indicate the proportion of policies for which the 95% confidence interval of the linear combination of the initiative process and its interaction with citizen ideology excludes zero. Positive coefficients indicate that the chance of adoption increases with citizen ideology; negative coefficients indicate it decreases with citizen ideology.

Figure 3: Effect of the Initiative Process on the Probability of Adoption by the Ideological Effect of Policies



Note: Results show the probability of adoption for a hypothetical initiative state and its counterfactual probability of adoption without the initiative process. Predicted probabilities and confidence intervals calculated using the `margins` command in Stata, which sets the random effects to zero. Other variables set to their median values. Regions for which the marginal effect of the initiative process achieves significance at the .05 level or better correspond to the black shaded regions of the kernel density plot. Kernel density plots represent the distribution of ideology within the estimation sample for the subset of policies coded into each of the three ideological effect categories. Percentages indicate the percentage of observations within each region; percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

A Supplemental Information

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Adoption	.0351683	.1842052	0	1
Initiative	.4673442	.4989332	0	1
Initiative Sigs	3.974788	4.666257	0	15
Distribution Req	.2385914	.426223	0	1
Std Latent Decay	.0157605	1.017916	-.3275005	17.03622
Std Neighbors	.0564481	1.033734	-.5923716	6.906522
Std Population	.0223354	1.019176	-.8630972	6.306389
Std Citizen Ideology	.0185469	.9757606	-2.548552	3.001671
Unified Government	.453799	.4978616	0	1
Std Income	.1503219	.8977005	-1.944665	3.760294
Std Professionalism	-.0007879	1.000343	-1.387275	3.802911
Duration	15.04208	20.66898	0	199
Duration Sq	653.4696	2991.769	0	39601
Duration Cb	64162.06	519901.9	0	7880599
Year	1991	11	1970	2013

Table 2: Pooled Event History Analysis of the Effect of the Initiative Process on Policy Adoption with Separate Effects for the Initiative and Ideology by Policy

Population	0.0984*	(0.0145)
Unified Control	0.0222	(0.0210)
Real Income Per Capita	0.0850*	(0.0192)
Squire Professionalism	-0.0633*	(0.0171)
Latent Network Decay	4.6807*	(0.2294)
Contiguous Neighbors	0.1231*	(0.0098)
Duration	0.0204*	(0.0051)
Duration Squared	0.0006*	(0.0001)
Duration Cubed	-0.0000*	(0.0000)
aborparc	-3.5113*	(0.3342)
aborparn	-3.6255*	(0.3337)
aborpreroe	-2.8498*	(0.5894)
abortion_consent_1992_201	-3.0170*	(0.2856)
abortion_medical	-3.8477*	(0.3711)
abortion_partial_birt	-2.3506*	(0.4460)
abortion_reform_prero	-2.8352*	(0.5811)
absvot	-5.1985*	(0.3672)
admittpriv	-2.3598*	(0.4586)
adoption act (1953)(1969)	-4.3674*	(0.7229)
adult guardianship and protective proceedings jurisdiction act	-1.6694*	(0.3048)
advertban	-3.0253*	(0.3331)
aging	-3.4102*	(0.3255)
agreement on detainees	-2.5918*	(0.4038)
agreement on qualifications of educational personnel	-3.6726*	(0.8608)
alcoholism and intoxication treatment	-2.9141*	(0.4837)
allpass_seatbelt	-3.3775*	(0.3208)
amber	-1.2062*	(0.2287)
anatomical gift (1968)	-0.1546	(0.4758)
anatomical gift act (1987)	-3.2584*	(0.3331)
anatomical gift act (2006)	-0.6486	(0.3846)
anim_cruel_felonfirs	-5.9337*	(0.3163)
animcruel	-18.4673*	(1.2790)
antibully	-1.9541*	(0.2497)
antistalk	-0.7198*	(0.2476)
anyactnot	-3.4320*	(0.3940)
anyid2	-4.1227*	(0.2554)
anyphotoid2	-4.6234*	(0.2772)
apology	-3.7553*	(0.2806)
arbitration act (1956)	-3.7451*	(0.3524)
arbitration act (2000)	-4.1936*	(0.5101)
assignment of rents act	-4.1043*	(0.7279)
athlete agents act	-1.4132*	(0.2773)
autism	-2.5406*	(0.2769)
banfaninc	-1.7918*	(0.2966)
bangag	-3.0701*	(0.2192)
barbanstate	-4.8093*	(0.5142)
bikehelmet	-2.9911*	(0.2869)
bldstds_yearadopted	-3.0545*	(0.2560)
boehmke_snrpres	-3.9805*	(0.3499)
bootcamp	-3.2702*	(0.3123)
bottle	-5.3134*	(0.4811)
bradycamp	-2.7873*	(0.3312)
breastdensity	-2.1932*	(0.3526)
breastfeed	-2.1247*	(0.2310)
broadcom	-2.8111*	(0.3817)
buildingcode	-4.0447*	(0.2754)
candlim	-2.8861*	(0.2464)
ccb	-3.7222*	(0.3574)
ccreceipt	-2.3035*	(0.2773)
cctheft	-2.7712*	(0.2745)
cent	-4.0135*	(0.3728)
certification of questions of law (1967)	-4.2888*	(0.3955)
certification of questions of law (1995)	-3.1254*	(0.5162)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

chartersch	-1.7160*	(0.2888)
child abduction prevention	-3.3340*	(0.6839)
child custody jurisdiction and enforcement act	-2.7709*	(0.2263)
child pornography	-2.4467*	(0.2290)
childrest	-0.2837	(0.2734)
civil defense and disaster compact	-4.1259*	(0.5291)
civinjaut	-2.8103*	(0.4916)
clinic_access	-5.0201*	(0.4177)
cogrowman	-6.2897*	(0.9918)
colcanscr	-2.9396*	(0.2714)
collaborative law act	-3.1405*	(0.5865)
collegesavings	-2.1582*	(0.2197)
common interest ownership act (1982)	-5.3364*	(0.8919)
compact for education	-3.6881*	(0.5176)
compact on adoption and medical assistance	-3.0085*	(0.2919)
compact on mental health	-1.7752	(0.8727)
compact on placement of children	-2.7325*	(0.2818)
compcrime	-2.1001*	(0.2215)
comsrv12	-2.1277*	(0.2427)
concealed carry	-4.2389*	(0.3687)
condominium act	-4.5634*	(0.4271)
conservation easement act	-3.5426*	(0.3129)
const_protect	-4.2231*	(0.4202)
consumer credit code	-4.2033*	(0.4671)
continsurance	-2.7509*	(0.3275)
contr_eq	-2.8370*	(0.3795)
controlled substances act	-3.1544*	(0.2996)
corporateeff_yearadopted	-3.5790*	(0.3493)
corporaterenew_yearadopted	-4.6136*	(0.4754)
corporlimits	-0.4080	(0.3252)
correct	-4.0326*	(0.3570)
cpban	-2.2960*	(0.2224)
credfreez	-2.3544*	(0.3524)
crimeviccomp	-2.3965*	(0.2489)
custodial trust act	-3.7764*	(0.3821)
cyberstalk	-1.8774*	(0.3345)
damagereduce	-4.0970*	(0.4727)
damremov	-4.9611*	(0.4129)
deathpen	-2.7104*	(0.2636)
debt-management services act, 2005	-4.2924*	(1.0362)
deceptive trade practices act (1964)	-5.3780	(2.1303)
deployed parents custody and visitation act	-3.3173*	(1.0207)
determination of death act	-3.5435*	(0.2726)
dev_s1	-3.7230*	(0.3186)
dev_s2	-4.4512*	(0.5863)
dev_s4	-4.9996*	(0.4255)
dev_s9	-4.0720*	(0.5110)
disclaimer of property interests act	-3.6379*	(0.3796)
disclaimer of property interests act (1973)	-4.5130*	(0.4906)
discrenot	-3.6896*	(0.4609)
disposition of community property rights at death act (1971)	-5.3261*	(0.3973)
division of income for tax purposes	-5.6715*	(0.7289)
dnafelon	-1.8269*	(0.3031)
dnaforexon	-1.7665*	(0.2382)
driver license compact	-3.8955*	(0.3284)
drugs_boehmke_statrapag	-4.0119*	(0.2838)
drugs_boehmke_zero	-2.6091*	(0.2914)
drugs_marijuana_decriminalizati	-5.5336*	(0.4789)
drugs_medical_marijuan	-5.0834*	(0.6468)
drugs_smoking_ban_restaurant	-3.5026*	(0.3386)
drugs_smoking_ban_workplace	-2.9655*	(0.3592)
drugtest	-2.5067*	(0.3496)
dual_enroll	-3.5248*	(0.2539)
dui	-2.7036*	(0.2198)
dui08	-3.2152*	(0.2812)
durable power of attorney	-4.4039*	(0.3719)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

duties to persons with medical id devices	-4.2860*	(0.8089)
dwi reform	-3.1949*	(0.2733)
earlvot	-4.7234*	(0.3733)
earned_income_taxcredi	-3.7061*	(0.3413)
econdev	-2.7548*	(0.3023)
education	-4.1690*	(0.3927)
education_corporal_punishment_b	-4.4229*	(0.3094)
elecdayreg	-4.9289*	(0.5918)
elecdereg	-1.9520*	(0.3588)
electronic legal material act	-3.7302*	(1.1430)
electronic transactions act	-1.0655*	(0.2688)
emcont.avail	-3.7364*	(0.4380)
emergency management assistance compact	-1.3491*	(0.2425)
emergency volunteer health practitioners	-2.8868*	(0.4292)
eminentscholar	-3.6849*	(0.3053)
enforcement of foreign judgments act	-3.6322*	(0.2624)
engonly	-18.6640*	(1.3302)
enterzone	-1.6833*	(0.2513)
entity transactions act, model (2007) (last amended 2013)	-4.2103*	(0.7881)
environ	-3.6439*	(0.4024)
environment_bottlebil	-5.5545*	(0.5177)
environment_ca_car_emissions_st	-4.5180*	(0.6938)
environment_electronic_wast	-3.1666*	(0.3501)
environment_ghg_ca	-3.3175*	(0.7427)
environment_publicbenefit_fund	-3.4536*	(0.3796)
environment_state_nepa	-3.7110*	(0.3361)
environmental covenants act	-2.5478*	(0.3835)
eqrightam	-7.6315*	(0.5503)
estate tax apportionment and probate code 3-916	-6.1799*	(0.5907)
estate.ta	-1.2426	(0.4962)
ewaste	-2.9162*	(0.3716)
famcap	-2.3905*	(0.3439)
famlim	-0.7427	(0.3025)
federal lien registration act	-3.8114*	(0.3026)
fetaldispos	-4.6490*	(0.3483)
fetalhomic	-4.5303*	(0.2631)
fetalpain	-4.5302*	(1.0503)
filmtaxcredit	-2.8039*	(0.2496)
foca	-6.6120*	(0.5996)
foia	-13.1722*	(0.9659)
foreign money claims act	-3.9961*	(0.3809)
foreign money judgments recognition act	-4.5292*	(0.3146)
foreign-country money judgments recognition act	-2.7864*	(0.4031)
fraudulent transfer act (1984)	-3.0782*	(0.2588)
frontpass.seatbelt	-2.5414*	(0.3223)
funds.avail	-5.1322*	(0.7992)
fundslife	-2.5809*	(0.2704)
fundslifehea	-2.0988*	(0.2461)
furlough	-2.8273*	(0.2447)
furprog	-3.1263*	(0.2648)
gagrule	-3.5356*	(0.3438)
gambling_casino	-7.3624*	(0.4224)
gambling_lottery_adoptio	-3.5424*	(0.2555)
gap	-4.4246*	(0.9053)
gay_employment_discrim_genderi	-4.9510*	(0.5066)
gayhate	-2.5903*	(0.2629)
gaymarban	-2.6574*	(0.2879)
gayrights_civilunion	-4.4358*	(0.5964)
gayrights_hatecrime	-2.3209*	(0.2825)
gayrights_marriag	-4.4420*	(0.8154)
gdl	-1.1707*	(0.2473)
gender_disc_laws_post196	-1.4938*	(0.5413)
genderrights_era_ratificatio	0.0043	(0.4656)
genderrights_nofault_divorc	-1.7840*	(0.2545)
genderrights_state_era	-3.8458*	(0.3183)
giexorder	-3.4777*	(0.4229)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

gilaw	-4.8098*	(0.4759)
goodsam911	-3.5970*	(0.5401)
governance_reform	-3.4204*	(0.3351)
guardianship and protective proceedings act (1997)	-5.2490*	(0.6742)
guncontrl_bc_private_handgu	-6.6202*	(0.4962)
guncontrl_bc_private_rifl	-9.4859*	(0.6219)
guncontrol_assaultweapon_ba	-4.4365*	(0.5250)
guncontrol_opencarr	-4.5991*	(0.2829)
guncontrol_satnightspecial_ba	-4.9060*	(0.5993)
harass	-3.1472*	(0.6161)
hate crimes	-2.9104*	(0.2385)
hatecrime	-2.8522*	(0.2338)
hazing	-3.5667*	(0.2452)
health	-1.9051*	(0.3066)
health care compact	-3.7138*	(0.6921)
health-care decisions act	-4.4096*	(0.7146)
helmetlaw_17	-2.6916*	(0.2279)
helmetlaw_learn	-3.7595*	(0.2890)
helmetlaw_pass	-3.9318*	(0.3021)
higissue	-1.3204*	(0.2899)
higrenew	-0.8227*	(0.2728)
hiport	-0.9875*	(0.2618)
hiprecon	-1.1598*	(0.2808)
hmomod1	-2.8179*	(0.2776)
hmomod2	-2.0384*	(0.3098)
hostliability	-3.0554*	(0.3666)
hsexit	-3.0330*	(0.2808)
humantraffic	-1.6471*	(0.3116)
idas	-1.7684*	(0.2541)
ide	-1.7586*	(0.2950)
idtheft	-1.2977*	(0.2371)
imitcontsub	-2.8999*	(0.2350)
immigration_english_languag	-4.5173*	(0.3195)
immigration_instate_tuition_ill	-3.3229*	(0.3613)
indgaming	-2.2527*	(0.3433)
indlimit	-0.3293	(0.3357)
indorgris	-1.8371*	(0.3543)
infantheat	-2.3532*	(0.2322)
infconsent	-3.8322*	(0.2549)
infertility	-4.1210*	(0.4303)
ins_stateexch	-1.5264*	(0.3848)
insandefref	-2.7785*	(0.2553)
insanity	-2.6578*	(0.2519)
insprivate	-4.5294*	(0.3136)
inspublic	-4.8193*	(0.3679)
inst_tu_und	-3.4205*	(0.4691)
inst_tu_vet	-2.9805*	(0.6091)
insurable interest amendment to the uniform trust code	-3.0891*	(0.7655)
inswaiver	-6.1854*	(0.6289)
interreg	-2.9156*	(0.3961)
interstate compact for adult offender supervision	-4.8075*	(0.2574)
interstate compact on adoption and medical assistance	-2.9557*	(0.4279)
interstate compact on educational opportunity for military children	-1.0783*	(0.3874)
interstate compact on licensure of participants in horse racing with pari-mutuel wagering	-3.0570*	(0.4015)
interstate compact on mentally disordered offenders	-4.7715*	(0.7308)
interstate corrections compact	-3.5033*	(0.2918)
interstate depositions and discovery act	-1.4857*	(0.3093)
interstate enforcement of domestic violence protection orders act	-3.2788*	(0.3735)
interstate family support act (1992)(1996)	-0.9533*	(0.2457)
interstate family support act (2001)	-3.2601*	(0.5360)
interstate family support act amendments (2008)	-2.9052*	(0.4909)
interstate high speed rail network compact	-4.2753*	(0.6158)
interstate insurance product regulation compact	-1.6494*	(0.2721)
interstate library compact	-3.2490*	(0.5322)
interstate mining compact	-5.6317*	(0.7194)
interstate rail passenger network compact	-4.2066*	(0.5126)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

keg_reg	-3.8005*	(0.2812)
kinship	-2.4881*	(0.3041)
labor_age_discriminatio	-3.6205*	(0.3717)
labor_collective_bargaining_sta	-3.8695*	(0.4008)
labor_collective_bargaining_tea	-2.9500*	(0.3797)
labor_minwage_aboveefe	-4.8905*	(0.3626)
labor_state_ada_accomodat	-2.8906*	(0.3215)
labor_state_ada_antidiscr	-2.1514*	(0.2467)
law on notarial acts, revised	-4.4114*	(1.0138)
lemon	-1.2967*	(0.3094)
licenseplate	-2.4777*	(0.2632)
limited cooperative association act (2007) (last amended 2013)	-4.0457*	(1.2057)
limited liability company (1995)(1996)	-3.7813*	(1.3695)
limited liability company (2006) (last amended 2013)	-4.1391*	(0.7180)
limited partnership (1976)	-2.1246*	(0.2346)
limited partnership act (2001) (last amended 2013)	-3.5681*	(0.4487)
lott	-3.2030*	(0.2694)
mailreg	-2.5196*	(0.2275)
manaccess	-3.1617*	(0.4278)
management of institutional funds act	-3.3706*	(0.2796)
manclin	-2.9980*	(0.3069)
mandatory disposition of detainees	-5.5160*	(0.7583)
mandnot	-3.8290*	(0.4698)
marriage and divorce act, model	-4.3375*	(0.7707)
medianot	-4.0808*	(0.6339)
mediation act	-5.1767*	(1.0090)
medicalrest	-3.4133*	(0.3517)
medmar	-3.3223*	(0.2713)
meganslaw	-1.3088*	(0.2223)
mendeapen	-3.3325*	(0.3696)
meritaid	-3.6518*	(0.4633)
meritstateadmin	-3.5316*	(0.4984)
methpre	-3.0106*	(0.3528)
military and overseas voters act	-2.4211*	(0.4796)
minfine	-3.1903*	(0.2967)
minor student capacity to borrow act (1969)	-4.8864*	(1.2511)
missplan	-5.0601*	(0.6105)
mlda21	-4.3760*	(0.2922)
model state administrative procedure act (1981)	-4.5144*	(0.5145)
money services act	-4.6395*	(0.7044)
motorvoter	-2.6725*	(0.2207)
mprisdm	-2.7321*	(0.2562)
msas	-2.3934*	(0.3555)
multistate lottery agreement	-2.9571*	(0.2867)
naticurric	-2.8943*	(0.3717)
national crime prevention and privacy compact	-2.8550*	(0.2972)
national guard mutual assistance counter-drug activities compact	-3.4107*	(0.6176)
national popular vote interstate compact	-5.3204*	(0.6420)
natreso	-3.3805*	(0.3351)
neighnot	-3.6611*	(0.4532)
netmeter	-3.0735*	(0.2573)
netmeter_yearadopted	-2.8510*	(0.2704)
newbornheartscreen	-1.0033*	(0.3040)
nonresident violator compact	-3.8590*	(0.3230)
norealid	-1.7060*	(0.4995)
notarial acts (1982)	-4.5367*	(0.4290)
nurse licensure compact	-3.4512*	(0.5272)
offwmh	-3.0933*	(0.2991)
opencont	-2.9704*	(0.2343)
optinnot	-4.3718*	(0.6763)
pain management	-2.3202*	(0.2479)
paperterror	-2.4755*	(0.3623)
parconsent	-4.0993*	(0.3007)
parentage act	-4.0985*	(0.5132)
parentage act (1973)	-3.6457*	(0.3945)
parnotific	-4.4655*	(0.3094)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

partition of heirs property act	-4.6443*	(1.0126)
partnership act (1997) (last amended 2013)	-3.1230*	(0.2816)
pbfb	-3.8208*	(0.2738)
pdrugmon	-6.6675*	(0.5156)
perforfun	-3.6052*	(0.2925)
personaltax_yearadopted	-3.6514*	(0.3774)
personaltaxeff_yearadopted	-4.9689*	(0.5275)
pestcomp	-4.4115*	(0.3431)
physreq	-2.9941*	(0.2364)
postdna	-2.1321*	(0.2580)
postvia	-3.5129*	(0.2793)
power of attorney	-3.4423*	(0.5277)
pre20wk	-1.8479*	(0.3702)
preconvictdays	-2.6789*	(0.2456)
premarital agreement act	-3.4926*	(0.3147)
prepaid	-3.0576*	(0.3202)
prepaytut	-3.1855*	(0.3315)
prescdrug	-5.2007*	(0.3437)
primaryenforce_all	-3.0348*	(0.2539)
primaryenforce_minor	-5.3263*	(0.6222)
primseat	-3.0847*	(0.2780)
principal and income act (1962)	-4.0495*	(0.3639)
principal and income act (2000)	-2.0654*	(0.2476)
principal and income amendments (2008)	-1.4570*	(0.3226)
prisondayswag	-5.3541*	(0.6221)
probate code	-5.5870*	(0.4695)
prudent investor act	-2.6818*	(0.2595)
prudent management of institutional funds act	-0.5317	(0.3572)
pubaccess	-3.1606*	(0.4275)
pubbenefits_yearadopted	-3.2593*	(0.3935)
pubbrefeed	-2.0706*	(0.2281)
pubcamfun	-2.9961*	(0.3123)
pubfacilities	-4.8271*	(0.4508)
r_d_tax_credit	-3.0695*	(0.2457)
racialpro	-2.2499*	(0.3334)
rackact	-3.0485*	(0.2921)
rapeshield	-2.3112*	(0.2311)
real property electronic recording act	-2.0518*	(0.3219)
real property transfer on death act	-3.2497*	(0.6556)
reciprocal enforcement of support act (1950)	-4.2155*	(0.4029)
refuseserv	-2.7630*	(0.2344)
regreq	-3.5683*	(0.3932)
regulation_bicycle_helmet	-2.7448*	(0.2805)
regulation_boehmke_cogrowma	-4.7758*	(0.3948)
regulation_boehmke_grandvis	-2.4802*	(0.2407)
regulation_boehmke_livingwil	-1.8646*	(0.2214)
regulation_boehmke_shiel	-6.1678*	(0.4024)
regulation_hate_crime	-2.5434*	(0.2386)
regulation_mandatory_car_insura	-3.7216*	(0.3125)
regulation_mandatory_seatbelt	-1.2821*	(0.2550)
regulation_motorcycle_helmet	-3.6153*	(0.9621)
regulation_pain_suffering_limit	-4.2009*	(0.2991)
regulation_rent_contro	-4.8137*	(0.3105)
regulation_rfr	-3.5135*	(0.3010)
regulations_lemonla	-2.6050*	(0.2119)
renewenergy	-3.8727*	(0.2899)
repsodomy	-3.4798*	(0.2354)
requireanyid2	-4.9622*	(0.3263)
residential landlord and tenant act 1972	-4.3730*	(0.3294)
restaurantbanstate	-4.6434*	(0.4636)
restruct	-2.5723*	(0.3816)
retail theft	-2.9718*	(0.2564)
revenue	-2.7971*	(0.3238)
rico	-3.2561*	(0.2763)
right2work	-10.2561*	(0.8626)
rightdie	-3.6764*	(0.4289)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

rights of the terminally ill act (1985)	-4.0846*	(0.6454)
roeovertur	-6.4405*	(0.8915)
rps_yearadopted	-3.2409*	(0.3567)
rules of evidence (1974)	-3.9323*	(0.7196)
salvia	-2.3426*	(0.5022)
savingplan	-2.4535*	(0.2652)
schoolchoi	-3.3056*	(0.5720)
sdce	-3.5748*	(0.3424)
securities act	-3.0399*	(0.3898)
securities act (1956)	-4.1509*	(0.4320)
sexreginfo	-2.9590*	(0.4333)
sexselect	-6.1478*	(0.5855)
shield	-6.7341*	(0.4540)
shoplift	-2.8037*	(0.2475)
simultaneous death act	-3.9796*	(0.4260)
smokeban	-4.2125*	(0.4380)
soexorder	-4.1765*	(0.2902)
solaw	-4.4029*	(0.3813)
sonofsam	-2.4001*	(0.2346)
sonsam	-2.4755*	(0.2371)
st_wd_tran	-3.5364*	(0.2505)
stalkdef	-1.4245*	(0.3234)
stalking	-0.7974*	(0.2497)
standground	-3.2355*	(0.2849)
statrape	-3.1232*	(0.2517)
statutory form power of attorney act	-4.6402*	(0.5958)
statutory rule against perpetuities	-3.5438*	(0.3074)
sundayban	-0.4010	(0.4221)
supp_research	-5.0212*	(0.8983)
syringe	-4.0562*	(0.4618)
tels	-3.3840*	(0.3255)
terrorfund	-2.3623*	(0.3497)
testamentary additions to trusts act	-5.3573*	(0.3969)
threestrikes	-1.2283*	(0.3201)
timelim	-1.6537*	(0.3459)
tod security registration act	-2.1613*	(0.2407)
trade secrets act	-2.9607*	(0.2447)
transboundary pollution reciprocal access act	-4.2705*	(0.6326)
transfers to minors act	-2.1892*	(0.2428)
transport	-3.7701*	(0.3739)
trap	-4.2488*	(0.3337)
trap_hosp	-3.9945*	(0.2562)
trap_lic	-4.2580*	(0.2730)
trust code	-2.9151*	(0.3477)
trustees' powers act (1964)	-4.1018*	(0.6052)
truthsent	-8.0049*	(0.4612)
tu_decent	-3.4856*	(0.3088)
u_record_sys	-3.0253*	(0.2419)
ucc article 1, general provisions (2001)	-1.7786*	(0.2963)
ucc article 2a, leases (1987) (1990)	-1.6389*	(0.2422)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments (1990)	-1.5031*	(0.2447)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments and article 4, bank deposits (2002)	-3.3672*	(0.4232)
ucc article 4a amendments (2012)	-0.1608	(0.2759)
ucc article 4a, funds transfers (1989)	-0.6116	(0.2968)
ucc article 5, letters of credit (1995)	-1.2442*	(0.2571)
ucc article 6 (revise)	-3.8418*	(0.6613)
ucc article 6, bulk sales (1989)	-2.4073*	(0.2528)
ucc article 7, documents of title (2003)	-1.5270*	(0.2921)
ucc article 8, investment securities	-2.1135*	(0.3325)
ucc article 8, investment securities (1994)	-0.7057*	(0.2627)
ucc article 9 amendments	-3.2879*	(0.2518)
ucc article 9 amendments (2010)	-0.1167	(0.3044)
ucc article 9, secured transactions (1998)	-3.3172*	(0.2214)
ultrasound	-3.2699*	(0.3173)
unclaimed property act	-3.4137*	(0.3976)
unclaimed property act (1952)(1981)	-3.4881*	(0.3046)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

undocuit	-3.3372*	(0.5221)
uniform unclaimed property act	-6.3237*	(0.7299)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (1992)(1996)	-3.7565*	(0.3938)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (2008) (last amended 2011)	-3.8281*	(0.7200)
unionlimits	-0.4505	(0.3200)
universal health care	-2.5647*	(0.3857)
universalprek	-4.1549*	(0.5427)
unsworn foreign declarations act (2008)	-3.3037*	(0.3767)
viatesting	-4.8626*	(1.0070)
vicrtsamd	-3.0420*	(0.2765)
victim notification	-2.6353*	(0.2219)
victimnotif	-2.5853*	(0.2198)
victimrights	-3.0028*	(0.2771)
w_abortion_parental_notice_1983	-4.2379*	(0.3333)
w_animal_cruelty_felon	-4.0265*	(0.4225)
w_ec_access_expan	-4.5415*	(0.8338)
w_educ_mom_silentmandator	-4.8038*	(0.3600)
w_educ_mom_silentpermis	-4.5354*	(0.3164)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_loca	-5.2550*	(0.5944)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_stat	-3.7834*	(0.2653)
w_environment_endangered_specie	-3.2104*	(0.2441)
w_gayright_publi_accom_genderi	-4.5579*	(0.3936)
w_gayrights_employment_discrimi	-4.9950*	(0.5387)
w_gayrights_public_accomodation	-4.4854*	(0.4762)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_handgu	-5.8638*	(0.4566)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_rifl	-5.7505*	(0.9514)
waiting	-4.1747*	(0.2695)
wildlife violator compact	-4.3333*	(0.3799)
wills recognition act	-4.8378*	(0.3977)
witnessint	-3.0384*	(0.2427)
wk20via	-5.1352*	(0.4032)
wmd	-1.6476*	(0.2749)
worksitebanstate	-3.4992*	(0.4782)
writreq	-3.4765*	(0.5378)
zerotol	-2.2956*	(0.2143)
zerotoleranceapis	-2.2695*	(0.2176)
zerotolerancelaw	-2.0923*	(0.2171)
aborparc × Initiative	-0.8677	(0.7182)
aborparn × Initiative	-0.5309	(0.5608)
aborpreroe × Initiative	-0.2959	(0.8705)
abortion_consent_1992_201 × Initiative	0.0179	(0.3892)
abortion_medicaid × Initiative	0.4431	(0.4862)
abortion_partial_birt × Initiative	-0.5470	(0.7846)
abortion_reform_prero × Initiative	-0.2850	(0.8655)
absvot × Initiative	0.9639	(0.4322)
admittpriv × Initiative	0.2514	(0.6200)
adoption act (1953)(1969) × Initiative	0.3286	(1.0411)
adult guardianship and protective proceedings jurisdiction act × Initiative	0.5152	(0.4018)
advertban × Initiative	-0.5490	(0.5273)
aging × Initiative	-0.2772	(0.4797)
agreement on detainees × Initiative	0.6004	(0.5135)
agreement on qualifications of educational personnel × Initiative	-0.1076	(0.9399)
alcoholism and intoxication treatment × Initiative	0.0409	(0.6780)
allpass_seatbelt × Initiative	-0.1169	(0.4399)
amber × Initiative	0.2494	(0.3184)
anatomical gift (1968) × Initiative	1.2014	(0.7048)
anatomical gift act (1987) × Initiative	0.1714	(0.4602)
anatomical gift act (2006) × Initiative	0.1590	(0.5037)
anim_cruel_felonfirs × Initiative	-0.5202	(0.3473)
animcruel × Initiative	-0.2873	(0.3406)
antibully × Initiative	-0.0547	(0.3240)
antistalk × Initiative	0.1375	(0.3362)
anyactnot × Initiative	0.0537	(0.5526)
anyid2 × Initiative	-0.3291	(0.3564)
anyphotoid2 × Initiative	-0.9594	(0.5034)
apology × Initiative	0.6323	(0.3583)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

arbitration act (1956) × Initiative	0.1964	(0.4818)
arbitration act (2000) × Initiative	1.3288	(0.5895)
assignment of rents act × Initiative	0.3412	(0.9402)
athlete agents act × Initiative	-0.4634	(0.3820)
autism × Initiative	-0.6611	(0.4138)
banfaninc × Initiative	0.0533	(0.4128)
bangag × Initiative	-0.1016	(0.2985)
barbanstate × Initiative	0.4874	(0.6001)
bikehelmet × Initiative	-1.8698*	(0.7245)
bldstds_yearadopted × Initiative	-0.1336	(0.3711)
boehmke_snrpres × Initiative	-0.2469	(0.4988)
bootcamp × Initiative	-0.0391	(0.4325)
bottle × Initiative	0.2786	(0.6701)
bradycamp × Initiative	-0.9702	(0.5983)
breastdensity × Initiative	-1.2797	(0.6766)
breastfeed × Initiative	-0.0601	(0.3116)
broadcom × Initiative	0.4017	(0.4953)
buildingcode × Initiative	-0.4656	(0.3497)
candlim × Initiative	-0.4171	(0.3652)
ccb × Initiative	-0.1789	(0.5177)
ccreceipt × Initiative	0.2377	(0.3802)
cctheft × Initiative	-0.1299	(0.3496)
cent × Initiative	0.2572	(0.4960)
certification of questions of law (1967) × Initiative	-0.5336	(0.6388)
certification of questions of law (1995) × Initiative	-2.6314	(1.1699)
chartersch × Initiative	-0.4190	(0.4353)
child abduction prevention × Initiative	0.6156	(0.7867)
child custody jurisdiction and enforcement act × Initiative	0.1314	(0.3115)
child pornography × Initiative	-0.3527	(0.3175)
childrest × Initiative	-0.1753	(0.3764)
civil defense and disaster compact × Initiative	-0.5826	(0.7978)
civinjaut × Initiative	1.0134	(0.5919)
clinic_access × Initiative	0.6151	(0.5305)
cogrowman × Initiative	0.8448	(1.1025)
colcanscr × Initiative	-0.4248	(0.4019)
collaborative law act × Initiative	0.3325	(0.7776)
collegesavings × Initiative	-0.1762	(0.3082)
common interest ownership act (1982) × Initiative	1.3705	(1.0615)
compact for education × Initiative	-0.4291	(0.6985)
compact on adoption and medical assistance × Initiative	-0.7091	(0.4560)
compact on mental health × Initiative	-1.6318	(0.9743)
compact on placement of children × Initiative	0.2229	(0.3569)
compcrime × Initiative	0.2598	(0.3070)
comsrv12 × Initiative	-0.2351	(0.3426)
concealed carry × Initiative	0.7204	(0.4531)
condominium act × Initiative	-0.4595	(0.6311)
conservation easement act × Initiative	-0.4005	(0.4657)
const_protect × Initiative	0.5675	(0.5390)
consumer credit code × Initiative	-0.0552	(0.7679)
continsurance × Initiative	-0.6655	(0.4748)
contr_eq × Initiative	-0.0002	(0.4840)
controlled substances act × Initiative	0.3122	(0.3895)
corporateeff_yearadopted × Initiative	0.0197	(0.4895)
corporaterenew_yearadopted × Initiative	-1.0862	(1.2337)
corporlimits × Initiative	-0.1021	(0.4352)
correct × Initiative	0.2382	(0.4812)
cpban × Initiative	-0.2325	(0.2981)
credfreez × Initiative	-0.1307	(0.4734)
crimeviccomp × Initiative	-0.0400	(0.3269)
custodial trust act × Initiative	-0.1313	(0.5325)
cyberstalk × Initiative	0.0276	(0.4757)
damagereduce × Initiative	1.5158*	(0.5601)
damremov × Initiative	0.4980	(0.5217)
deathpen × Initiative	0.7079	(0.3558)
debt-management services act, 2005 × Initiative	1.0055	(1.1537)
deceptive trade practices act (1964) × Initiative	1.8331	(2.2402)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

deployed parents custody and visitation act × Initiative	1.2877	(1.1937)
determination of death act × Initiative	0.4131	(0.3729)
dev_s1 × Initiative	-0.6406	(0.5190)
dev_s2 × Initiative	-0.1069	(0.8245)
dev_s4 × Initiative	0.2436	(0.5624)
dev_s9 × Initiative	-0.3222	(0.7707)
disclaimer of property interests act × Initiative	0.1116	(0.5224)
disclaimer of property interests act (1973) × Initiative	-0.0611	(0.6977)
discrenot × Initiative	-1.1484	(0.8491)
disposition of community property rights at death act (1971) × Initiative	0.3662	(0.5207)
division of income for tax purposes × Initiative	0.7554	(1.0115)
dnafelon × Initiative	0.6126	(0.3999)
dnaforexon × Initiative	-0.2047	(0.3310)
driver license compact × Initiative	0.3891	(0.5000)
drugs_boehmke_statrapag × Initiative	0.2756	(0.3310)
drugs_boehmke_zeroto × Initiative	-0.1263	(0.4149)
drugs_marijuana_decriminalizati × Initiative	0.8918	(0.5718)
drugs_medical_marijuan × Initiative	1.7548	(0.7137)
drugs_smoking_ban_restaurant × Initiative	0.6230	(0.4181)
drugs_smoking_ban_workplace × Initiative	0.4296	(0.4756)
drugtest × Initiative	-0.1658	(0.4996)
dual_enroll × Initiative	0.5947	(0.3343)
dui × Initiative	0.0782	(0.2898)
dui08 × Initiative	-0.1135	(0.4105)
durable power of attorney × Initiative	0.1331	(0.5065)
duties to persons with medical id devices × Initiative	1.0733	(0.9533)
dwi reform × Initiative	0.1236	(0.3751)
earlvot × Initiative	-0.1021	(0.5249)
earned_income_taxcredi × Initiative	-0.5625	(0.5332)
econdev × Initiative	0.0163	(0.4254)
education × Initiative	-0.6398	(0.7304)
education_corporal_punishment_b × Initiative	-0.0480	(0.4426)
elecdayreg × Initiative	0.4615	(0.7701)
elecdereg × Initiative	0.5743	(0.4595)
electronic legal material act × Initiative	1.8918	(1.2366)
electronic transactions act × Initiative	-0.0422	(0.3693)
emcont_avail × Initiative	0.6742	(0.5376)
emergency management assistance compact × Initiative	-0.6111	(0.3416)
emergency volunteer health practitioners × Initiative	0.0849	(0.5838)
eminent scholar × Initiative	-0.5638	(0.4687)
enforcement of foreign judgments act × Initiative	0.1195	(0.3237)
engonly × Initiative	0.3403	(0.4174)
enterzone × Initiative	-0.4903	(0.3591)
entity transactions act, model (2007) (last amended 2013) × Initiative	0.0638	(1.0638)
environ × Initiative	0.2257	(0.5771)
environment_bottlebil × Initiative	0.3752	(0.7056)
environment_ca_car_emissions_st × Initiative	1.1874	(0.8823)
environment_electronic_wast × Initiative	-0.0813	(0.6024)
environment_ghg_ca × Initiative	-1.2857	(1.2662)
environment_publicbenefit_fund × Initiative	-0.1091	(0.6319)
environment_state_nepa × Initiative	-0.8268	(0.6138)
environmental covenants act × Initiative	0.4851	(0.4880)
eqrightam × Initiative	-0.4360	(0.5851)
estate tax apportionment and probate code 3-916 × Initiative	0.9974	(0.6943)
estate_ta × Initiative	-1.2611	(1.0669)
ewaste × Initiative	-0.1509	(0.5422)
famcap × Initiative	0.0672	(0.4945)
famlim × Initiative	-0.0710	(0.4102)
federal lien registration act × Initiative	0.4136	(0.4102)
fetaldispos × Initiative	0.5876	(0.4469)
fetalhomic × Initiative	0.4006	(0.3419)
fetalpain × Initiative	1.0912	(1.2798)
filmtaxcredit × Initiative	-0.0002	(0.3327)
foca × Initiative	1.1767	(0.7784)
foia × Initiative	-1.0323	(0.5801)
foreign money claims act × Initiative	0.5837	(0.4859)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

foreign money judgments recognition act × Initiative	0.4932	(0.4263)
foreign-country money judgments recognition act × Initiative	0.3868	(0.5312)
fraudulent transfer act (1984) × Initiative	1.2879*	(0.3399)
frontpass_seatbelt × Initiative	0.2706	(0.4252)
funds_avail × Initiative	1.0668	(0.9404)
fundslife × Initiative	0.5239	(0.3508)
fundslifehea × Initiative	-0.1499	(0.3327)
furlough × Initiative	-0.1376	(0.3532)
furprog × Initiative	-0.5266	(0.3969)
gagrule × Initiative	-0.0364	(0.4737)
gambling_casino × Initiative	0.0185	(0.4509)
gambling_lottery_adoptio × Initiative	-0.2738	(0.3350)
gap × Initiative	0.9236	(1.0387)
gay_employment_discrim_genderi × Initiative	0.4347	(0.6488)
gayhate × Initiative	-0.4006	(0.3942)
gaymarban × Initiative	0.4227	(0.3869)
gayrights_civilunion × Initiative	0.3925	(0.7323)
gayrights_hatecrime × Initiative	-0.5002	(0.4228)
gayrights_marriag × Initiative	-1.1151	(1.7694)
gdI × Initiative	-0.2480	(0.3323)
gender_disc_laws_post196 × Initiative	-1.3242	(0.6958)
genderrights_era_ratificatio × Initiative	-1.9056*	(0.5877)
genderrights_nofault_divorc × Initiative	-0.3752	(0.3436)
genderrights_state_era × Initiative	-0.2114	(0.4761)
giexorder × Initiative	-1.6182	(0.7151)
gilaw × Initiative	0.3660	(0.6109)
goodsam911 × Initiative	0.6562	(0.6775)
governance_reform × Initiative	0.5502	(0.4464)
guardianship and protective proceedings act (1997) × Initiative	-1.1506	(1.4368)
guncontrl_bc_private_handgu × Initiative	-0.9648	(0.8403)
guncontrl_bc_private_rifl × Initiative	0.4025	(0.9081)
guncontrol_assaultweapon_ba × Initiative	-1.0884	(1.2716)
guncontrol_opencarr × Initiative	0.3029	(0.3588)
guncontrol_satnightspecial_ba × Initiative	-0.7100	(0.9467)
harass × Initiative	0.7752	(0.7641)
hate crimes × Initiative	0.3015	(0.3240)
hatecrime × Initiative	0.3936	(0.3128)
hazing × Initiative	-0.0336	(0.3195)
health × Initiative	-0.2670	(0.4569)
health care compact × Initiative	-0.4563	(1.8532)
health-care decisions act × Initiative	0.4877	(0.8932)
helmetlaw_17 × Initiative	-0.1282	(0.3055)
helmetlaw_learn × Initiative	-0.1049	(0.4063)
helmetlaw_pass × Initiative	0.1112	(0.4099)
higissue × Initiative	0.0632	(0.3868)
higrenew × Initiative	0.1874	(0.3600)
hiport × Initiative	-0.0480	(0.3509)
hiprecon × Initiative	0.0528	(0.3662)
hmomod1 × Initiative	-0.7749	(0.4628)
hmomod2 × Initiative	-0.1769	(0.4487)
hostliability × Initiative	0.7462	(0.4589)
hsexit × Initiative	-0.8670	(0.4370)
humantraffice × Initiative	0.0698	(0.3912)
idas × Initiative	-0.5477	(0.3743)
ide × Initiative	0.0957	(0.4127)
idtheft × Initiative	0.0922	(0.3265)
imitcontsub × Initiative	0.1157	(0.2992)
immigration_english_languag × Initiative	0.5413	(0.3931)
immigration_instate_tuition_ill × Initiative	-0.0911	(0.5086)
indgaming × Initiative	0.7634	(0.4512)
indlimit × Initiative	-0.2212	(0.4533)
indorgris × Initiative	-1.0737	(0.6674)
infantheat × Initiative	-0.2259	(0.3221)
infconsent × Initiative	0.3099	(0.3332)
infertility × Initiative	0.1435	(0.6998)
ins_stateexch × Initiative	0.0792	(0.5450)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

insandefref × Initiative	-0.3349	(0.3583)
insanity × Initiative	-0.2459	(0.3475)
insprivate × Initiative	-0.2286	(0.4760)
inspublic × Initiative	0.7840	(0.4758)
inst_tu_und × Initiative	0.1011	(0.6412)
inst_tu_vet × Initiative	-0.1246	(0.8102)
insurable interest amendment to the uniform trust code × Initiative	-0.1090	(1.0064)
inswaiver × Initiative	-0.7708	(1.1822)
interreg × Initiative	0.1514	(0.5327)
interstate compact for adult offender supervision × Initiative	0.2443	(0.2830)
interstate compact on adoption and medical assistance × Initiative	-0.2675	(0.6796)
interstate compact on educational opportunity for military children × Initiative	0.2760	(0.4641)
interstate compact on licensure of participants in horse racing with pari-mutuel wagering × Initiative	0.0491	(0.5548)
interstate compact on mentally disordered offenders × Initiative	0.1602	(1.0064)
interstate corrections compact × Initiative	0.2517	(0.3729)
interstate depositions and discovery act × Initiative	-0.4672	(0.4263)
interstate enforcement of domestic violence protection orders act × Initiative	-0.0908	(0.5487)
interstate family support act (1992)(1996) × Initiative	0.5763	(0.3752)
interstate family support act (2001) × Initiative	1.3707	(0.6156)
interstate family support act amendments (2008) × Initiative	0.3199	(0.6545)
interstate high speed rail network compact × Initiative	0.2774	(0.8413)
interstate insurance product regulation compact × Initiative	-0.3821	(0.3591)
interstate library compact × Initiative	-0.6587	(0.8395)
interstate mining compact × Initiative	0.8964	(0.8720)
interstate rail passenger network compact × Initiative	-0.0665	(0.7713)
keg_reg × Initiative	0.2528	(0.3772)
kinship × Initiative	0.1327	(0.4138)
labor_age_discriminatio × Initiative	-1.1624	(0.5856)
labor_collective_bargaining_sta × Initiative	0.4625	(0.4932)
labor_collective_bargaining_tea × Initiative	0.2719	(0.4618)
labor_minwage_abovefe × Initiative	0.2780	(0.4649)
labor_state_ada_accomodat × Initiative	-0.2661	(0.5011)
labor_state_ada_antidiscr × Initiative	-0.3296	(0.3429)
law on notarial acts, revised × Initiative	1.1057	(1.2431)
lemon × Initiative	0.3616	(0.4321)
licenseplate × Initiative	-0.0905	(0.3673)
limited cooperative association act (2007) (last amended 2013) × Initiative	0.7611	(1.3683)
limited liability company (1995)(1996) × Initiative	1.0406	(1.4902)
limited liability company (2006) (last amended 2013) × Initiative	1.1602	(0.8708)
limited partnership (1976) × Initiative	-0.0189	(0.3367)
limited partnership act (2001) (last amended 2013) × Initiative	0.8618	(0.5400)
lott × Initiative	0.0077	(0.3565)
mailreg × Initiative	-0.3541	(0.3001)
manaccess × Initiative	0.3717	(0.5876)
management of institutional funds act × Initiative	0.4390	(0.3579)
manclin × Initiative	-0.4624	(0.4621)
mandatory disposition of detainers × Initiative	0.1543	(1.5963)
mandnot × Initiative	0.4753	(0.6037)
marriage and divorce act, model × Initiative	1.0416	(0.9313)
medianot × Initiative	-1.5393	(1.1067)
mediation act × Initiative	1.8637	(1.0812)
medicalrest × Initiative	0.0304	(0.4922)
medmar × Initiative	-0.6200	(0.3886)
meganslaw × Initiative	-0.0700	(0.3152)
mendeapen × Initiative	-0.0827	(0.5102)
meritaid × Initiative	-0.1322	(0.6429)
meritstateadmin × Initiative	0.0237	(0.6771)
methpre × Initiative	0.7347	(0.4284)
military and overseas voters act × Initiative	0.6582	(0.6214)
minfine × Initiative	0.1349	(0.4113)
minor student capacity to borrow act (1969) × Initiative	1.9137	(1.3559)
missplan × Initiative	0.6420	(0.8287)
mlda21 × Initiative	0.0139	(0.3355)
model state administrative procedure act (1981) × Initiative	-0.2794	(0.7794)
money services act × Initiative	0.0244	(0.9128)
motorvoter × Initiative	0.1360	(0.2933)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

mprisdm × Initiative	-0.2179	(0.3642)
msas × Initiative	1.1855*	(0.4520)
multistate lottery agreement × Initiative	-0.5081	(0.4001)
naticurric × Initiative	0.6881	(0.4530)
national crime prevention and privacy compact × Initiative	0.2139	(0.4026)
national guard mutual assistance counter-drug activities compact × Initiative	0.7943	(0.7544)
national popular vote interstate compact × Initiative	1.4358	(0.8229)
natreso × Initiative	-0.5126	(0.5365)
neighnot × Initiative	-0.1421	(0.6901)
netmeter × Initiative	-0.3400	(0.3639)
netmeter_yearadopted × Initiative	-0.0212	(0.3613)
newbornheartscreen × Initiative	-0.0818	(0.4046)
nonresident violator compact × Initiative	0.1623	(0.4302)
norealid × Initiative	0.3403	(0.6385)
notarial acts (1982) × Initiative	-0.3000	(0.6384)
nurse licensure compact × Initiative	0.8671	(0.6452)
offwmh × Initiative	-0.8795	(0.5092)
opencont × Initiative	0.2104	(0.3208)
optinnot × Initiative	-0.2992	(0.9836)
pain management × Initiative	0.1376	(0.3444)
paperterror × Initiative	1.3847*	(0.4447)
parconsent × Initiative	0.4643	(0.3957)
parentage act × Initiative	0.0315	(0.7803)
parentage act (1973) × Initiative	0.2848	(0.5435)
parnotific × Initiative	0.0541	(0.4310)
partition of heirs property act × Initiative	1.2824	(1.2433)
partnership act (1997) (last amended 2013) × Initiative	0.7575	(0.3668)
pbf × Initiative	-0.3880	(0.4276)
pdrugmon × Initiative	0.4398	(0.6418)
perforfun × Initiative	-0.0207	(0.4078)
personaltax_yearadopted × Initiative	-0.3632	(0.5864)
personaltaxeff_yearadopted × Initiative	1.0525	(0.7067)
pestcomp × Initiative	0.0969	(0.4338)
physreq × Initiative	0.1850	(0.3073)
postdna × Initiative	0.1818	(0.3574)
postvia × Initiative	0.0937	(0.3829)
power of attorney × Initiative	0.7791	(0.6455)
pre20wk × Initiative	-0.2566	(0.5929)
preconvictdays × Initiative	0.1091	(0.3314)
premarital agreement act × Initiative	0.3498	(0.4143)
prepaid × Initiative	0.4153	(0.4241)
prepaytut × Initiative	0.2530	(0.4578)
prescdrug × Initiative	0.1770	(0.4695)
primaryenforce_all × Initiative	-1.0653	(0.4154)
primaryenforce_minor × Initiative	-0.2387	(0.9873)
primseat × Initiative	-1.1488	(0.4918)
principal and income act (1962) × Initiative	0.0005	(0.5133)
principal and income act (2000) × Initiative	0.2208	(0.3269)
principal and income amendments (2008) × Initiative	0.5561	(0.4438)
prisondayswag × Initiative	0.5512	(0.8032)
probate code × Initiative	1.2649	(0.5512)
prudent investor act × Initiative	0.8680	(0.3430)
prudent management of institutional funds act × Initiative	0.3409	(0.4802)
pubaccess × Initiative	0.4286	(0.5783)
pubbenefits_yearadopted × Initiative	0.0144	(0.6073)
pubbrefeed × Initiative	-0.2604	(0.3173)
pubcamfun × Initiative	-0.0100	(0.4406)
pubfacilities × Initiative	-0.4849	(0.7261)
r_d_tax_credit × Initiative	-0.4647	(0.3674)
racialpro × Initiative	0.3744	(0.4391)
rackact × Initiative	0.3022	(0.3937)
rapeshield × Initiative	0.1235	(0.3108)
real property electronic recording act × Initiative	-0.7680	(0.4661)
real property transfer on death act × Initiative	0.9910	(0.8096)
reciprocal enforcement of support act (1950) × Initiative	1.0087	(0.4904)
refuseserv × Initiative	0.5687	(0.3017)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

regreq × Initiative	0.2845	(0.5265)
regulation_bicycle_helmet × Initiative	-1.6468*	(0.6101)
regulation_boehmke_cogrowma × Initiative	-0.6690	(0.6035)
regulation_boehmke_grandvis × Initiative	-0.0821	(0.3079)
regulation_boehmke_livingwil × Initiative	-0.0643	(0.3005)
regulation_boehmke_shiel × Initiative	-0.4102	(0.4521)
regulation_hate_crime × Initiative	0.0856	(0.3306)
regulation_mandatory_car_insura × Initiative	0.0594	(0.3863)
regulation_mandatory_seatbelt × Initiative	0.0626	(0.3339)
regulation_motorcycle_helmet × Initiative	1.2996	(1.0681)
regulation_pain_suffering_limit × Initiative	0.5614	(0.3698)
regulation_rent_contro × Initiative	0.1244	(0.3802)
regulation_rfr × Initiative	-0.9217	(0.5817)
regulations_lemonla × Initiative	0.0164	(0.2869)
renewenergy × Initiative	0.0990	(0.3951)
repsodomy × Initiative	-0.0114	(0.2984)
requireanyid2 × Initiative	-1.2861	(0.6340)
residential landlord and tenant act 1972 × Initiative	-0.0549	(0.4602)
restaurantbanstate × Initiative	0.6740	(0.5311)
restruct × Initiative	-0.2771	(0.6168)
retail theft × Initiative	0.3937	(0.3422)
revenue × Initiative	-0.4002	(0.5048)
rico × Initiative	0.0202	(0.3780)
right2work × Initiative	-0.7281	(1.4595)
rightdie × Initiative	0.6018	(0.5738)
rights of the terminally ill act (1985) × Initiative	1.6810	(0.7268)
roeovertur × Initiative	0.3733	(1.1576)
rps_yearadopted × Initiative	-0.8799	(0.6780)
rules of evidence (1974) × Initiative	1.1917	(0.8680)
salvia × Initiative	-0.0412	(0.6648)
savingplan × Initiative	-0.2091	(0.3713)
schoolchoi × Initiative	1.4990	(0.6503)
sdce × Initiative	0.1199	(0.5027)
securities act × Initiative	-0.2970	(0.5516)
securities act (1956) × Initiative	-1.0889	(0.9153)
sexreginfo × Initiative	0.4284	(0.5816)
sexselect × Initiative	0.0197	(0.8804)
shield × Initiative	0.0772	(0.5118)
shoplift × Initiative	0.3369	(0.3168)
simultaneous death act × Initiative	-0.1666	(0.6108)
smokeban × Initiative	0.9836	(0.5330)
soexorder × Initiative	0.0040	(0.3992)
solaw × Initiative	-0.8204	(0.6293)
sonofsam × Initiative	0.1698	(0.3096)
sonsam × Initiative	0.0314	(0.3153)
st_wd_tran × Initiative	0.6737	(0.3347)
stalkdef × Initiative	-0.4214	(0.4671)
stalking × Initiative	-0.4204	(0.3451)
standground × Initiative	-0.3532	(0.4263)
statrape × Initiative	0.3426	(0.3244)
statutory form power of attorney act × Initiative	0.7882	(0.7221)
statutory rule against perpetuities × Initiative	0.4421	(0.4035)
sundayban × Initiative	-1.1227	(0.6396)
supp_research × Initiative	0.4846	(1.0825)
syringe × Initiative	-0.4618	(0.6517)
tels × Initiative	0.7254	(0.4153)
terrorfund × Initiative	0.0163	(0.4761)
testamentary additions to trusts act × Initiative	0.0761	(0.5404)
threestrikes × Initiative	-0.6411	(0.4672)
timelim × Initiative	-0.6693	(0.5522)
tod security registration act × Initiative	0.9368*	(0.3249)
trade secrets act × Initiative	0.6876	(0.3250)
transboundary pollution reciprocal access act × Initiative	0.3903	(0.8627)
transfers to minors act × Initiative	1.2384*	(0.3307)
transport × Initiative	0.2582	(0.5061)
trap × Initiative	0.0903	(0.4837)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

trap_hosp × Initiative	-0.1861	(0.3660)
trap_lic × Initiative	-0.4772	(0.4121)
trust code × Initiative	0.3409	(0.4509)
trustees' powers act (1964) × Initiative	-0.2286	(0.9515)
truthsent × Initiative	0.5133	(0.4114)
tu_decent × Initiative	-0.3722	(0.4662)
u_record_sys × Initiative	-0.1802	(0.3200)
ucc article 1, general provisions (2001) × Initiative	-0.0735	(0.3848)
ucc article 2a, leases (1987) (1990) × Initiative	0.7033	(0.3310)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments (1990) × Initiative	1.3729*	(0.3829)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments and article 4, bank deposits (2002) × Initiative	-0.7540	(0.7193)
ucc article 4a amendments (2012) × Initiative	-0.0695	(0.3869)
ucc article 4a, funds transfers (1989) × Initiative	0.8272	(0.4054)
ucc article 5, letters of credit (1995) × Initiative	1.2614*	(0.3900)
ucc article 6 (revise) × Initiative	-0.2949	(0.9699)
ucc article 6, bulk sales (1989) × Initiative	1.1562*	(0.3478)
ucc article 7, documents of title (2003) × Initiative	-0.0613	(0.3898)
ucc article 8, investment securities × Initiative	-0.0836	(0.4700)
ucc article 8, investment securities (1994) × Initiative	0.5263	(0.4031)
ucc article 9 amendments × Initiative	-0.3170	(0.3508)
ucc article 9 amendments (2010) × Initiative	-0.1547	(0.4062)
ucc article 9, secured transactions (1998) × Initiative	0.0411	(0.2835)
ultrasound × Initiative	0.0840	(0.4220)
unclaimed property act × Initiative	-0.3452	(0.5707)
unclaimed property act (1952)(1981) × Initiative	0.1993	(0.4109)
undocuit × Initiative	0.3941	(0.6838)
uniform unclaimed property act × Initiative	0.8207	(0.8936)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (1992)(1996) × Initiative	-0.4023	(0.6004)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (2008) (last amended 2011) × Initiative	-0.0525	(1.0420)
unionlimits × Initiative	-0.0564	(0.4312)
universal health care × Initiative	-0.3777	(0.6555)
universalprek × Initiative	-0.0939	(0.7814)
unsworn foreign declarations act (2008) × Initiative	0.3258	(0.4851)
viatesting × Initiative	-0.0286	(1.2296)
vicrtsamd × Initiative	0.3165	(0.3777)
victim notification × Initiative	0.1506	(0.3060)
victimnotif × Initiative	0.3757	(0.2990)
victimrights × Initiative	0.4051	(0.3689)
w_abortion_parental_notice_1983 × Initiative	-0.2508	(0.4770)
w_animal_cruelty_felon × Initiative	0.0822	(0.5680)
w_ec_access_expan × Initiative	0.7746	(1.0101)
w_educ_mom_silentmandator × Initiative	-7.1777	(4.0076)
w_educ_mom_silentpermis × Initiative	-0.2889	(0.4519)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_loca × Initiative	-1.0887	(0.9173)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_stat × Initiative	-0.3319	(0.3598)
w_environment_endangered_specie × Initiative	-0.9793*	(0.3650)
w_gayright_publi_accom_genderi × Initiative	-0.0059	(0.5696)
w_gayrights_employment_discrimi × Initiative	-1.1989	(1.1146)
w_gayrights_public_accomodation × Initiative	-1.5579	(1.2023)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_handgu × Initiative	-0.8210	(0.7063)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_rifl × Initiative	0.5428	(1.1809)
waiting × Initiative	0.0453	(0.3663)
wildlife violator compact × Initiative	0.6891	(0.4863)
wills recognition act × Initiative	0.5688	(0.5033)
witnessint × Initiative	0.2748	(0.3226)
wk20via × Initiative	0.2980	(0.5315)
wmd × Initiative	0.1195	(0.3788)
worksitebanstate × Initiative	1.3066	(0.5580)
writreq × Initiative	0.1016	(0.7969)
zerotol × Initiative	0.0434	(0.2982)
zerotoleranceapis × Initiative	-0.0131	(0.2954)
zerotolerancelaw × Initiative	-0.0546	(0.3044)
aborparc × Ideology	-0.3714	(0.4082)
aborparn × Ideology	0.1084	(0.2288)
aborpreroe × Ideology	-0.0953	(0.8306)
abortion_consent_1992_201 × Ideology	-0.9946*	(0.3158)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

abortion_medical × Ideology	0.9748*	(0.3075)
abortion_partial_birt × Ideology	-1.2714*	(0.4901)
abortion_reform_prero × Ideology	-0.0433	(0.7591)
absvot × Ideology	0.1902	(0.3533)
admittpriv × Ideology	-1.2283	(0.5603)
adoption act (1953)(1969) × Ideology	-0.0377	(0.2570)
adult guardianship and protective proceedings jurisdiction act × Ideology	-0.1245	(0.3320)
advertban × Ideology	-0.2926	(0.3858)
aging × Ideology	0.1703	(0.2759)
agreement on detainers × Ideology	0.1323	(0.2878)
agreement on qualifications of educational personnel × Ideology	0.0337	(0.7026)
alcoholism and intoxication treatment × Ideology	0.3007	(0.3218)
allpass_seatbelt × Ideology	0.0419	(0.3324)
amber × Ideology	-0.0727	(0.2008)
anatomical gift (1968) × Ideology	0.2718	(0.3601)
anatomical gift act (1987) × Ideology	-0.0885	(0.3800)
anatomical gift act (2006) × Ideology	-0.4026	(0.3513)
anim_cruel_felonfirs × Ideology	0.0998	(0.2256)
animcruel × Ideology	0.0101	(0.1764)
antibully × Ideology	0.1287	(0.2272)
antistalk × Ideology	0.1710	(0.2418)
anyactnot × Ideology	-0.3200	(0.4991)
anyid2 × Ideology	-0.5531	(0.2361)
anyphotoid2 × Ideology	-0.4465	(0.2405)
apology × Ideology	0.1877	(0.2284)
arbitration act (1956) × Ideology	-0.4690*	(0.1669)
arbitration act (2000) × Ideology	0.3574	(0.3076)
assignment of rents act × Ideology	-1.0843	(0.7040)
athlete agents act × Ideology	-0.3918	(0.2390)
autism × Ideology	-0.0632	(0.2259)
banfaninc × Ideology	0.2441	(0.2867)
bangag × Ideology	0.1331	(0.1872)
barbanstate × Ideology	1.0155*	(0.3934)
bikehelmet × Ideology	0.4155	(0.2546)
bldstds_yearadopted × Ideology	0.4061	(0.1764)
boehmke_snrpres × Ideology	0.8850*	(0.3016)
bootcamp × Ideology	-0.6349	(0.2824)
bottle × Ideology	0.9276*	(0.2875)
bradycamp × Ideology	0.6297	(0.2751)
breastdensity × Ideology	0.0236	(0.3530)
breastfeed × Ideology	0.3311	(0.2226)
broadcom × Ideology	-0.5531	(0.5451)
buildingcode × Ideology	0.0741	(0.2198)
candlim × Ideology	-0.1654	(0.2831)
ccb × Ideology	0.1202	(0.3362)
ccreceipt × Ideology	-0.4117	(0.2632)
cctheft × Ideology	-0.1064	(0.2572)
cent × Ideology	0.0436	(0.3549)
certification of questions of law (1967) × Ideology	0.2118	(0.2337)
certification of questions of law (1995) × Ideology	0.7434	(0.3474)
chartersch × Ideology	-0.2855	(0.3503)
child abduction prevention × Ideology	-2.2946	(0.9838)
child custody jurisdiction and enforcement act × Ideology	-0.1186	(0.1564)
child pornography × Ideology	-0.2824	(0.1806)
childrest × Ideology	0.0727	(0.2322)
civil defense and disaster compact × Ideology	0.2702	(0.4824)
civinjaut × Ideology	0.1677	(0.4738)
clinic_access × Ideology	0.4534	(0.2417)
cogrowman × Ideology	1.6773	(0.7194)
colcanscr × Ideology	-0.0052	(0.2249)
collaborative law act × Ideology	-0.3255	(0.9022)
collegesavings × Ideology	-0.1091	(0.2454)
common interest ownership act (1982) × Ideology	1.2387	(0.4845)
compact for education × Ideology	-0.4728	(0.3233)
compact on adoption and medical assistance × Ideology	0.1013	(0.2457)
compact on mental health × Ideology	1.4023	(0.7706)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

compact on placement of children × Ideology	-0.0256	(0.1988)
compcrime × Ideology	-0.1785	(0.1682)
comsrv12 × Ideology	0.3571	(0.3400)
concealed carry × Ideology	-0.9935*	(0.2603)
condominium act × Ideology	-0.7908	(0.6274)
conservation easement act × Ideology	-0.7465*	(0.2025)
const_protect × Ideology	0.5650	(0.3886)
consumer credit code × Ideology	-0.0546	(0.3113)
continsurance × Ideology	0.9816*	(0.3424)
contr_eq × Ideology	1.2284*	(0.3981)
controlled substances act × Ideology	-0.0705	(0.2638)
corporateeff_yearadopted × Ideology	0.3890	(0.3037)
corporaterenew_yearadopted × Ideology	0.3416	(0.2089)
corporlimits × Ideology	1.1988*	(0.4231)
correct × Ideology	0.1708	(0.3301)
cpban × Ideology	-0.1944	(0.1811)
credfreez × Ideology	0.5171	(0.2789)
crimeviccomp × Ideology	0.2194	(0.1848)
custodial trust act × Ideology	0.1438	(0.4262)
cyberstalk × Ideology	0.0289	(0.3516)
damagereduce × Ideology	0.7839*	(0.1720)
damremov × Ideology	0.4290	(0.2776)
deathpen × Ideology	-0.6188*	(0.2247)
debt-management services act, 2005 × Ideology	0.7240	(0.7121)
deceptive trade practices act (1964) × Ideology	2.0781	(1.5727)
deployed parents custody and visitation act × Ideology	-1.1676*	(0.3759)
determination of death act × Ideology	-0.3529	(0.3392)
dev_s1 × Ideology	-0.2044	(0.2707)
dev_s2 × Ideology	-0.6548	(0.3760)
dev_s4 × Ideology	-0.2276	(0.6204)
dev_s9 × Ideology	-0.5325	(0.4884)
disclaimer of property interests act × Ideology	0.2300	(0.1794)
disclaimer of property interests act (1973) × Ideology	0.4324	(0.5100)
discrenot × Ideology	0.0881	(0.5345)
disposition of community property rights at death act (1971) × Ideology	-0.2346	(0.5166)
division of income for tax purposes × Ideology	0.4273*	(0.1601)
dnafelon × Ideology	-0.2591	(0.2184)
dnaforexon × Ideology	0.1332	(0.2307)
driver license compact × Ideology	0.5285	(0.3085)
drugs_boehmke_statrapag × Ideology	-0.0621	(0.2017)
drugs_boehmke_zero × Ideology	-0.0097	(0.2913)
drugs_marijuana_decriminalizati × Ideology	0.2351	(0.5621)
drugs_medical_marijuan × Ideology	1.4438*	(0.4010)
drugs_smoking_ban_restaurant × Ideology	0.8436*	(0.2731)
drugs_smoking_ban_workplace × Ideology	0.6420	(0.2705)
drugtest × Ideology	0.7037	(0.4499)
dual_enroll × Ideology	0.1375	(0.2387)
dui × Ideology	0.0092	(0.2811)
dui08 × Ideology	-0.2341	(0.4595)
durable power of attorney × Ideology	-0.4519	(0.3228)
duties to persons with medical id devices × Ideology	-0.3523	(0.5878)
dwi reform × Ideology	-0.5669	(0.3673)
earlvot × Ideology	-0.0253	(0.4166)
earned_income_taxcredi × Ideology	0.8212*	(0.2853)
econdev × Ideology	0.1473	(0.2355)
education × Ideology	-0.6124	(0.2608)
education_corporal_punishment_b × Ideology	1.2869*	(0.2666)
elecdayreg × Ideology	0.1318	(0.4604)
elecderereg × Ideology	0.3736	(0.3379)
electronic legal material act × Ideology	1.3303	(0.6112)
electronic transactions act × Ideology	-0.7460	(0.2963)
emcont_avail × Ideology	0.8649*	(0.2837)
emergency management assistance compact × Ideology	-0.1605	(0.2189)
emergency volunteer health practitioners × Ideology	-0.4695	(0.3226)
eminent scholar × Ideology	-0.4674	(0.3452)
enforcement of foreign judgments act × Ideology	0.0539	(0.1724)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

engonly × Ideology	-1.2730*	(0.2464)
enterzone × Ideology	0.2708	(0.2540)
entity transactions act, model (2007) (last amended 2013) × Ideology	-0.0056	(0.6633)
environ × Ideology	0.3430	(0.2485)
environment_bottlebil × Ideology	1.0372*	(0.3264)
environment_ca_car_emissions_st × Ideology	2.0295*	(0.3941)
environment_electronic_wast × Ideology	0.7140*	(0.2239)
environment_ghg_ca × Ideology	1.7835*	(0.5499)
environment_publicbenefit_fund × Ideology	1.0946*	(0.2791)
environment_state_nepa × Ideology	0.2016	(0.3613)
environmental covenants act × Ideology	-0.0692	(0.2967)
eqrightam × Ideology	0.1157	(0.2513)
estate tax apportionment and probate code 3-916 × Ideology	-0.1068	(0.3080)
estate.ta × Ideology	1.7621*	(0.6082)
ewaste × Ideology	0.7263*	(0.2475)
famcap × Ideology	-0.4364	(0.3901)
famlim × Ideology	0.5265	(0.3285)
federal lien registration act × Ideology	-0.2497	(0.1750)
fetaldispos × Ideology	-0.5248	(0.4712)
fetalhomic × Ideology	-0.2902	(0.1646)
fetalpain × Ideology	-5.5148*	(1.4838)
filmtaxcredit × Ideology	0.2270	(0.2109)
foca × Ideology	1.1082*	(0.1428)
foia × Ideology	-0.0429	(0.2920)
foreign money claims act × Ideology	0.2710	(0.3169)
foreign money judgments recognition act × Ideology	0.2433	(0.2699)
foreign-country money judgments recognition act × Ideology	-0.0609	(0.3354)
fraudulent transfer act (1984) × Ideology	0.0104	(0.2684)
frontpass_seatbelt × Ideology	0.3458	(0.3290)
funds_avail × Ideology	0.8012	(0.4763)
fundslife × Ideology	0.3517	(0.2445)
fundslifehea × Ideology	-0.5761*	(0.2185)
furlough × Ideology	-0.0929	(0.1978)
furprog × Ideology	-0.1960	(0.2098)
gagrule × Ideology	-1.3327*	(0.4018)
gambling_casino × Ideology	0.2397	(0.2392)
gambling_lottery_adoptio × Ideology	0.4098	(0.1689)
gap × Ideology	0.3580	(0.5308)
gay_employment_discrim_genderi × Ideology	1.2229*	(0.2961)
gayhate × Ideology	0.3347	(0.2797)
gaymarban × Ideology	-0.7959*	(0.2516)
gayrights_civilunion × Ideology	0.9457	(0.3778)
gayrights_hatecrime × Ideology	0.0805	(0.3250)
gayrights_marriag × Ideology	0.9215	(0.4887)
gdl × Ideology	0.2098	(0.2686)
gender_disc_laws_post196 × Ideology	1.8508*	(0.6229)
genderrights_era_ratificatio × Ideology	1.6041*	(0.3437)
genderrights_nofault_divorc × Ideology	0.0311	(0.1909)
genderrights_state_era × Ideology	0.1412	(0.4082)
giexorder × Ideology	0.0788	(0.3584)
gilaw × Ideology	1.1231*	(0.2801)
goodsam911 × Ideology	0.8316*	(0.3059)
governance_reform × Ideology	-0.0903	(0.4683)
guardianship and protective proceedings act (1997) × Ideology	0.1449	(0.6346)
guncontrl_bc_private_handgu × Ideology	0.5519*	(0.2100)
guncontrl_bc_private_rifl × Ideology	0.9964*	(0.1128)
guncontrol_assaultweapon.ba × Ideology	1.3796*	(0.2929)
guncontrol_opencarr × Ideology	-0.7304*	(0.1299)
guncontrol_satnightspecial.ba × Ideology	0.6488	(0.6603)
harass × Ideology	0.5116	(0.5358)
hate crimes × Ideology	0.3180	(0.2353)
hatecrime × Ideology	0.4408	(0.2322)
hazing × Ideology	0.2546	(0.1934)
health × Ideology	-0.2766	(0.2851)
health care compact × Ideology	-3.8413*	(1.1939)
health-care decisions act × Ideology	0.4774	(0.6593)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

helmetlaw_17 × Ideology	-0.2718	(0.2705)
helmetlaw_learn × Ideology	0.2740	(0.2749)
helmetlaw_pass × Ideology	0.1565	(0.3425)
higissue × Ideology	0.5378	(0.2991)
higrenew × Ideology	-0.1773	(0.2355)
hiport × Ideology	0.3433	(0.2716)
hiprecon × Ideology	0.4644	(0.2795)
hmomod1 × Ideology	-0.0717	(0.2144)
hmomod2 × Ideology	-0.4179	(0.5846)
hostliability × Ideology	0.2867	(0.3171)
hsexit × Ideology	-0.4976	(0.2620)
humantraffic × Ideology	-0.0465	(0.2533)
idas × Ideology	0.0316	(0.2452)
ide × Ideology	-0.6033	(0.4187)
idtheft × Ideology	-0.0248	(0.2258)
imitcontsub × Ideology	-0.0361	(0.1985)
immigration_english_languag × Ideology	-1.0570*	(0.1966)
immigration_instate_tuition_ill × Ideology	0.1711	(0.2411)
indgaming × Ideology	0.2321	(0.2890)
indlimit × Ideology	1.7000*	(0.4412)
indorgris × Ideology	0.1166	(0.3297)
infantheat × Ideology	0.2120	(0.2262)
infconsent × Ideology	-0.2154	(0.2426)
infertility × Ideology	1.0950*	(0.2869)
ins_stateexch × Ideology	-1.0497	(0.8374)
insandefref × Ideology	0.1444	(0.2467)
insanity × Ideology	0.3581	(0.2808)
insprivate × Ideology	-0.7105	(0.3171)
inspublic × Ideology	-0.4233	(0.3525)
inst_tu_und × Ideology	-0.4266	(0.3508)
inst_tu_vet × Ideology	-0.0793	(0.4572)
insurable interest amendment to the uniform trust code × Ideology	-1.3799	(1.3169)
inswaiver × Ideology	-1.2729*	(0.4102)
interreg × Ideology	-0.4185	(0.6497)
interstate compact for adult offender supervision × Ideology	0.1855	(0.2112)
interstate compact on adoption and medical assistance × Ideology	-0.4539	(0.3568)
interstate compact on educational opportunity for military children × Ideology	0.3260	(0.3276)
interstate compact on licensure of participants in horse racing with pari-mutuel wagering × Ideology	-0.2321	(0.4587)
interstate compact on mentally disordered offenders × Ideology	0.1819	(0.0713)
interstate corrections compact × Ideology	-0.3064	(0.1863)
interstate depositions and discovery act × Ideology	-0.1551	(0.2872)
interstate enforcement of domestic violence protection orders act × Ideology	-0.5118	(0.5174)
interstate family support act (1992)(1996) × Ideology	-0.3235	(0.2559)
interstate family support act (2001) × Ideology	0.4876	(0.4061)
interstate family support act amendments (2008) × Ideology	-0.0652	(0.5802)
interstate high speed rail network compact × Ideology	0.3167	(0.4555)
interstate insurance product regulation compact × Ideology	-0.1256	(0.2408)
interstate library compact × Ideology	-0.6839	(0.3455)
interstate mining compact × Ideology	0.2490	(0.2496)
interstate rail passenger network compact × Ideology	0.0332	(0.4214)
keg_reg × Ideology	0.1986	(0.2571)
kinship × Ideology	-0.5308	(0.3480)
labor_age_discriminatio × Ideology	0.5166	(0.2191)
labor_collective_bargaining_sta × Ideology	1.1639*	(0.2925)
labor_collective_bargaining_tea × Ideology	1.4953*	(0.3262)
labor_minwage_abovefe × Ideology	1.5390*	(0.3188)
labor_state_ada_accomodat × Ideology	0.0819	(0.2586)
labor_state_ada_antidiscr × Ideology	0.5703*	(0.2051)
law on notarial acts, revised × Ideology	-1.6794*	(0.3049)
lemon × Ideology	0.4411	(0.2667)
licenseplate × Ideology	-0.4588	(0.2751)
limited cooperative association act (2007) (last amended 2013) × Ideology	0.4290	(1.1127)
limited liability company (1995)(1996) × Ideology	0.8592	(1.3083)
limited liability company (2006) (last amended 2013) × Ideology	0.1636	(0.0921)
limited partnership (1976) × Ideology	0.0495	(0.1657)
limited partnership act (2001) (last amended 2013) × Ideology	-0.2367	(0.5414)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

lott × Ideology	0.6759*	(0.2085)
mailreg × Ideology	0.3162	(0.1409)
manaccess × Ideology	-0.0237	(0.4581)
management of institutional funds act × Ideology	0.1470	(0.2876)
manclin × Ideology	0.2669	(0.2920)
mandatory disposition of detainees × Ideology	-0.6400*	(0.2040)
mandnot × Ideology	-0.1718	(0.5826)
marriage and divorce act, model × Ideology	-0.4862	(0.3750)
medianot × Ideology	-0.9871	(0.6682)
mediation act × Ideology	1.1254	(0.5957)
medicalrest × Ideology	-1.3113*	(0.3135)
medmar × Ideology	-0.1025	(0.3019)
meganslaw × Ideology	-0.3517	(0.2676)
mendeapen × Ideology	-0.3237	(0.3824)
merिताid × Ideology	-1.1707	(0.6356)
meritstateadmin × Ideology	-0.9976	(0.6894)
methpre × Ideology	-0.5978	(0.5051)
military and overseas voters act × Ideology	-0.0610	(0.4004)
minfine × Ideology	-0.4045	(0.4606)
minor student capacity to borrow act (1969) × Ideology	-1.0783	(0.7171)
missplan × Ideology	0.1264	(0.2119)
mlda21 × Ideology	0.2025	(0.1648)
model state administrative procedure act (1981) × Ideology	0.0612	(0.2955)
money services act × Ideology	0.2539	(0.6118)
motorvoter × Ideology	0.1755	(0.1961)
mprisdm × Ideology	-0.0087	(0.2394)
msas × Ideology	0.1797	(0.3227)
multistate lottery agreement × Ideology	0.1031	(0.2529)
maticurric × Ideology	-0.1415	(0.3147)
national crime prevention and privacy compact × Ideology	0.0252	(0.2448)
national guard mutual assistance counter-drug activities compact × Ideology	-0.8275	(0.8479)
national popular vote interstate compact × Ideology	1.6983*	(0.3337)
natreso × Ideology	0.0425	(0.1552)
neighnot × Ideology	-0.0746	(0.6149)
netmeter × Ideology	0.4604	(0.2211)
netmeter_yearadopted × Ideology	0.6637*	(0.2105)
newbornheartscreen × Ideology	-0.1936	(0.2631)
nonresident violator compact × Ideology	-0.1741	(0.3253)
norealid × Ideology	-0.6763	(0.4898)
notarial acts (1982) × Ideology	-0.7775*	(0.2860)
nurse licensure compact × Ideology	0.0693	(0.3830)
offwmh × Ideology	-0.2452	(0.2825)
opencont × Ideology	-0.2426	(0.2738)
optinnot × Ideology	0.2017	(0.7777)
pain management × Ideology	-0.4274	(0.3088)
paperterror × Ideology	0.0397	(0.4531)
parconsent × Ideology	-0.4542	(0.2941)
parentage act × Ideology	-0.2914	(0.2686)
parentage act (1973) × Ideology	0.1543	(0.3838)
parnotific × Ideology	-0.1760	(0.1566)
partition of heirs property act × Ideology	-2.1634*	(0.4173)
partnership act (1997) (last amended 2013) × Ideology	-0.0514	(0.3334)
pbf × Ideology	-0.3242	(0.1917)
pdrugmon × Ideology	-0.2587	(0.6314)
performfun × Ideology	-0.1530	(0.2645)
personaltax_yearadopted × Ideology	0.4013	(0.3423)
personaltaxeff_yearadopted × Ideology	0.4997*	(0.1868)
pestcomp × Ideology	-0.5996	(0.3050)
physreq × Ideology	0.0547	(0.1624)
postdna × Ideology	-0.1201	(0.2560)
postvia × Ideology	0.1011	(0.2631)
power of attorney × Ideology	-0.1938	(0.3892)
pre20wk × Ideology	-0.3141	(0.4600)
preconvictdays × Ideology	-0.3862	(0.2282)
premarital agreement act × Ideology	-0.0491	(0.3406)
prepaid × Ideology	-0.6243	(0.3830)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

prepaytut × Ideology	-0.3957	(0.3307)
prescdrug × Ideology	-0.0336	(0.3109)
primaryenforce_all × Ideology	-0.1378	(0.2337)
primaryenforce_minor × Ideology	0.4255	(0.3411)
primseat × Ideology	-0.0316	(0.2981)
principal and income act (1962) × Ideology	0.2379	(0.2831)
principal and income act (2000) × Ideology	-0.1253	(0.1904)
principal and income amendments (2008) × Ideology	-0.3275	(0.4032)
prisondayswag × Ideology	0.4147	(0.4068)
probate code × Ideology	-0.0587	(0.4599)
prudent investor act × Ideology	0.3295	(0.2677)
prudent management of institutional funds act × Ideology	-0.1627	(0.2914)
pubaccess × Ideology	-0.0274	(0.4552)
pubbenefits_yearadopted × Ideology	1.1390*	(0.2930)
pubbrefeed × Ideology	0.2194	(0.2170)
pubcamfun × Ideology	0.2462	(0.2753)
pubfacilities × Ideology	-1.1096	(0.4398)
r_d_tax_credit × Ideology	0.2519	(0.1677)
racialpro × Ideology	-0.1238	(0.4584)
rackact × Ideology	-0.0233	(0.3363)
rapeshield × Ideology	0.1597	(0.2573)
real property electronic recording act × Ideology	-0.1672	(0.2873)
real property transfer on death act × Ideology	0.5460	(0.4239)
reciprocal enforcement of support act (1950) × Ideology	-0.0696	(0.1776)
refuseserv × Ideology	0.1990	(0.1431)
regreq × Ideology	-0.3696	(0.4743)
regulation_bicycle_helmet × Ideology	0.2889	(0.2324)
regulation_boehmke_cogrowma × Ideology	0.9166	(0.3903)
regulation_boehmke_grandvis × Ideology	0.2050	(0.1988)
regulation_boehmke_livingwil × Ideology	-0.1961	(0.1977)
regulation_boehmke_shiel × Ideology	0.4347	(0.2803)
regulation_hate_crime × Ideology	0.6583	(0.2616)
regulation_mandatory_car_insura × Ideology	0.2972	(0.2425)
regulation_mandatory_seatbelt × Ideology	0.2409	(0.2339)
regulation_motorcycle_helmet × Ideology	-1.1043	(0.5556)
regulation_pain_suffering_limit × Ideology	-0.3614	(0.2805)
regulation_rent_contro × Ideology	-0.7775*	(0.1435)
regulation_rfr × Ideology	-0.3626	(0.2752)
regulations_lemonla × Ideology	0.2514	(0.1608)
renewenergy × Ideology	0.8694*	(0.2017)
repsodomy × Ideology	0.4717*	(0.1830)
requireanyid2 × Ideology	-0.7981*	(0.2061)
residential landlord and tenant act 1972 × Ideology	-0.3025	(0.4049)
restaurantbanstate × Ideology	0.9087	(0.3700)
restruct × Ideology	0.7400	(0.3191)
retail theft × Ideology	-0.4100	(0.2054)
revenue × Ideology	0.0431	(0.2731)
rico × Ideology	0.1723	(0.2724)
right2work × Ideology	-1.9777*	(0.3969)
rightdie × Ideology	0.2891	(0.2567)
rights of the terminally ill act (1985) × Ideology	0.6698	(0.3408)
roeouvertur × Ideology	-1.2090	(0.6900)
rps_yearadopted × Ideology	1.0448*	(0.2487)
rules of evidence (1974) × Ideology	0.4221*	(0.1089)
salvia × Ideology	-0.9425	(0.6937)
savingplan × Ideology	-0.0348	(0.2933)
schoolchoi × Ideology	0.2849	(0.4639)
sdce × Ideology	0.6724*	(0.2131)
securities act × Ideology	0.1466	(0.3289)
securities act (1956) × Ideology	0.2399	(0.4591)
sexreginfo × Ideology	-0.0163	(0.6195)
sexselect × Ideology	-0.4079	(0.4792)
shield × Ideology	0.1716	(0.3204)
shoplift × Ideology	-0.1108	(0.1784)
simultaneous death act × Ideology	-0.4619	(0.6318)
smokeban × Ideology	1.2962*	(0.2718)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

soexorder × Ideology	0.0415	(0.1745)
solaw × Ideology	1.1843*	(0.2862)
sonofsam × Ideology	0.1312	(0.1934)
sonsam × Ideology	0.0109	(0.1804)
st_wd_tran × Ideology	-0.1197	(0.2233)
stalkdef × Ideology	-0.8166	(0.4347)
stalking × Ideology	-0.0162	(0.2335)
standground × Ideology	-0.6844	(0.2681)
statrape × Ideology	-0.0766	(0.1964)
statutory form power of attorney act × Ideology	-0.6190	(0.5211)
statutory rule against perpetuities × Ideology	-0.4621	(0.2975)
sundayban × Ideology	-0.7434	(0.4791)
supp_research × Ideology	0.4582	(0.9858)
syringe × Ideology	0.9508*	(0.3466)
tels × Ideology	-0.1832	(0.3068)
terrorfund × Ideology	-0.4007	(0.2498)
testamentary additions to trusts act × Ideology	-0.1353	(0.2160)
threestrikes × Ideology	-0.4304	(0.3769)
timelim × Ideology	-0.5450	(0.4585)
tod security registration act × Ideology	0.1266	(0.2427)
trade secrets act × Ideology	-0.1910	(0.2542)
transboundary pollution reciprocal access act × Ideology	0.5865	(0.3516)
transfers to minors act × Ideology	-0.4303	(0.1910)
transport × Ideology	0.8378*	(0.2498)
trap × Ideology	-0.5304	(0.2327)
trap_hosp × Ideology	-0.2606	(0.2825)
trap_lic × Ideology	-0.6037	(0.3696)
trust code × Ideology	-0.4686	(0.3763)
trustees' powers act (1964) × Ideology	0.5704	(0.3267)
truthsent × Ideology	-0.0971	(0.2119)
tu_decent × Ideology	-0.0301	(0.3110)
u_record_sys × Ideology	0.0007	(0.2335)
ucc article 1, general provisions (2001) × Ideology	0.0122	(0.2745)
ucc article 2a, leases (1987) (1990) × Ideology	-0.1005	(0.2521)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments (1990) × Ideology	-0.5631	(0.3189)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments and article 4, bank deposits (2002) × Ideology	-0.5597	(0.2432)
ucc article 4a amendments (2012) × Ideology	-0.2631	(0.2845)
ucc article 4a, funds transfers (1989) × Ideology	0.0550	(0.3539)
ucc article 5, letters of credit (1995) × Ideology	-0.1371	(0.3184)
ucc article 6 (revise) × Ideology	0.4270	(0.8668)
ucc article 6, bulk sales (1989) × Ideology	-0.1533	(0.3572)
ucc article 7, documents of title (2003) × Ideology	-0.0781	(0.2603)
ucc article 8, investment securities × Ideology	-0.0666	(0.3582)
ucc article 8, investment securities (1994) × Ideology	-0.3339	(0.3168)
ucc article 9 amendments × Ideology	-0.0871	(0.2287)
ucc article 9 amendments (2010) × Ideology	-0.1957	(0.3224)
ucc article 9, secured transactions (1998) × Ideology	0.0781	(0.1961)
ultrasound × Ideology	-0.7039	(0.4008)
unclaimed property act × Ideology	-0.2405	(0.5858)
unclaimed property act (1952)(1981) × Ideology	-0.2556	(0.2452)
undoctuit × Ideology	-0.2948	(0.4304)
uniform unclaimed property act × Ideology	0.3301	(0.3817)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (1992)(1996) × Ideology	-0.2751	(0.4393)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (2008) (last amended 2011) × Ideology	-0.2326	(0.1550)
unionlimits × Ideology	1.2415*	(0.4225)
universal health care × Ideology	0.2373	(0.4503)
universalprek × Ideology	0.4375	(0.4448)
unsworn foreign declarations act (2008) × Ideology	-0.2987	(0.3855)
viatesting × Ideology	-1.8289	(1.3066)
victrsamd × Ideology	-0.1974	(0.2631)
victim notification × Ideology	-0.1386	(0.1933)
victimnotif × Ideology	0.0222	(0.2154)
victimrights × Ideology	-0.1847	(0.2656)
w_abortion_parental_notice_1983 × Ideology	-0.2625	(0.2082)
w_animal_cruelty_felon × Ideology	-0.8604*	(0.1726)
w_ec_access_expan × Ideology	0.9877	(0.5267)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

w_educ_mom_silentmandator × Ideology	-0.5106	(0.2873)
w_educ_mom_silentpermis × Ideology	-0.3301	(0.2330)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_loca × Ideology	0.8734	(0.6071)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_stat × Ideology	0.2265	(0.2638)
w_environment_endangered_specie × Ideology	-0.1716	(0.2637)
w_gayright_publi_accom_genderi × Ideology	0.9707*	(0.2063)
w_gayrights_employment_discrimi × Ideology	1.5067*	(0.4054)
w_gayrights_public_accomodation × Ideology	0.8228	(0.3371)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_handgu × Ideology	0.7004	(0.3336)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_rifl × Ideology	1.0080	(0.8103)
waiting × Ideology	-0.4917*	(0.1284)
wildlife violator compact × Ideology	0.0999	(0.2527)
wills recognition act × Ideology	-0.0679	(0.3171)
witnessint × Ideology	-0.4299	(0.1937)
wk20via × Ideology	-1.0115*	(0.3884)
wmd × Ideology	-0.0174	(0.2561)
worksitebanstate × Ideology	0.9524*	(0.3185)
writreq × Ideology	-1.1916*	(0.3753)
zerotol × Ideology	-0.1065	(0.1937)
zerotoleranceapis × Ideology	0.0252	(0.2223)
zerotolerancelaw × Ideology	-0.0310	(0.2226)
aborparc × Initiative × Ideology	1.8223	(1.0073)
aborparn × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9590	(0.4786)
aborpreroe × Initiative × Ideology	0.7351	(1.3431)
abortion_consent_1992_201 × Initiative × Ideology	0.5812	(0.4949)
abortion_medical × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5398	(0.5296)
abortion_partial_birt × Initiative × Ideology	0.2808	(0.8168)
abortion_reform_prero × Initiative × Ideology	0.6830	(1.3003)
absvot × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3551	(0.4088)
admittpriv × Initiative × Ideology	0.6480	(0.6504)
adoption act (1953)(1969) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9110	(0.8958)
adult guardianship and protective proceedings jurisdiction act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1128	(0.4166)
advertban × Initiative × Ideology	0.3187	(0.5532)
aging × Initiative × Ideology	0.3470	(0.3553)
agreement on detainees × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0810	(0.4511)
agreement on qualifications of educational personnel × Initiative × Ideology	0.0939	(0.9227)
alcoholism and intoxication treatment × Initiative × Ideology	0.4028	(0.4715)
allpass_seatbelt × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0381	(0.5966)
amber × Initiative × Ideology	0.2698	(0.3366)
anatomical gift (1968) × Initiative × Ideology	-1.1476	(0.6806)
anatomical gift act (1987) × Initiative × Ideology	0.0413	(0.4716)
anatomical gift act (2006) × Initiative × Ideology	0.3506	(0.4520)
anim_cruel_felonfirs × Initiative × Ideology	0.1382	(0.3864)
animcruel × Initiative × Ideology	0.5396	(0.3613)
antibully × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1760	(0.3041)
antistalk × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0662	(0.3754)
anyactnot × Initiative × Ideology	0.7809	(0.8792)
anyid2 × Initiative × Ideology	0.2872	(0.3184)
anyphotoid2 × Initiative × Ideology	0.0547	(0.4686)
apology × Initiative × Ideology	0.3065	(0.4512)
arbitration act (1956) × Initiative × Ideology	0.1718	(0.3961)
arbitration act (2000) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6138	(0.3947)
assignment of rents act × Initiative × Ideology	0.6037	(0.8467)
athlete agents act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5926	(0.3662)
autism × Initiative × Ideology	0.6586	(0.3599)
banfaninc × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1347	(0.4313)
bangag × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5445	(0.2664)
barbanstate × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3496	(0.4953)
bikehelmet × Initiative × Ideology	1.4446	(0.6367)
bldstds_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	0.2325	(0.3078)
boehmke_snrpres × Initiative × Ideology	0.0177	(0.4147)
bootcamp × Initiative × Ideology	1.1395*	(0.3702)
bottle × Initiative × Ideology	0.2640	(0.4530)
bradycamp × Initiative × Ideology	0.0911	(0.5275)
breastdensity × Initiative × Ideology	0.4144	(0.4203)
breastfeed × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1952	(0.2864)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

broadcom × Initiative × Ideology	0.9897	(0.6499)
buildingcode × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1140	(0.3724)
candlim × Initiative × Ideology	0.0265	(0.5190)
ccb × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1325	(0.4983)
ccreceipt × Initiative × Ideology	0.5037	(0.3618)
cctheft × Initiative × Ideology	0.0422	(0.3293)
cent × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1687	(0.4507)
certification of questions of law (1967) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4710	(0.4123)
certification of questions of law (1995) × Initiative × Ideology	-3.0809*	(0.7669)
chartersch × Initiative × Ideology	0.3351	(0.5255)
child abduction prevention × Initiative × Ideology	2.1017	(0.9989)
child custody jurisdiction and enforcement act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3766	(0.2253)
child pornography × Initiative × Ideology	0.7789*	(0.2780)
childrest × Initiative × Ideology	0.6170	(0.4118)
civil defense and disaster compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9710	(0.6569)
civinjaut × Initiative × Ideology	0.0499	(0.5492)
clinic_access × Initiative × Ideology	0.2498	(0.3240)
cogrowman × Initiative × Ideology	-1.7100	(0.7550)
colcanscr × Initiative × Ideology	0.0302	(0.3418)
collaborative law act × Initiative × Ideology	0.2899	(1.0254)
collegesavings × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1138	(0.3896)
common interest ownership act (1982) × Initiative × Ideology	-1.7014*	(0.4974)
compact for education × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3406	(0.7155)
compact on adoption and medical assistance × Initiative × Ideology	0.0415	(0.7401)
compact on mental health × Initiative × Ideology	-1.1066	(0.9472)
compact on placement of children × Initiative × Ideology	0.2597	(0.3444)
compcrime × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1645	(0.2651)
comsrv12 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0773	(0.5029)
concealed carry × Initiative × Ideology	0.6184	(0.3978)
condominium act × Initiative × Ideology	0.4822	(0.8373)
conservation easement act × Initiative × Ideology	0.2860	(0.3491)
const_protect × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4619	(0.6100)
consumer credit code × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5744	(0.8624)
continsurance × Initiative × Ideology	0.1288	(0.4566)
contr_eq × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2430	(0.4742)
controlled substances act × Initiative × Ideology	0.0593	(0.3386)
corporateeff_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	0.1804	(0.5839)
corporaterenew_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	1.5144	(0.9779)
corporlimits × Initiative × Ideology	-1.0176	(0.5271)
correct × Initiative × Ideology	0.1431	(0.5822)
cpban × Initiative × Ideology	0.4574	(0.2848)
credfreez × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2715	(0.4620)
crimeviccomp × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0011	(0.3482)
custodial trust act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6081	(0.6496)
cyberstalk × Initiative × Ideology	0.6124	(0.4969)
damagereduce × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6987*	(0.2697)
damremov × Initiative × Ideology	0.0387	(0.3206)
deathpen × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5378	(0.3801)
debt-management services act, 2005 × Initiative × Ideology	-1.2071	(0.7972)
deceptive trade practices act (1964) × Initiative × Ideology	-3.1657	(1.7252)
deployed parents custody and visitation act × Initiative × Ideology	1.1753	(0.4639)
determination of death act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0510	(0.4058)
dev_s1 × Initiative × Ideology	0.5127	(0.3383)
dev_s2 × Initiative × Ideology	0.1533	(0.4250)
dev_s4 × Initiative × Ideology	0.3276	(0.6617)
dev_s9 × Initiative × Ideology	0.3417	(0.5823)
disclaimer of property interests act × Initiative × Ideology	0.0651	(0.2461)
disclaimer of property interests act (1973) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4743	(0.6509)
discrenot × Initiative × Ideology	0.5221	(0.5899)
disposition of community property rights at death act (1971) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1271	(0.5907)
division of income for tax purposes × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1733	(0.2483)
dnafelon × Initiative × Ideology	0.5821	(0.3148)
dnaforexon × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2915	(0.3204)
driver license compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3198	(0.5221)
drugs_boehmke_statrapag × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0498	(0.2983)
drugs_boehmke_zero × Initiative × Ideology	0.0504	(0.4449)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

drugs_marijuana_decriminalizati × Initiative × Ideology	0.1625	(0.6214)
drugs_medical_marijuan × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9373	(0.4453)
drugs_smoking_ban_restaurant × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3611	(0.3979)
drugs_smoking_ban_workplace × Initiative × Ideology	0.0735	(0.4108)
drugtest × Initiative × Ideology	-1.5639	(0.6538)
dual_enroll × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2558	(0.3397)
dui × Initiative × Ideology	0.0108	(0.3698)
dui08 × Initiative × Ideology	0.2628	(0.6102)
durable power of attorney × Initiative × Ideology	0.6562	(0.5753)
duties to persons with medical id devices × Initiative × Ideology	0.1979	(0.7556)
dwi reform × Initiative × Ideology	0.5117	(0.4974)
earlvot × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2116	(0.4943)
earned_income_taxcredi × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1263	(0.6733)
econdev × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5178	(0.3517)
education × Initiative × Ideology	1.7459*	(0.5623)
education_corporal_punishment_b × Initiative × Ideology	0.3376	(0.4801)
elecdayreg × Initiative × Ideology	0.0800	(0.8915)
elecderreg × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0998	(0.5836)
electronic legal material act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9739	(0.6729)
electronic transactions act × Initiative × Ideology	0.0873	(0.4312)
emcont_avail × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4472	(0.4963)
emergency management assistance compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3119	(0.3741)
emergency volunteer health practitioners × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0736	(0.4991)
eminent scholar × Initiative × Ideology	0.1148	(0.4716)
enforcement of foreign judgments act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2825	(0.3035)
engonly × Initiative × Ideology	1.3496*	(0.3845)
enterzone × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2584	(0.3107)
entity transactions act, model (2007) (last amended 2013) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3004	(0.9739)
environ × Initiative × Ideology	0.2557	(0.5165)
environment_bottlebil × Initiative × Ideology	0.1819	(0.5160)
environment_ca_car_emissions_st × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5557	(0.5993)
environment_electronic_wast × Initiative × Ideology	0.7064	(0.7531)
environment_ghg_ca × Initiative × Ideology	0.2461	(0.9081)
environment_publicbenefit_fund × Initiative × Ideology	0.4285	(0.7022)
environment_state_nepa × Initiative × Ideology	0.7812	(0.5676)
environmental covenants act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2811	(0.5080)
eqrightam × Initiative × Ideology	0.5597	(0.4776)
estate tax apportionment and probate code 3-916 × Initiative × Ideology	0.1502	(0.6344)
estate_ta × Initiative × Ideology	0.5551	(1.3313)
ewaste × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0874	(0.4647)
famcap × Initiative × Ideology	0.0314	(0.5829)
famlim × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2854	(0.4911)
federal lien registration act × Initiative × Ideology	0.2330	(0.2858)
fetaldispos × Initiative × Ideology	0.6073	(0.4991)
fetalhomic × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0803	(0.2452)
fetalpain × Initiative × Ideology	3.4820	(1.6123)
filmtaxcredit × Initiative × Ideology	0.1376	(0.3339)
foca × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6414	(0.2668)
foia × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0678	(0.5486)
foreign money claims act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3134	(0.4341)
foreign money judgments recognition act × Initiative × Ideology	0.7917	(0.4443)
foreign-country money judgments recognition act × Initiative × Ideology	0.3185	(0.4459)
fraudulent transfer act (1984) × Initiative × Ideology	0.2819	(0.3231)
frontpass_seatbelt × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6105	(0.3936)
funds_avail × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1667	(0.4875)
fundslife × Initiative × Ideology	0.2680	(0.3624)
fundslifehea × Initiative × Ideology	0.0822	(0.3322)
furlough × Initiative × Ideology	0.3384	(0.4719)
furprog × Initiative × Ideology	0.3143	(0.4617)
gagrule × Initiative × Ideology	0.9264	(0.4910)
gambling_casino × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2052	(0.3372)
gambling_lottery_adoptio × Initiative × Ideology	0.1840	(0.3735)
gap × Initiative × Ideology	0.5554	(0.6167)
gay_employment_discrim_genderi × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0010	(0.3991)
gayhate × Initiative × Ideology	0.3495	(0.3968)
gaymarban × Initiative × Ideology	0.5416	(0.3900)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

gayrights_civilunion × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0195	(0.4403)
gayrights_hatecrime × Initiative × Ideology	0.8959	(0.4714)
gayrights_marriag × Initiative × Ideology	0.8176	(1.2641)
gdl × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1045	(0.3745)
gender_disc_laws_post196 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0606	(1.0106)
genderrights_era_ratificatio × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2268	(0.5579)
genderrights_nofault_divorc × Initiative × Ideology	0.2498	(0.3368)
genderrights_state_era × Initiative × Ideology	0.7044	(0.5836)
giexorder × Initiative × Ideology	0.9915	(0.3965)
gilaw × Initiative × Ideology	0.0422	(0.3660)
goodsam911 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2678	(0.4190)
governance_reform × Initiative × Ideology	0.9387	(0.5821)
guardianship and protective proceedings act (1997) × Initiative × Ideology	1.1647	(1.0223)
guncontrl_bc_private_handgu × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9889*	(0.2325)
guncontrl_bc_private_rifl × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5439	(0.2113)
guncontrol_assaultweapon_ba × Initiative × Ideology	0.3210	(0.7410)
guncontrol_opencarr × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1908	(0.2663)
guncontrol_satnightspecial_ba × Initiative × Ideology	0.4727	(0.8108)
harass × Initiative × Ideology	0.5703	(0.7293)
hate crimes × Initiative × Ideology	0.3510	(0.3708)
hatecrime × Initiative × Ideology	0.0775	(0.3617)
hazing × Initiative × Ideology	0.1770	(0.3408)
health × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4363	(0.4741)
health care compact × Initiative × Ideology	1.7511	(1.8122)
health-care decisions act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.8277	(0.8513)
helmetlaw_17 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1418	(0.4162)
helmetlaw_learn × Initiative × Ideology	0.1148	(0.3979)
helmetlaw_pass × Initiative × Ideology	0.2426	(0.4347)
higissue × Initiative × Ideology	0.0226	(0.4703)
higrenew × Initiative × Ideology	0.5915	(0.3919)
hiport × Initiative × Ideology	0.2960	(0.4544)
hiprecon × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0772	(0.4567)
hmomod1 × Initiative × Ideology	0.2350	(0.4056)
hmomod2 × Initiative × Ideology	0.2085	(0.6806)
hostliability × Initiative × Ideology	0.2045	(0.4848)
hsexit × Initiative × Ideology	0.3284	(0.4680)
humantraffic × Initiative × Ideology	0.0158	(0.3410)
idas × Initiative × Ideology	0.2123	(0.3609)
ide × Initiative × Ideology	0.0434	(0.4987)
idtheft × Initiative × Ideology	0.0610	(0.3587)
imitcontsub × Initiative × Ideology	0.0998	(0.3215)
immigration_english_languag × Initiative × Ideology	0.9344	(0.3727)
immigration_instate_tuition_ill × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6769	(0.4496)
indgaming × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2807	(0.4489)
indlimit × Initiative × Ideology	-1.2811	(0.5651)
indorgris × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2544	(0.7874)
infantheat × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2137	(0.3853)
infconsent × Initiative × Ideology	0.4149	(0.3408)
infertility × Initiative × Ideology	0.3222	(0.5916)
ins_stateexch × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1515	(0.9130)
insandefref × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0963	(0.3153)
insanity × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4842	(0.3491)
insprivate × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4930	(0.4668)
inspublic × Initiative × Ideology	0.0081	(0.5202)
inst_tu_und × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2952	(0.6034)
inst_tu_vet × Initiative × Ideology	0.4290	(0.5314)
insurable interest amendment to the uniform trust code × Initiative × Ideology	0.6097	(1.3813)
inswaiver × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1447	(0.8832)
interreg × Initiative × Ideology	0.4682	(0.8381)
interstate compact for adult offender supervision × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2551	(0.2998)
interstate compact on adoption and medical assistance × Initiative × Ideology	0.0877	(0.8049)
interstate compact on educational opportunity for military children × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2266	(0.4103)
interstate compact on licensure of participants in horse racing with pari-mutuel wagering × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0634	(0.5659)
interstate compact on mentally disordered offenders × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0183	(0.2787)
interstate corrections compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0943	(0.2859)
interstate depositions and discovery act × Initiative × Ideology	0.1791	(0.3586)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

interstate enforcement of domestic violence protection orders act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5032	(0.6744)
interstate family support act (1992)(1996) × Initiative × Ideology	0.4158	(0.4423)
interstate family support act (2001) × Initiative × Ideology	-1.1762	(0.5387)
interstate family support act amendments (2008) × Initiative × Ideology	0.4007	(0.7778)
interstate high speed rail network compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1686	(0.4688)
interstate insurance product regulation compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0966	(0.4632)
interstate library compact × Initiative × Ideology	0.6714	(1.0766)
interstate mining compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3441	(0.4741)
interstate rail passenger network compact × Initiative × Ideology	0.3335	(0.4676)
keg_reg × Initiative × Ideology	0.1313	(0.4556)
kinship × Initiative × Ideology	0.5761	(0.4327)
labor_age_discriminatio × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7618	(0.5620)
labor_collective_bargaining_sta × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3743	(0.4657)
labor_collective_bargaining_tea × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3800	(0.6151)
labor_minwage_abovefe × Initiative × Ideology	0.2779	(0.4531)
labor_state_ada_accomodat × Initiative × Ideology	0.0234	(0.5343)
labor_state_ada_antidiscr × Initiative × Ideology	0.3135	(0.4615)
law on notarial acts, revised × Initiative × Ideology	1.8380*	(0.5306)
lemon × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1495	(0.4231)
licenseplate × Initiative × Ideology	0.1807	(0.3613)
limited cooperative association act (2007) (last amended 2013) × Initiative × Ideology	-1.8131	(1.2407)
limited liability company (1995)(1996) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5343	(1.3461)
limited liability company (2006) (last amended 2013) × Initiative × Ideology	-1.5404*	(0.4764)
limited partnership (1976) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1120	(0.3821)
limited partnership act (2001) (last amended 2013) × Initiative × Ideology	0.3156	(0.6622)
lott × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0774	(0.3854)
mailreg × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4253	(0.2353)
manaccess × Initiative × Ideology	0.9151	(0.7844)
management of institutional funds act × Initiative × Ideology	0.4853	(0.3891)
manclin × Initiative × Ideology	0.2478	(0.4675)
mandatory disposition of detainees × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3602	(1.4542)
mandnot × Initiative × Ideology	0.4954	(0.9197)
marriage and divorce act, model × Initiative × Ideology	1.1863	(0.5138)
medianot × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7850	(0.8380)
mediation act × Initiative × Ideology	-1.5267	(0.7140)
medicalrest × Initiative × Ideology	0.7402	(0.4337)
medmar × Initiative × Ideology	0.7878	(0.3903)
meganslaw × Initiative × Ideology	0.2169	(0.4135)
mendeapen × Initiative × Ideology	0.1057	(0.4234)
meritaid × Initiative × Ideology	1.2777	(0.8972)
meritstateadmin × Initiative × Ideology	0.8790	(0.8000)
methpre × Initiative × Ideology	0.7408	(0.5789)
military and overseas voters act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4225	(0.5736)
minfine × Initiative × Ideology	0.1287	(0.5446)
minor student capacity to borrow act (1969) × Initiative × Ideology	0.8922	(0.9382)
missplan × Initiative × Ideology	-1.8168*	(0.6198)
mlda21 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1456	(0.3398)
model state administrative procedure act (1981) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4701	(0.4185)
money services act × Initiative × Ideology	0.2784	(0.6242)
motorvoter × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0493	(0.2753)
mprisdm × Initiative × Ideology	0.1824	(0.3340)
msas × Initiative × Ideology	-1.0721	(0.4576)
multistate lottery agreement × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3999	(0.3953)
naticurric × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0456	(0.4310)
national crime prevention and privacy compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1520	(0.3264)
national guard mutual assistance counter-drug activities compact × Initiative × Ideology	0.7882	(0.9345)
national popular vote interstate compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7452	(0.4120)
natreso × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3609	(0.4309)
neighnot × Initiative × Ideology	0.9537	(1.0149)
netmeter × Initiative × Ideology	0.0597	(0.3741)
netmeter_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2364	(0.3126)
newbornheartscreen × Initiative × Ideology	0.1313	(0.4044)
nonresident violator compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2919	(0.4274)
norealid × Initiative × Ideology	0.8326	(0.6207)
notarial acts (1982) × Initiative × Ideology	0.2458	(0.5532)
nurse licensure compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3622	(0.5625)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

offwmh × Initiative × Ideology	0.0373	(0.5245)
opencont × Initiative × Ideology	0.1889	(0.3891)
optinnot × Initiative × Ideology	0.1939	(0.8552)
pain management × Initiative × Ideology	0.2130	(0.5034)
paperterror × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1062	(0.5052)
parconsent × Initiative × Ideology	0.5299	(0.5559)
parentage act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7568	(0.7557)
parentage act (1973) × Initiative × Ideology	0.3100	(0.4002)
parnotific × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6241	(0.3635)
partition of heirs property act × Initiative × Ideology	2.6565*	(0.4787)
partnership act (1997) (last amended 2013) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3700	(0.4120)
pbf × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1029	(0.3756)
pdrugmon × Initiative × Ideology	0.7525	(0.8145)
perforfun × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0602	(0.3771)
personaltax_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	0.1329	(0.8550)
personaltaxeff_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	0.1052	(0.8445)
pestcomp × Initiative × Ideology	0.4119	(0.3834)
physreq × Initiative × Ideology	0.1060	(0.2871)
postdna × Initiative × Ideology	0.1190	(0.3735)
postvia × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7382	(0.4350)
power of attorney × Initiative × Ideology	0.1719	(0.5360)
pre20wk × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6631	(0.7282)
preconvictdays × Initiative × Ideology	0.1633	(0.3696)
premarital agreement act × Initiative × Ideology	0.2279	(0.4310)
prepaid × Initiative × Ideology	0.9431	(0.5050)
prepaytut × Initiative × Ideology	0.6795	(0.5968)
prescdrug × Initiative × Ideology	0.4829	(0.6033)
primaryenforce_all × Initiative × Ideology	0.5067	(0.4255)
primaryenforce_minor × Initiative × Ideology	-1.1020	(0.7248)
primseat × Initiative × Ideology	0.2817	(0.5031)
principal and income act (1962) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0720	(0.3416)
principal and income act (2000) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0775	(0.3181)
principal and income amendments (2008) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0108	(0.5187)
prisondayswag × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6480	(0.6066)
probate code × Initiative × Ideology	0.3047	(0.5370)
prudent investor act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5458	(0.4128)
prudent management of institutional funds act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3167	(0.4449)
pubaccess × Initiative × Ideology	0.6992	(0.7986)
pubbenefits_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	1.1101	(0.6364)
pubbrefeed × Initiative × Ideology	0.0138	(0.2803)
pubcamfun × Initiative × Ideology	0.4291	(0.4832)
pubfacilities × Initiative × Ideology	0.4113	(0.6970)
r_d_tax_credit × Initiative × Ideology	0.4076	(0.3878)
racialpro × Initiative × Ideology	0.0988	(0.5608)
rackact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1632	(0.4280)
rapeshield × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1335	(0.3423)
real property electronic recording act × Initiative × Ideology	0.2102	(0.4056)
real property transfer on death act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1869	(0.5619)
reciprocal enforcement of support act (1950) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3827	(0.3216)
refuseserv × Initiative × Ideology	0.1675	(0.2536)
regreq × Initiative × Ideology	0.3696	(0.6499)
regulation_bicycle_helmet × Initiative × Ideology	1.2630	(0.6255)
regulation_boehmke_cogrowma × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3275	(0.5277)
regulation_boehmke_grandvis × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2239	(0.3082)
regulation_boehmke_livingwil × Initiative × Ideology	0.3028	(0.2719)
regulation_boehmke_shiel × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4054	(0.4082)
regulation_hate_crime × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2827	(0.3703)
regulation_mandatory_car_insura × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4882	(0.3980)
regulation_mandatory_seatbelt × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6631	(0.3093)
regulation_motorcycle_helmet × Initiative × Ideology	0.9886	(1.3687)
regulation_pain_suffering_limit × Initiative × Ideology	0.8349	(0.4121)
regulation_rent_contro × Initiative × Ideology	0.6725	(0.3088)
regulation_rfr × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7528	(0.5507)
regulations_lemonla × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1076	(0.2773)
renewenergy × Initiative × Ideology	0.0766	(0.3593)
repsodomy × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3908	(0.2422)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

requireanyid2 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0065	(0.4409)
residential landlord and tenant act 1972 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0267	(0.5687)
restaurantbanstate × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4677	(0.4625)
restruct × Initiative × Ideology	1.4064	(0.7204)
retail theft × Initiative × Ideology	0.7980	(0.3259)
revenue × Initiative × Ideology	0.3766	(0.3834)
rico × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3720	(0.3854)
right2work × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4609	(0.9404)
rightdie × Initiative × Ideology	0.7865	(0.5369)
rights of the terminally ill act (1985) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3920	(0.3692)
roeovertur × Initiative × Ideology	0.8474	(1.0321)
rps_yearadopted × Initiative × Ideology	1.3484	(0.5959)
rules of evidence (1974) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9891	(0.4755)
salvia × Initiative × Ideology	1.3662	(0.7939)
savingplan × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2219	(0.3888)
schoolchoi × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1798	(0.5913)
sdce × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0233	(0.4598)
securities act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.4842	(0.6461)
securities act (1956) × Initiative × Ideology	1.3481	(0.8540)
sexreginfo × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5871	(0.7491)
sexselect × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0911	(0.9494)
shield × Initiative × Ideology	0.0052	(0.4516)
shoplift × Initiative × Ideology	0.2978	(0.2969)
simultaneous death act × Initiative × Ideology	0.8606	(0.7625)
smokeban × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5681	(0.3961)
soexorder × Initiative × Ideology	0.5893	(0.2725)
solaw × Initiative × Ideology	0.5636	(0.4548)
sonofsam × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1865	(0.3239)
sonsam × Initiative × Ideology	0.1000	(0.3196)
st_wd_tran × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0656	(0.3389)
stalkdef × Initiative × Ideology	0.6015	(0.5136)
stalking × Initiative × Ideology	0.6340	(0.3611)
standground × Initiative × Ideology	0.3068	(0.3976)
statrape × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1288	(0.2869)
statutory form power of attorney act × Initiative × Ideology	0.5561	(0.6302)
statutory rule against perpetuities × Initiative × Ideology	0.8954	(0.3754)
sundayban × Initiative × Ideology	0.5506	(1.0339)
supp_research × Initiative × Ideology	0.4355	(1.0371)
syringe × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0080	(0.4082)
tels × Initiative × Ideology	0.2770	(0.4482)
terrorfund × Initiative × Ideology	0.2716	(0.3896)
testamentary additions to trusts act × Initiative × Ideology	0.1756	(0.4666)
threestrikes × Initiative × Ideology	0.4333	(0.4724)
timelim × Initiative × Ideology	0.6816	(0.5669)
tod security registration act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3018	(0.3437)
trade secrets act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0238	(0.2929)
transboundary pollution reciprocal access act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3648	(0.5654)
transfers to minors act × Initiative × Ideology	0.5509	(0.3080)
transport × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3942	(0.4434)
trap × Initiative × Ideology	0.0699	(0.4032)
trap_hosp × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0456	(0.4643)
trap_lic × Initiative × Ideology	0.3832	(0.4217)
trust code × Initiative × Ideology	0.5097	(0.5001)
trustees' powers act (1964) × Initiative × Ideology	0.1707	(0.6506)
truthsent × Initiative × Ideology	0.0426	(0.3364)
tu_decent × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1165	(0.3998)
u_record.sys × Initiative × Ideology	0.4609	(0.3404)
ucc article 1, general provisions (2001) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0659	(0.3617)
ucc article 2a, leases (1987) (1990) × Initiative × Ideology	0.0736	(0.3350)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments (1990) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6646	(0.4160)
ucc article 3, negotiable instruments and article 4, bank deposits (2002) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2732	(0.6053)
ucc article 4a amendments (2012) × Initiative × Ideology	0.5021	(0.4259)
ucc article 4a, funds transfers (1989) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9091	(0.4545)
ucc article 5, letters of credit (1995) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3177	(0.4810)
ucc article 6 (revise) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.8583	(0.8799)
ucc article 6, bulk sales (1989) × Initiative × Ideology	0.3217	(0.4451)

Continued on next page

Table 2 – Continued from previous page

ucc article 7, documents of title (2003) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1044	(0.3655)
ucc article 8, investment securities × Initiative × Ideology	0.0861	(0.5432)
ucc article 8, investment securities (1994) × Initiative × Ideology	0.0499	(0.5372)
ucc article 9 amendments × Initiative × Ideology	-0.7046	(0.3168)
ucc article 9 amendments (2010) × Initiative × Ideology	0.3082	(0.4153)
ucc article 9, secured transactions (1998) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2163	(0.3072)
ultrasound × Initiative × Ideology	0.2178	(0.4728)
unclaimed property act × Initiative × Ideology	0.3490	(0.7062)
unclaimed property act (1952)(1981) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.0973	(0.4196)
undocuit × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2510	(0.6663)
uniform unclaimed property act × Initiative × Ideology	-0.9101	(0.5617)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (1992)(1996) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3838	(0.4864)
unincorporated nonprofit association act (2008) (last amended 2011) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1948	(0.6636)
unionlimits × Initiative × Ideology	-1.0647	(0.5267)
universal health care × Initiative × Ideology	0.7957	(0.7378)
universalprek × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1595	(0.9566)
unsworn foreign declarations act (2008) × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1606	(0.4677)
viatesting × Initiative × Ideology	1.7854	(1.3225)
victrsamd × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1778	(0.3935)
victim notification × Initiative × Ideology	0.4409	(0.3126)
victimnotif × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1056	(0.3434)
victimrights × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1871	(0.3622)
w_abortion_parental_notice_1983 × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2689	(0.3531)
w_animal_cruelty_felon × Initiative × Ideology	0.6208	(0.4274)
w_ec_access_expan × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1833	(0.8159)
w_educ_mom_silentmandator × Initiative × Ideology	5.7962*	(2.1772)
w_educ_mom_silentpermis × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1651	(0.4684)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_loca × Initiative × Ideology	-0.6800	(0.6112)
w_envir_solar_taxcredit_stat × Initiative × Ideology	0.3636	(0.3750)
w_environment_endangered_specie × Initiative × Ideology	0.9672*	(0.3378)
w_gayright_publi_accom_genderi × Initiative × Ideology	0.0592	(0.3231)
w_gayrights_employment_discrimi × Initiative × Ideology	0.0374	(0.7964)
w_gayrights_public_accomodation × Initiative × Ideology	1.0444	(0.8941)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_handgu × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5147	(0.5442)
w_guncontrl_bc_dealer_rifl × Initiative × Ideology	0.0931	(1.1166)
waiting × Initiative × Ideology	0.4923	(0.3888)
wildlife violator compact × Initiative × Ideology	-0.3723	(0.4601)
wills recognition act × Initiative × Ideology	0.1717	(0.3909)
witnessint × Initiative × Ideology	0.4754	(0.3827)
wk20via × Initiative × Ideology	0.5435	(0.6038)
wmd × Initiative × Ideology	0.1102	(0.4349)
worksitebanstate × Initiative × Ideology	-0.5714	(0.4211)
writreq × Initiative × Ideology	1.4611	(1.4636)
zerotol × Initiative × Ideology	-0.1648	(0.3214)
zerotoleranceapis × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2272	(0.3262)
zerotolerancelaw × Initiative × Ideology	-0.2511	(0.3721)
Observations		316,555

Pooled Event History Analysis includes 487 policies with policies as the group level and fixed effects for year (not reported). * indicates $p < .01$.

Table 3: Comparing Economic and Social Policies

	(1)	(2)
	Social	Economic
Initiative Process	0.3593* (0.0637)	-0.0006 (0.0710)
Signatures - Average	-0.0331* (0.0071)	0.0086 (0.0079)
Latent Decay	0.1316* (0.0088)	0.1364* (0.0087)
Contiguity	0.1446* (0.0120)	0.1788* (0.0138)
Population	0.0917* (0.0180)	0.0811* (0.0204)
Citizen Ideology	-0.0334 (0.0282)	0.1687* (0.0337)
Unified Control	0.0567 (0.0269)	-0.0396 (0.0305)
Duration	-0.0256* (0.0057)	-0.0542* (0.0083)
Duration Squared	0.0004* (0.0001)	0.0016* (0.0003)
Duration Cubed	-0.0000* (0.0000)	-0.0000* (0.0000)
Real Income Per Capita	0.0456 (0.0256)	0.1051* (0.0268)
Squire Professionalism	-0.0391 (0.0217)	-0.1016* (0.0245)
Constant	-2.1816* (0.1766)	-1.9406* (0.1892)
<i>Policy Level Random Effects:</i>		
$\text{Var}(\beta_{Ideology})$	0.1162* (0.0161)	0.1469* (0.0213)
$\text{Var}(\beta_{Policy})$	1.1040* (0.1069)	1.0854* (0.1125)
$\text{Cov}(\text{constant}, \beta_{Ideology})$	-0.0057 (0.0298)	-0.0738 (0.0356)
Observations	202663	139708

Note: Social Policies are from the following topic areas: civil rights, education, law and crime, and social welfare. Economic policies are from macroeconomics, agriculture, labor, transportation, energy, housing, domestic commerce, technology, government operations, foreign trade, public lands