SPID 1.2

State Policy and Innovation and Diffusion Data, Version 1.2

July 1, 2021

Introduction to the Data

This database includes information on the year of adoption for 724 policies in the American states. For each policy we document the year of first adoption for each state. Adoption dates range from 1691 to 2017 and includes all fifty states. Policies are adopted by anywhere from 1 to 50 states, with an average of 24.6 adoptions and a total of 17,823 adoptions. The data were assembled from a variety of sources, including academic publications and policy advocacy/information groups. Policies were coded according to the Policy Agendas Project major topic code.

The information below explains the general formatting of the data, sources used to compile data, and information on how the information was compiled into a single data. Procedures on topic coding and deleting duplicate observations are also explained.

Changes

SPID v1.2 includes a small number of corrections to the previous version.

1. Removes three policies newly identified as duplicates. This removes 80 observations.
2. Revises date of adoption for NJ for casino gambling. This changes one observation.
3. Corrects some data entry errors to include LA adoptions for Karch et al. data and WV adoptions for Uniform Law data. This adds 63 adoption dates.

A full listing of changes is reported in SPID_v1.2_changes.xlsx.

Research Team and Support

The SPID v1.0 database was assembled by the following team with the support of the National Science Foundation (grant numbers #1558509, #1637095, #1558661, #1558781, and #1558561): Frederick J. Boehmke, Bruce Desmarais, Jeff Harden, and Hanna Wallach (co-PIs). We also wish to thank Christopher Blythe, Mark Brockway, Scott LaCombe, Fridolin Linder, Nathan Micatka, Ariel Perez, Abigail Rury, Paul Skinner, and Desmond Wallace for their hard work and research assistance on the project.

The SPID v1.2 database updates were done by Frederick J. Boehmke, Scott LaCombe, and Mark Brockway.

Guide to General Formatting

The SPID database includes two separate datasets; one capturing information about policy adoptions and another capturing information about policies.

The policy adoption dataset is in long form, meaning there is an observation each year a policy was adopted in each state. Only observed adoptions are included in the dataset. Several

identifying variables are used. *state* is the state postal abbreviation, *state_fips* is the federal information processing standard number for states and territories, *statenam* is the name of the state/territory, *stateno* is the a number based on the alphabetic order of the state's name, and *state_icpsr* is the ICPSR state number. The variable *policy* gives the policy name. The variable *adopt_year* is the year that a state adopted a given policy.

The policy data set includes one observation for each policy. *first_year* records the first year that a policy was adopted and *last_year* records the final year that a policy was adopted in the dataset (see note on first and last adoptions in the Constructing Datasets section below). The variable *source* is the source that information on each policy was compiled from (see below for source specific information). *adopt_count* refers to the number of states that adopted a given policy. *Description* provides a brief explanation of the policy and *majortopic* represents the our coding of the topic area based on the Policy Agendas Project major topic listings.[1]

List of Variables

Variable Name	Description
state, stateno, state_fips, statenam, state_icpsr	State Identifier
policy	Policy Name
adopt_year	Year that a policy is adopted
first_year	First year a policy is adopted by any state
last_year	Last year a policy is adopted by any state
source	Data source for policy adoption
adopt_count	Number of states that adopt a policy
description	Brief policy overview
majortopic	Policy area code (Policy Agendas Project)

Dataset Sources

Note: For all sources, names were changed to fit the naming conventions outlined above. Furthermore, duplicates were dropped using the procedure outlined in the next section. The number next to the source name is the number of policies in the dataset before duplicates in the compiled dataset were dropped.

Boehmke and Skinner (189 policies)

This dataset comes from the 2012 *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* article titled "State Policy Innovativeness Revisited" by Boehmke and Skinner.[2] Data from this source set the format for all other sources when appending into the data. This dataset includes 85 policies from Walker's (1969) article in the *American Political Science Review,* and an additional 100 policies that have been adopted in the last four decades. Data were reshaped from wide to long, and missing observations were dropped.

Uniform Law Dataset (194 policies)

[1] The Master Codebook can be found at http://www.comparativeagendas.net/pages/master-codebook

[2] Harvard Dataverse link: https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/V8Q4YC.

The Uniform Law Dataset was pulled from the Uniform Law Commission's website.[3] This dataset is already in long format. All observations were dropped if the policy was not enacted that year (some policies had bill introduction years listed, or had the status missing). The data were then sorted by name, policy, and then year. Here some states had multiple adoptions of the same policy, so a new variable was generated that counted the number of adoptions per state and policy. No policy was adopted more than twice, so values were separated into two variables; first adoption year (year) and second adoption year (secondadopt). These values were then collapsed so that each state and policy combination had only one observation.

Note that versions 1.0 and 1.1 of SPID erroneously excluded adoptions by West Virginia. These were inexplicably lost before a final round of updates by research assistants at Iowa. We restored them by using the adoption dates from the penultimate spreadsheet and redoing the addition of 2015-2017 data using information from the Uniform Law Commission's website. The website underwent a major revision between now and the updates done in 2017. This affected our ability to access the needed information for all policies. Therefore, we collected information on policy adoptions for West Virginia through annual policy activity reports from the Uniform Law Commission for 2016 and 2017 archived on the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine (https://archive.org/web/). The information in these reports matched the SPID data for other states that we spot checked. In practice, this means that it is possible that updates to West Virginia adoptions prior to 2016 issued by the Uniform Law Commission between 2015 and 2017 may have been lost. Examining changes for other states suggest that such updates happen but are rare.

Boushey APSR 2016 (44 policies)

This dataset was taken from the Harvard dataverse from an *American Political Science Review* article titled "Targeted for Diffusion? How the Use and Acceptance of Stereotypes Shape the Diffusion of Criminal Justice Policy Innovations in the American States".[4] Non-policy related variables were dropped. The variable "yradopt" is the year of adoption, so other year variables were dropped.

Caughey-Warshaw (129 policies)

The Caughey-Warshaw data comes from a 2015 AJPS article titled "The Dynamics of State Policy Liberalism, 1936-2014".[5] This dataset is in wide format so it was reshaped. Before doing this, the variables needed to be de-stringed and observations coded as "NA" were replaced with missing values. A series of variables that begin with the characters "w_" are ordinal instead of binary, so they were recoded to be separate binary variables reflecting multiple policy adoptions. Non-policy adoption variables were also dropped. The dataset was then reshaped from wide to long form. Policies were sorted by state and policy while generating a variable that counts duplicate state policy observations, and duplicates were dropped along with missing observations. This dataset went to the 4th adoption, so there are 4 different variables to reflect the maximum of 4 adoptions of a policy. Several policies relating to certifications were dropped

[3] http://www.uniformlaws.org/
[4] Harvard Dataverse link: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/3HOJZ4
[5] Harvard Dataverse link: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/ZXZMJB

because the original dataset codes all adoptions before 1935 as 1935. The actual policy adoption years were found manually and then appended to the original dataset.

Makse (27 policies)

The Makse dataset was already in long form and was collected from a 2011 JOP paper by Makse and Volden titled "The Role of Policy Attributes in the Diffusion of Innovations".[6] The data was sorted and ordered by the standard project guidelines and saved.

Mallinson (17 Policies)

The Mallinson data is from a 2015 SPPQ journal article titled "Building a Better Speed Trap: Measuring Policy Adoption Speed in the American States".[7] Variables were renamed to fit general guidelines, and the fips code for Idaho was recoded to the correct value. The data was reshaped to long form and missing adoption values were dropped.

Other (56 Policies)

These data were collected by a student that worked for the research team. It is a collection of sources from academic journals in the social sciences related to policy adoption. Policies were found using a variety of search terms, Articles were searched for that use the terms "policy and innovation", "policy and diffusion", "policy and adoption", and "Walker." A total of 50 different sources were used to construct this set. This dataset was reshaped from wide to long form. Then 4 additional policies collected separately from the original dataset were appended to the original dataset. The fips code for Idaho was recoded back to the correct value. The appended datasets include additional policies on renewable energy, energy regulation, pain management laws, and prepaid savings plans.

Sheprd (30 policies)

The Sheprd dataset is short for the "State Health Research Dataset"[8] and ranges from 1980-2010 and studies trends in state public health laws. It was conducted through ICPSR at the University of Michigan. Variables were renamed to the standard format. Then, several variables were split from ordinal to multiple binary variables to reflect each variable representing a single policy. Variables not related to policy adoption were dropped, and the data was reshaped from wide to long form.

Michigan State (9 policies)

This dataset is from Michigan State's "Correlates of State Policy" project.[9] This project includes a variety of policies and state level information for US states overtime. The data was in wide format, so it was reshaped to long, with variables for state, policy name, and adoption year, and only adoptions were kept in the data. Policies include campaign finance laws and discrimination protection orders.

Biggers and Hanmer (3 policies)

[6] See article DOI: http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1017/S0022381610000903
[7] Harvard Dataverse link: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/6RCYDU
[8] ICPSR Data: https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/HMCA/studies/34789
[9] Website link: http://ippsr.msu.edu/public-policy/correlates-state-policy

This dataset is a list of Voter ID Laws from 1974-2013 from Biggers and Hammer's 2017 *American Political Research* article titled "Understanding the Adoption of Voter Identification Laws in the American States".[10] The data was in wide format, so it was reshaped to long, with variables for state, policy name, and adoption year. The data consist of 3 different photo identification requirements.

Gray et al (1 policy)

This is a dataset created by Gray et al. with adoptions ranging from 1988-2002. The source comes from a 2010 article titled "Incrementing toward Nowhere: Universal Health Care Coverage in the States" from the *Publius: The Journal of Federalism.*[11] This dataset had numerous state level characteristics (% spent on healthcare, political control, etc). Only one variable was kept in this dataset (pointcount) that listed state level universal healthcare laws that were signed by the governor (when pointcoint=5). Earlier stages of policy making (pass committee, etc) were not included because policy innovation is measured through adoption. Some states had multiple adoptions of this policy, so a variable was created called "second adopt" to reflect that.

Doyle (1 policy)

This data includes adoption information of states creating an administration to give merit aid for higher education with dates from 1986-1999 and comes from a 2006 article in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* titled "Adoption of Merit-Based Student Grant Programs: An Event History Analysis".[12] The policy was already in long form, so it was ready to include in the dataset.

Karch et al (52 policies)

This dataset covers a variety of national compacts, and comes from a 2016 *Political Research Quarterly* article by Karch et al titled "Policy Diffusion and the Pro-Innovation Bias".[13] The only variables kept were state, year, and compact number. Compact number designates each interstate compact. A loop was used to rename the compacts, from just a number to "compact#". There are 36 compacts in the data ranging from 1951-2005. The authors were contacted for the names of each compact. Additional compacts were identified using the National Center for Interstate Compacts database.[14] Regional compacts (such as Midwestern, or Missouri Valley compacts for example) were dropped, and additional national compacts added to the dataset.

Kreitzer (43 policies)

This dataset includes information on 30 abortion related policies adopted by the states from 1973-2013 published in Kreitzer's 2015 article titled "Politics and Morality in State Abortion Policy".[15] The data was reshaped from wide to long format, and states that did not adopt a policy

[10] Supplemental material: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1532673X16687266
[11] DOI: https://academic.oup.com/publius/article/40/1/82/1922844
[12] Article Link: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4121783?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
[13] Article Link: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1065912915622289
[14] Website: http://apps.csg.org/ncic/SearchResults.aspx?
[15] Article Link: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1532440014561868

were dropped from the long form. State names, policy names, and adoption years were kept in dataset.

Lacy (26 policies)

This dataset includes a variety of higher education financial policies ranging from 1976-2008. The data comes from a 2008 article in *Research in Higher Education* titled "Rethinking Policy Diffusion: The Interstate Spread of 'Finance Innovations'".[16] The data was reshaped to long form, and only policy adoption variables were kept along with state names and years. This data was originally formatted where after initial adoption all further years were also coded as 1. So, each policy was collapsed by policy and state by the first year the policy was adopted, making one observation per state per policy (non-adopters are omitted).

Matisoff and Edwards (8 policies)

This dataset ranges from 1990-2008 and includes information about energy policies and is from a 2014 *Environmental Politics* article titled " (1990-2008)".[17] State level characteristic variables were dropped, then the dataset was reshaped from wide form to long form. Missing observations were recoded from 9999 to ".", and variables were kept for state names, policy names, and adoption years.

Curran and Go (1 policy)

This dataset was constructed using two papers that each had a single policy. Curran's data was on universal pre-K adoption and is found in the article "Expanding Downward: Innovation, Diffusion, and State Policy Adoptions of Universal Preschool".[18] The second policy was taken from a Min Hee Go article on building codes titled "Building a Safe State Hybrid Diffusion of Building Code Adoption in American States".[19] The state, policy, and adoption year were recorded and appended to the master dataset.

Constructing Datasets

Pre-Statehood Adoptions

Many of the policies start to diffuse before all states achieve statehood. Some sources may include information on adoption by territories, others may not. Researchers should pay attention to these issues when working with policies that begin diffusing prior to 1959.

Of particular note, the policies from the Walker data source excludes Alaska and Hawaii completely.

First and Last Observed Adoptions

As noted in our variables description first_year and last_year record the first and last observed adoption in the final data set. Since we drop territories, the District of Columbia, and Federal actions, these might differ from the first and last adoptions in the source data. Since inclusion of these non-states varies across sources we constructed them after edits for consistency. Further,

[16] Article Link: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-014-9330-2#Sec8
[17] Article Link: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09644016.2014.923639
[18] Article Link: https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1688
[19] Article Link: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0275074014563827

some sources, most notably Caughey-Warshaw, might track policies for some period before or after the last observed adoption. Again, for consistency's sake we used the first and last observed adoption in our final data set.

Checking for Duplicate Policies

1. Once the data were compiled, policy duplicates were checked for using a few different methods. First, the data was collapsed by policy, and variables were generated for the mean year of adoption, the last year of adoption, and the first year of adoption. Then, duplicates in the year variables were identified and any duplicates were deleted.
2. The next method used for checking for duplicates reshaped the compiled data. Variables were reshaped to wide form and variables were generated for the years of adoptions by looking at what years the first, second, etc. state adopted a policy. The first ten adoption years of a policy were reported, and then policies were sorted by those that had duplicate first ten years of adoption. In a few cases, the policies shared the first 10 adoptions, so then the number of adoptions were examined beyond this. If policies shared every adoption, then one of the duplicates were deleted based upon which policy had less observations.
3. Duplicates were collapsed by policy and source this time because several of the policies had identical names. Duplicates were dropped based on policies that had identical names, and first and last year of adoptions. The policy with fewer observations was dropped.
4. Finally, as policy were coded by policy agenda area, researchers noted policies that looked to be duplicates. After these were identified, adoption information and policy content were evaluated and duplicate policies were dropped.

Topic Coding

Three coders were given information from the Policy Agendas Project[20] to code major topic area coding for each policy. This project documents national policies and codes them into 21 major topic areas, ranging from taxes, to healthcare to criminal justice. Coders used a guide from the Policy Agendas Project to assign a major topic to each policy. Coders all agreed on 60% of policies, and at least two agreed with 85% of policies. Where there was disagreement, PI Boehmke worked with research team members to reconcile differences and assign an agreed upon policy area. To further reduce uncertainty, a research assistant also used topic data on bills in US Congress and the Pennsylvania state legislature. The policy coding from these sources aided in reconciling disagreements in topic area. A final review was conducted for researchers to determine proper coding.

State adoptions dataset

After the above sources were reformatted and recoded, we appended them into one master dataset including the listing of recorded state adoptions of each policy. Before any other changes were made to the dataset duplicates were checked for (see above on process of searching for duplicates). The dataset is in the long form described at the beginning of the documentation page and includes 17,823 state adoptions of 724 policies from 1691 to 2017.

Policy information dataset

[20] Website: http://www.comparativeagendas.net/

The policy-level dataset includes one observation per policy. It provides information on the data source, the first year of adoption, the last year of adoption, the number of states that adopted the policy, the topic area, and a brief description of the policy. Variables use the same naming convention described for the compiled set.

Bibliography

Biggers, D., & Hanmer, M. (2017). Understanding the adoption of voter identification laws in the American states. *American Politics Research, 45*(4), 560-588.

Boehmke, F., & Skinner, P. (2012). State Policy Innovativeness Revisited. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly, 12*(3), 303-329.

Boushey, G. (2016). Targeted for diffusion? How the use and acceptance of stereotypes shape the diffusion of criminal justice policy innovations in the American States. *American Political Science Review, 110*(1), 198-214.

Caughey, D., & Warshaw, C. (2016). The Dynamics of State Policy Liberalism, 1936-2014. *American Journal of Political Science, 60*(4), 899-913.

Curran, F. C. (2015). Expanding downward: Innovation, diffusion, and state policy adoptions of universal preschool. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas, 23*.

Doyle, W. (2006). Adoption of Merit-Based Student Grant Programs: An Event History Analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 28*(3), 259-285.

Gray, V., Lowery, D., Monogan, J., & Godwin, E. (2009). Incrementing toward nowhere: Universal health care coverage in the states. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 40*(1), 82-113.

Karch, A., Nicholson-Crotty, S., Woods, N., & Bowman, A. (2016). Policy Diffusion and the Pro-Innovation Bias. *Political Research Quarterly, 69*(1), 83-95.

Kreitzer, R. (2015). Politics and Morality in State Abortion Policy. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly, 15*(1), 41-66.

Lacy, A., & Tandberg, D. (2014). Rethinking Policy Diffusion: The Interstate Spread of 'Finance Innovations'. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(7), 627-649.

Makse, T., & Volden, C. (2011). The Role of Policy Attributes in the Diffusion of Innovations. *The Journal of Politics, 73*(1), 108-124.

Mallinson, D. (2016). Building a Better Speed Trap: Measuring Policy Adoption Speed in the American States. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly, 16*(1), 98-120.

Matisoff, D., & Edward, J. (2014). Kindred Spirits or Intergovernmental competition? The Innovation and Diffusion of Energy Politics in the American States. *Environmental Politics, 23*(5), 795-817.