UPDATED & REVISED CITIZEN AND GOVERNMENT IDEOLOGY MEASURES THROUGH 2006

Microsoft Excel file 'ideo6006.xls' contains revised and updated values of the citizen and government ideology measures through 2006; 'ideo6006.dta' is a Stata 9.0 data set containing the same data. Values are included for all fifty American states beginning in 1960.

Variable labels are as follows:
statename: state name
state: 2-digit numerical code for states (alphabetical order)
year: year
inst6006: government ideology measure
citi6006: citizen ideology measure

As a test to determine whether the data in your file are accurate, you might calculate the mean and sum of each variable over all cases; they should be as follows:

Variable	Mean	Sum
inst6006	48.426769	113802.9057809
citi6006	46.963303	110363.7613378

To prevent confusion about data sources, please refer to these citizen ideology data as the "*revised 1960-2006 citizen ideology series*" and to these government ideology data as the "*revised 1960-2006 government ideology series*," citing the original article for a description of the measurement methodology.

Notes on Updated Citizen Ideology Scores

For 16 states, the 1960-2004 scores for the updated version and the previous version of our citizen ideology series are identical. For 34 states, there are some slight differences. For 24 of these 34 states, the differences between the old and new versions (for common 1960-2004 period) are trivial. Indeed, the within-state correlations between the old and new series for these 24 states all exceed .99. For ten states (CT, HI, KS, MD, MI, MN, NJ, RI, VT, WI) however, the differences were slightly greater. Yet, the correlations between the old and new series (for common 1960-2004 period) for these 10 states are high as well, with the minimum correlation at .93 (RI). In addition, most of the differences are concentrated among the ideology scores for years 2003 and 2004 (for reasons that are described below). These differences arise from several different sources.

1. As we describe in the unpublished supplement to our 1998 AJPS article, we estimate vote shares for House and Senate candidates who ran unopposed, rather than assume that 100% of voters in their district supported the candidate. Our interpolation process for estimating such vote shares is dependent upon the availability of observed vote shares (i.e. contested elections) within the district in question that occur before and/or after the election for which the vote share is missing. Thus, by including 2006 election data in our calculations, our interpolation strategies for unobserved vote shares in 2004 and 2002 are

changed in many cases. Since we do not interpolate vote shares across districting periods (because district populations are not comparable), the re-estimation of vote shares for uncontested elections affects only ideology values within the current districting period (2003-2004).

2. Consistent with previous updates of our ideology measures, we re-estimated missing values for state party delegations using the regression estimation procedure described in our unpublished supplement to the original (1998) AJPS article. Even if we were to retain the identical specifications for our predictive regression models for this update, the expansion of the dataset to 2006 would naturally lead to slightly different (but in most cases improved) predictions for missing state party delegations. This likely explains the trivial differences between our old and updated series for the vast majority of states where differences are observed prior to 2003.

3. By updating our dataset to reflect the 2006 elections we are able to improve upon our estimates of voter support for incumbent Senators who faced re-election in 2006 (their vote shares were previously extrapolated for the 2001-2004 period). This leads to slight differences in the final citizen ideology scores for some states during the 2001-2004 period.

4. We made two corrections to our individual level House and Senate datasets.

    a. David Scott (GA-13-Democrat) was incorrectly coded as Republican for 2003-04.
    b. We corrected an error in the AFL-CIO voting score for Daniel Akaka (HI-Senate-Democrat) in 2001.

Notes on Updated Government Ideology Scores

In constructing our government ideology measures, we continue to rely on the state partisan control data provided by Carl Klarner, which was documented in his article, "Measurement of Partisan Balance of State Government." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 3 (Fall 2003): 309-19.

For 32 states, the 1960-2004 scores for the updated version and the previous version of our government ideology series are identical. For 28 states, there are some slight differences. However, the differences between the old and new versions for these 28 states are trivial. Indeed, the within-state correlations between the old and new series for 26 of these 28 states exceeds .99. For the remaining two states (HI and RI), the correlations exceeded .98. These differences arise from the re-estimation of party ideology scores for missing party delegations (described above).

Inquiries about the updated measures should be directed to Richard Fording, Department of Political Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0027 (rford@.uky.edu).