A Nationalized Agenda or Laboratories of Democracy? Issue Attention in State Politics

Andreu Casas[*] Oscar Stuhler[†] Julia Payson[‡]
Joshua A. Tucker [§] Richard Bonneau[¶] Jonathan Nagler [‖]

Abstract

Who shapes the issue-attention cycle of state legislators? Although state governments make critical policy decisions, data and methodological constraints have limited researchers' ability to study state-level agenda setting. For this paper, we collect nearly 105 million Twitter messages sent by state and national actors in 2018 and 2021. We then employ supervised topic modeling and time series techniques to study how the issue attention of state lawmakers evolves vis-à-vis their constituents, members of Congress, and state and national media outlets. We find that federal policy debates strongly influence the public agenda of state legislators on state and federal issues alike. However, we also find that state legislators both lead and are responsive to shifts in attention by partisan members of the public and to regional media outlets, indicating that states can sometimes act as "laboratories of democracy" for policy discourse.

[*]Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, *Department of Communication Science*
[†]New York University, *Department of Sociology*
[‡]New York University, *Department of Politics*
[§]New York University: *Department of Politics*
[¶]New York University: *Department of Biology, Computer Science, and Center for Data Science*
[‖]New York University: *Department of Politics*

1 Introduction

Classic theories of agenda setting argue that attention to an issue is a necessary precondition for policy change (e.g., Schattschneider 1960; Kingdon 1984; Baumgartner and Jones 2010). In the U.S., critical policies are increasingly crafted at the state level, including minimum wage laws, civil rights legislation, and responses to public health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the importance of state policies on people's lives, we know little about when and why state legislators in the U.S. choose to pay attention to different policy areas in their public communications.

Existing theoretical frameworks offer competing predictions as to which actors influence the policy discussions of state legislators. We empirically assess the explanatory power of two prominent theories. First, we test the argument that state and local politics have become nationalized Hopkins (2018). According to this perspective, the public communications of state legislators should emphasize the issues that are discussed by national actors, such as members of the U.S. Congress. At the same time, state governments are geographically closer to the people than the national government, and classic theories of federalism suggest that state legislators should be particularly responsive to the priorities and interests of local constituents (Madison 1961; Erikson et al. 1993).

Understanding who sets the agenda when it comes to the issue attention of state legislators is crucial for assessing the state of representative democracy and the policymaking process in the United States. Amid increasing gridlock and polarization in D.C., many of the most important policy battles today are taking place at the state rather than the national level. Although many researchers have studied whether politicians respond to the policy preferences of various political actors (Page and Shapiro 1983; Stimson, Mackuen, and Erikson 1995; Soroka and Wlezien 2009; Caughey and Warshaw 2018), other work focuses on whether they respond to "issue attention" (Edwards and Wood 1999; Jones and Baumgartner 2004; Sulkin 2005; Lowery, Gray, and Baumgartner 2011; Neundorf and Adams 2018), as issue-attention cycles are often crucial for understanding whose interests are represented and when policies will change. In this paper, we study the latter by exploring whether and how shifts in issue attention by relevant political actors and the public predict shifts in issue attention by state legislators.

Research on this topic at the state level remains limited (Tausanovitch 2019) in part due to data and methodological limitations. While we know that state policies tend to be responsive to the ideological preferences of state residents (e.g Erikson et al. 1993; Caughey and Warshaw 2016; Gray et al. 2004; Caughey and Warshaw 2018; Lax and Phillips 2009), we do not know if these correlations extend beyond legislated policies to the broader issue agenda. Does the set of policy issues being debated by state legislators reflect the same set of issues being discussed by the public—or is some other political actor driving attention to particular issues? We lack answers to these questions largely because collecting data on the topics that state legislators are paying attention to is an extremely arduous task. For example, it would be prohibitively time-consuming to collect and manually annotate press releases or newsletters from thousands of state and national legislators in combination with comparative state-level opinion polls on public issue priorities and news stories published by the mass media during the same time period.

However, most state and national legislators today actively use social media platforms such as Twitter, where they frequently express opinions on the issues that are important to them (Payson et al. 2022). Moreover, the general public and various media outlets also present their views on various topics on the same platform and in the same standardized format. Building on the methodological framework used by Barbera et al. (2019) to study issue attention at the national level, we collected the universe of Twitter messages sent in 2018 and 2021 by: (a) state legislators from 13 states, (b) members of Congress, (c) four prominent national media outlets, (d) President Trump and Biden, (e) the most consumed newspapers in each state, and (f) a sample of Democrats and Republicans who closely follow state politics in each state. Using supervised BERT models, we predict the topics of each tweet, classifying them into the policy topics of the Comparative Agendas Project. Finally, we use vector auto regressive models (VAR) to study who leads and who follows shifts in issue attention by state legislators.

Our findings add to a growing body of research documenting the nationalization of politics and show that national actors (and especially members of Congress) strongly influence the issue agenda of state legislators. This is true even when the issues being discussed are those typically handled by the states, such as education and healthcare. We also uncover evidence that state legislators engage in policy debates specific to their own states. For example, lawmakers respond to shifts in issue attention by state media and even more strongly to shifts by partisan members of the public within their state. In turn, they also influence the issue agendas of both groups (particularly the state media). However, this bi-directional influence is dwarfed by the massive effect exerted by members of Congress when it comes to setting the agenda of state legislators. Overall, our results lend support to the idea that politics has become increasingly nationalized — but we also find that, by being responsive to the different issue demands of the constituents from each state, states can act as laboratories of democracy. In the next section, we lay out the competing theoretical predictions that inform our analyses before introducing the data and methodological approach.

2 A Nationalized Issue Agenda or Laboratories of Democracy?

Who leads the issue attention of state legislators? Recent research on the nationalization of politics, including Hopkins (2018)'s *The Increasingly United States*, offers one possible answer: national political actors. This work argues that in the last few decades, party unity, affective polarization, and the decline in local media have contributed to a political environment in which voters identify more strongly than ever with the two national parties, pay more attention to national news, and know more about national politics than state politics (Abramowitz and Webster 2016; Rogers 2016; Moskowitz 2019; Hopkins 2018). The net result is that voters are more likely to pay attention to and be informed about national rather than regional political issues. If national actors are defining the political agenda, it seems logical for state legislators to emphasize the policy issues discussed by national legislators. We therefore test the following hypothesis:

> $\mathbf{H}_1$: Changes in issue attention by members of Congress will influence changes in issue attention by state legislators.

The main competing theoretical perspective predicts that attentive members of the public within each state, in particular supporters of each party (Barbera et al. 2019) – we refer to them as *mass public partisans* or *state partisans* – should drive the issue attention of state legislators. A core principle of representative democracy holds that elected officials should represent the interests and policy priorities of their constituents (Dexter 1957; Miller and Stokes 1963; Erikson 1971; Achen 1977). Attention is a precondition for policy change, and empirical research on agenda setting at the national level has uncovered a strong correlation between public attention to particular issues and political action by elected officials. For example, members of Congress are more likely to debate, introduce bills, and hold hearings on issues that are salient in the public discourse (Sulkin 2005; Brayden, Bentele, and Soule 2007; Jones, Larsen-Price, and Wilkerson 2009; Baumgartner and Jones 2010).

There are reasons to expect similar responsiveness to public issue attention at the state level. States are often viewed as "laboratories of democracy," and one of the features of the American federal system is that multiple policy venues exist in different levels of government. When an issue doesn't make it onto the national agenda, the states offer an alternative venue for issue attention and policymaking (Grodzins 1966; Karch 2007; True, Jones, and Baumgartner 2019). From education and welfare to civil rights, states regularly experiment with different local policies (Gray 1973), and literature on state policymaking shows a correlation between voter preferences and policy adoption across states (Erikson et al. 1993). While most work on policy diffusion focuses on the content of policies, other work explicitly studies the diffusion of issue attention (Lowery, Gray, and Baumgartner 2011), and state officials often try to shift attention to problems that are important to their local constituents but not on the federal agenda (Krane 2007). Given the straightforward electoral incentives that state legislators face to respond to the priorities that residents within their states deem important, we test the following hypothesis:

> $\mathbf{H}_2$: Changes in issue attention by mass public partisans in each state will influence changes in issue attention by state legislators.

2.1 Alternative Sources of Influence

In addition to studying how state legislators respond to (and influence) members of Congress and the public (state partisans) in their issue attention, we conduct several additional analyses to paint a fuller portrait of the agenda-setting process at the state level. First, we study how both the state and national media shape the public discourse of state legislators. The media often responds to public demands and the political agenda when deciding which issues to cover (Berkowitz 1992). At the same time, research on media effects also shows that sometimes the media successfully increases the salience of particular policy issues (Baumgartner, De Boef, and Boydstun 2008)) which translates into greater public scrutiny followed by attention from politicians (McCombs and Shaw 1972; Zaller 1992; Boydstun 2013). Second, we also take into account the issues discussed by the President. Findings are mixed as to whether the sitting President is able to shape the political agendas of other politicians (Wells et al. 2016; Lawrence and Boydstun 2017; Edwards and Wood 1999), although Trump may have uniquely influenced the media and political agenda (Lawrence and Boydstun 2017). By including two time periods in our analysis, 2018 and 2021, we assess whether Trump's ability to set the agenda was stronger than Biden's.

Beyond this, we examine whether the type of policy being discussed dictates whether state legislators are leading or following in terms of issue attention. Given the federal structure of the U.S., certain policy areas fall primarily to state governments in terms of legislation and administration. These areas include education, healthcare, law and crime, and transportation, which comprise the bulk of legislation passed at the state level (Jewell 1982). At the same time, state governments have significantly less power to legislate on issues related to foreign trade, defense, and international affairs.

Research on federalism typically finds that candidates for different levels of office focus on the policy areas that are most directly tied to that position (e.g., Jacob and Vines 1965; Laumann and Knoke 1987). A plausible extension of this logic suggests that legislators are also more responsive when it comes to issues over which they hold legislative power. We therefore expect that state legislators will be most attentive to shifts in issue attention by other actors when those groups are discussing policy issues that are primarily the domain of state government. At the same time, the literature on policy diffusion suggests that the federal government often looks to the states for innovation in certain policy areas—especially when those policies are traditionally in the domain of state government (Karch 2007). This suggests that national legislators might also be more responsive to state legislators on state-owned issues.

3 Data to Measure Issue Attention

We use Twitter data to identify what issues state legislators emphasize in their public communications and to examine how their issue attention evolves *vis a vis* other groups. Twitter is widely and frequently used by both national (Barbera et al. 2019) and state-level (Payson et al. 2022) political elites. In addition, media outlets are active on Twitter (Eady et al. 2019), frequently posting about their most relevant stories. Moreover, the mass public also uses Twitter as a platform for expressing political views (Barbera et al. 2019) and for mobilizing on political issues (Freelon, McIlwain, and Clark 2018). Other research has shown that the topics Americans discuss on social media platforms like Twitter are highly correlated with survey-based measures of issue salience (O'Connor et al. 2010). As a result, Twitter data provide an opportunity to study the political issues publicly emphasized by different groups, on one single platform and in the same format.

We note that this exercise would not be possible with roll call votes, which are only available for legislators and not other actors. Issues emphasized in legislative settings (e.g., roll call votes, bill introduction, etc.) are heavily constrained by the agenda-setting power of the party leadership in the chamber. Moreover, measuring the issue attention of legislators on other public channels, such as media interviews or press releases, would not yield the detailed analyses put forward in this study, as legislators engage in these types of activities far less often. Hence, tweets provide an excellent proxy for attention being paid to various policy topics and allow us to assess agenda-setting dynamics at the state level in an unprecedentedly granular and detailed manner; making theoretical (as well as descriptive) contributions to the literature on state politics that would be difficult to achieve otherwise.

Below we present a brief description of how we created the list of Twitter users belonging to each group in our analysis. We used the Twitter REST API to collect all tweets sent by the users in each group for two full years, 2018 and 2021. We collected data for two different years in order to be able to generalize beyond one particular context (e.g., the Trump presidency) and to assess whether results are similar in years when state legislatures are or are not in session.[1] In Table 1, we report the total number of messages collected for each group, as well as the number of unique users responsible for them.

- **State Legislators**. We study the issue attention distribution of state legislators from 13 states: Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Texas, Utah, and Virginia.[2] We first obtained a list and the Twitter handles of the state legislators serving in 2018, and then in 2021, in the lower and upper chambers of these state legislatures by using the Google Civic API. Then we manually checked to see if an account actually existed when the Google Civic API did not return an account for a policymaker, manually adding them to the list of state legislator Twitter accounts to track.

- **Members of Congress**. We used several public sources to collect the Twitter handles of members of Congress serving during the 115th and 117th Congress.[3]

- **President**. We collected all tweets sent by President Trump in 2018; and by President Biden in 2021.

[1] Some U.S. state legislatures meet only in odd numbered years; from our sample, Montana, Nevada, and Texas met only in 2021 and not in 2018. Other recent work, however, finds that being in session is not predictive of being less active on Twitter nor discussing policy-relevant issues less often (Payson et al. 2022). While state legislators remain politically active on the social media platform regardless of whether they are in the state capitol or not, including both an even and an odd year of data help us to allay this concern even further. Due to the intense effort (both computationally and qualitatively) that such data collection requires, we limit our analysis to one year of both the Trump and Biden presidencies.

[2] Collecting, processing, and analyzing tweets from state legislators, newspapers, and partisans from all 50 states was computationally and qualitatively unfeasible. Instead, we focused on a subset of states, which we selected to maximize variation across several key features, such as population, geographic region, levels of legislative professionalization, partisan composition of the chambers, and whether the legislature was in versus out of session in 2018. We based our selection criteria on data from a variety of sources, including the Census Bureau, the Correlates of State Policy Database, and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

[3] We collected the handles of the official accounts via this collaborative github account with a variety of individual level information about members of Congress: https://github.com/unitedstates/congress-legislators Additionally, we also collected and included the handles for the personal accounts of members of Congress.

- **National Media**. We tracked four of the main national media organizations in the United States: Huffington Post, CNN, Associated Press, and Fox News. We followed two main rationales when selecting them. First, these are major news organizations each with more than 10 million Twitter followers Second, these outlets are roughly representative of the ideological media space, with FoxNews on the right, Huffington Post on the left, and CNN and the Associated Press representing a more moderate position.

- **State Partisans**. We used the Twitter REST API to access the followers of all state legislators in our sample. Next, we created a group of state partisans for each of the 13 states by selecting those who followed at least 2 Democratic and no Republican state legislators from that state, and *vice versa*. Barbera et al. (2019) have shown that this method reliably identifies Twitter users from these states who are supportive of each party.[4] Appendix B contains some additional validation.

- **State Media**. We track the tweets of the most relevant news outlets from each of the 13 states.[5]

3.1 Classifying policy issues

At the heart of our analytical strategy is an assessment of when different actors discuss different topics on Twitter, so we now turn to how we identify the topics of discussion. We rely on the comprehensive list of policy issues defined by the Comparative Agendas Project (CAP)[6]. This classification schema has been widely adopted and allows scholars to study

[4]E.g., validated by matching Twitter users with their voter registration records for states that make it available for research, see SI.F2 in Barbera et al. (2019)

[5]For 2018, we tracked the top 10 newspapers in each state, based on circulation data from `https://www.agilitypr.com/`. For the 2021 data collection, we substantially complemented the number of state media accounts to ensure we accounted for a more comprehensive list of media outlets in each state. In this data, we include a total of 1,070 media Twitter accounts from the 13 states under analysis.

[6]`https://www.comparativeagendas.net/codebook`

Table 1: Number of tweets and unique accounts by group

Group	2018 Unique accounts	2018 Tweets collected	2021 Unique accounts	2021 Tweets collected
Democrat State Legislators	672	375,791	802	468,308
Republican State Legislators	583	207,547	514	161,658
Democrats in Congress	393	331,558	448	397,530
Republicans in Congress	454	225,462	353	242,421
National Media	4	192,383	4	100,561
President	1	3,416	1	3,012
Democrat State Partisans	70,152	26,098,321	79,648	41,338,348
Republican State Partisans	32,809	15,136,002	29,938	15,621,228
State Media	130	1,100,320	1,070	3,226,880
Total	105,198	43,670,800	112,778	61,559,946

issue attention, agenda setting, framing, and political responsiveness in a systematic and comparative fashion across contexts and time periods. We adopted this issue categorization for two main reasons. First, the codebook provides a comprehensive list that allows us to classify virtually all policy-relevant tweets into one of the issue categories (with a minor exception that we discuss below). Second, because this classification is used by a large community of scholars, it ensures that our results speak to existing and future work on the topic.

Table 2 shows the 20 macro policy issue categories defined by the CAP codebook (such as the *Economy*) and several sub-issue categories (e.g., taxes and unemployment are subcategories of the *Economy*).[7] Because we use machine learning classifiers to predict the policy issues discussed in tweets and need many examples of annotated tweets within each category to build sufficiently accurate classifiers, we focus on shifts in attention across the 20 macro issue categories (rather than the numerous sub-issue ones). Although these are broad categories, we are still able to accurately trace issue responsiveness between groups, as discussions around two sub-issue domains of the same topic category are unlikely to correspond in time (see Appendix E). For our analysis, we decided to add an additional macro issue category: *Gun Control*. Shootings and the regulation of gun ownership, carriage, and usage

[7]We excluded the CAP topic category *Culture*, as an analysis revealed that it was rarely discussed.

Table 2: Policy areas included in the analysis, plus examples of sub-issues that are part of each policy area.

Policy area	Examples
Economy	Interest rates, unemployment, monetary policy, tax code, ...
Civil Rights	Minority and gender discrimination, voting rights, ...
Healthcare	Insurance, drug industry, medical facilities, reform, ...
Agriculture	Subsidies to farmers, foo1d inspection and safety, ...
Labor	Workers safety, benefits and training, labor unions, ...
Education	Preliminary, secondary and higher education, ...
Environment	Water, air pollution, recycling, conservation, ...
Energy	Nuclear, electricity, natural gas and oil, coal, renewable, ...
Immigration	Immigrants, refugees, citizenship, ...
Transportation	Highways, air travel, railroad, maritime, ...
Law and Crime	Crime control, police, court administration, criminal and civil code, ...
Social Welfare	Assistance for low-income and elderly, child care, ...
Housing	Urban development, rural housing, low-income and veteran assistance, ...
Domestic Commerce	Banking, securities and commodities, small businesses, ...
Defense	Alliances, intelligence, personnel issues, foreign operations, ...
Technology	Space, science transfer, telecommunications, broadcast, ...
Foreign Trade	Trade agreements, exports, tariffs, exchange rates, ...
International Affairs	Foreign aid, human rights, international organizations, ...
Gov. Operations	Appointments, scandals, bureaucratic oversight, branch relations, ...
Public Lands	National parks, native American affairs, water resources, ...
Gun Control	Gun carriage, gun production, gun control/rights groups, ...

have been a very salient topic in the United States. Currently, the CAP codebook subsumes these discussions under *Law & Crime*, but due to the increased salience and number of tweets on this topic, we capture gun control as a separate policy category.

Finally, to test whether state legislators are more likely to respond to or lead the public agenda on particular issues, we categorize the policy areas we study into those over which state governments have legislative power ("state issues") and those that are primarily the domain of the federal government ("federal issues"). The policy areas that are traditionally the focus of the federal government are finance and domestic commerce, defense, science, technology and communications, foreign trade, and international affairs. Most state legislatures do not have standing committees on these issues (Fouirnaies and Hall 2018), and the federal government has sole power to conduct foreign affairs and regulate interstate commerce. In contrast, policies like health, education, and welfare are typically considered to be the realm of state government and comprise the largest number of bills passed by state legislatures.[8]. The states and federal governments also share responsibility for certain policy areas like the economy. For the sharpest comparisons possible, we focus on examining differences across the more clearly defined policy areas described in Table 3 rather than these shared areas.

Table 3: State vs. Federal Issues in the Comparative Agendas Project

State Issues	Federal Issues
Education	Domestic Commerce
Healthcare	Defense
Law & Crime	International Affairs
Transportation	Technology
Labor	Foreign Trade
Social Welfare	
Housing	
Gun Control	

4 Methods

4.1 Modeling the Issues Discussed on Twitter

We fine-tune a BERT model to accurately classify the tweets sent by the groups we study into one of the 21 policy areas presented in Table 2, plus a non-policy category for those tweets not related to politics (22 classes in total). BERT (Devlin et al. 2018) is a neural language model that has been trained to learn vector representations of words while taking into account the order and relationships of words in documents (contrary to previous word embedding models that did not take the order and relationship of words into account, e.g. Mikolov et al. (2013)). These models are well-suited at representing text for supervised classification, and they substantially improve on many previous state of the art classification

[8]https://openstates.org/

tasks (see Terechshenko et al. (2020) for more details).

We fine-tuned three version of the same BERT model (`bert-base-uncase`): one model to classify the tweets by politicians; another for the tweets by the mass public; and a final model for the media messages. We use separate models to account for the fact that these actors often use different language to discuss the same issue.

We trained each of the models with various datasets, assessed the out-of-sample accuracy of each model-dataset pair based on an annotated sample of the tweets we collected for this analysis, and selected the best performing model-data pairing to generate topic predictions for all tweets sent in 2018 and 2021 by the actors under study. In Appendix A, we explain the training process in detail, and we also show how BERT models outperform an ngram-based machine learning model.

In Table 4, we report the accuracy of the final classifiers that we use in the paper. We split the labeled data into three sets during training: a training set used for model estimation and to update the model weights at each training iteration, a test set used for calculating the model loss and deciding when to stop the training, and a validation set that remained unseen during training and that we used to perform a final accuracy test. In Table 4, we report the validation accuracy for each model, which provides the best estimate for the model's performance when predicting the remaining unlabeled tweets. These accuracy measures are based on 3-fold cross-validations, where we used different random seeds to split the training and test sets (the fully unseen validation set remained the same across folds).

Table 4: Accuracy of three BERT models fine-tuned to predict the policy areas discussed by politicians, mass media, and the mass public (state partisans).

Model	Max. Class Prop.	Accuracy	Policy F1
Politicians BERT	0.13	0.65	0.62
Media BERT	0.06	0.77	0.67
Partisans BERT	0.06	0.83	0.65

We also provide information about the proportion of tweets classified into the largest topic class in the labeled data (after excluding the non-topic category). This *Maximum Class Proportion* serves as a baseline to judge the performance of each model, as it indicates how well we would do by simply classifying all tweets into the modal topic category. We report the model's *Accuracy* (how often the model makes correct predictions) as well as the *Policy F1 score* after removing the non-policy category (the average of how well the model makes correct predictions for each of the 21 topic categories). The accuracy allows us to assess overall model performance, while the policy F1 score allows us to judge whether the model is doing a good job across all the different topic categories. This is necessary because we want to make sure that the model does a good job at distinguishing policy-relevant tweets from non-policy ones as well as discerning between policy issue categories.

Overall, the three models perform well at both of these tasks and prove to be useful for the objective at hand. Accuracy is high for all classifiers (66% for the Politician Model, 74% for the Media Model, and 82% for the Partisans Model), especially given that the model is generating predictions for a large number of (unbalanced) topic classes, which is a very difficult task. In addition, the policy F1 scores for the three models are between 62 and 67%. This means that when classifying policy-relevant tweets, our BERT model for Politicians performs 4.8 times better than a model classifying tweets naively (into the modal policy category referenced in the *Max. Class Prop.* column), and our Media and Partisans BERT models perform 11.2 and 10.8 times better, respectively. In Appendix A, we provide additional analyses to document the satisfactory accuracy of these classifiers. Of course, we cannot classify each tweet correctly by topic. However, the quantities used in our analysis are aggregates of tweet-classifications (i.e., topic predictions) over many tweets. We are thus confident that the high level of accuracy we have achieved in addition to the many validation tests presented in this section and in Appendix A show that these models perform well for the task at hand and are appropriate for the analysis conducted in the rest of the paper.

Finally, we use the Politicians BERT to generate topic predictions for the tweets sent

Figure 1: Average daily issue attention by group.



Note: The symbols represent the average daily amount of attention that a group paid to an issue during 2018 and 2021. These were generated by first averaging the issue distributions of all tweets sent by a group on a given day and then averaging over all days. For political groups, both parties were weighted equally. The lines represent the average of all groups. Note that the X-axis is compressed in the figure.

by state legislators and members of Congress in 2018 and 2021, the Media BERT for tweets sent by state and national media accounts both years, and the Partisans BERT for the tweets sent by our partisan followers of state legislators in both years. In Figure 1, we show the average daily attention paid to each policy area by each of these groups in 2018 and 2021. Across groups, *Government Operations* dominate the agenda. This broad category includes discussions related to political campaigns, government appointments, state and federal agencies, procurement, and political scandals. At the other end of the spectrum, topics such as *Agriculture* or *Public Lands* received relatively little attention, which makes sense given that agriculture is a relevant sector for some states but not others.

We observe some key differences between issues prevalence in 2018 and 2021. In 2018, for example, *Immigration* was among the most discussed issues, as the Trump administration took a strong anti-immigration stance with discussion around building a wall on the Mexican border and the practice of separating migrant families. Unsurprisingly given the COVID pandemic that began in 2020, topics such as *Healthcare* and the *Economy* were considerably more prevalent in 2021, comprising a large share of the overall issue attention that year. Note that, across issue areas, the groups under study display quite a bit of variation in the relative attention paid to each topic. For some issues, like education, state legislators appear to pay quite a bit more attention to the policy area than members of Congress. These initial patterns add face validity to the policy classifications of the tweets in our sample and suggest some interesting differences in the communication behavior of state legislators relative to other groups.

4.2 Vector Auto Regressive Models

To see whether shifts in attention by one group are predictive of subsequent shifts in attention by other groups, we leverage the temporal dimension of our data and model these in a vector autoregression (VAR). VAR models help identify dependencies among multiple time series (Freeman, Williams, and Lin 1989; Sims 1980). While most commonly applied to economic time series data, these models have also been used to study political responsiveness (Barbera et al. 2019; Edwards and Wood 1999; Wood and Peake 1998). To illustrate the logic of this approach, consider Figure 2, which shows the attention paid to immigration and defense, broken down by party and level of government over the years 2018 and 2021 respectively. Spikes in attention generally correspond to salient events, such as Trump signing an executive order on family separation or the takeover of Afghanistan by the Taliban. Often, state legislators and national legislators appear to move in tandem on issues. But in some instances, it appears that one group starts to discuss an issue before another group then follows suit.

Figure 2: Example issue attention time series.



Note: The displayed time series capture the share of attention that was paid to the issues immigration and defense by each of the four groups on Twitter. These were generated by averaging the issue distributions of all tweets sent by a group on a given day. The lines represent 5-day averages. For state legislators, each state was weighted equally.

While the raw data are suggestive, it is difficult to ascertain whether systematic political responsiveness exists between state legislators and other actors in terms of the policy issues emphasized. To uncover how these groups interact with each other over time across the total range of policy issues, we need to model their behavior statistically. For the analysis, we transform the data into a set of time series Y, where $Y_{i,s,j,t}$ captures the amount of attention that group i, in state s paid to issue j on day t of the observed time period. For groups or actors at the national level, the time series are constant across states. The values of the time series were generated by averaging the issue distributions (the predicted tweet-level topic probabilities from the BERT models) of all tweets sent by a given group from a given state on a given day. These values vary between 0 and 1, with 0 implying that no attention was paid to an issue at all and 1 implying that attention was exclusively devoted to this issue.

Because attention to a given issue usually happens around a few particular points in time, these distributions are heavily right-skewed. For the models, we transform our data to log odds $Z_{i,j,s,t}$, as is common when analyzing time-series with proportional values (Wallis 1987).[9] Our VAR model comprises a system of equations, in which every time series $Z_{i,s,j,t}$ is modeled as a function of its lagged values plus the lagged values of the other time series. We use five lags, thereby modeling the assumption that groups today only respond directly to tweets by other groups posted within the previous 5 days.[10] Formally, the model can be expressed as follows:

$$Z = log(\frac{Y}{1-Y}) \tag{1}$$

[9]We impute values of .01 and .99 for 0 and 1 values respectively.

[10]Partial auto-correlation analyses conducted on these time series indicated the inclusion of up to 5 lags in our models.

$$Z_{i,s,j,t} = \alpha_{s,j} + \sum_{i} \sum_{p=1}^{5} \beta_{i,p} Z_{i,s,j,t-p} + \varepsilon_{i,s,j,t} \tag{2}$$

In our first model, we use fixed effects $a_{s,j}$ for each combination of state and issue. We thereby make the simplifying assumption that dependencies between our groups are constant across state and issue. While this assumption is inaccurate to some extent, it drastically reduces the complexity of our data and makes the analysis more tractable. Within this framework, we can express the degree to which changes in issue attention by one group are predictive of changes in issue attention by another group.

5 Results

5.1 Members of Congress Drive State Issue Agendas

VAR coefficients are difficult to interpret, so we use cumulative impulse response functions (IRFs) to display the results of our models. IRFs trace the effect of simulated shocks to the VAR system of equations. In our case, we simulate a sudden increase in attention to an issue by one group to observe the resulting changes in cumulative attention devoted to that issue by another group over time. We estimate cumulative IRFs for a 15-day period. As Barbera et al. (2019) have pointed out, it may be more realistic for changes in political issue attention to last longer than a day. We follow their approach and present our results as responses to a permanent attention change to a given issue from 0% to 10%.[11]

[11] To estimate responses to permanent changes in issue attention, we repeatedly insert an increase in attention to the respective time series until it reaches 10%. Formally these increases $\phi_{i,t}$ for group i in day t can be expressed as

$$\phi_{i,t} = \begin{cases} 10 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ 10 - \hat{y}_{i,t} & \text{if } t > 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{y}_{i,t}$ is the predicted value of attention for the respective group on a given day.

Intuitively, to interpret these coefficients assume that on day 0 none of the groups is paying attention to an issue j. We then introduce a 10 percentage point increase in attention in the time series of one group on day 1 and keep it fixed at 10% over the subsequent 15 days. We then use the parameters of our VAR model to calculate the resulting cumulative change in issue attention by each of the other groups over the next 15 days. So if a group reacted by discussing the topic in 1% of the tweets in day 1, 0.5% in day 2, and 0% the remaining 13 days, we would observe a cumulative 15-day effect of 1.5 percentage points.

In all models reported in this study we control for the ability of each group (state and national legislators, state and national media, the President, and state partisans) to influence the issues discussed by any other group. To simplify the presentation of the results, we only report the effects that are of substantive interest given our focus on state legislators. Figure 3 shows the 15-day effects from the main model for both national and state actors (and associated 95% confidence intervals). The coefficients are expressed in percentage points. The dark gray bands represent responses by state legislators to increases in issue attention by each of the five groups on the left side of the figure, while the light gray ones stand for responses of these five groups to increases in state legislators' issue attention. To the right of the estimates we indicate whether they are based on the 2018 or 2021 data. The coefficients range from about 0 to just under 6 and are similar in size to those found by Barbera et al. (2019) using a similar methodological framework. These responses are substantively meaningful in magnitude as shifting the agenda of other groups is extremely difficult (Jones and Baumgartner 2005; Schattschneider 1975). Attention dynamics tend to follow nonlinear functions with tipping points, so even small changes in attention have potentially large consequences (Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Kingdon 2013).

When assessing the results of our main model, we particularly care about whether state legislators are responsive to other groups or not (dark bars) and whether other groups are

Figure 3: Cumulative 15 day effect of a permanent 10 percentage point increase



Note: The dark gray coefficients represent how much more cumulative attention (in percentage points) state legislators pay to an issue as a result of a permanent 10 percentage-point increase in issue attention by the groups in the rows 15 days ago. The light gray coefficients show the row groups' responses to changes in issue attention by state legislators. The bands represent 95% confidence intervals.

in turn responsive to the issue attention of state legislators (light bars). Despite some minor differences between the 2018 and 2021 estimates, the patterns are remarkably robust across years. The key takeaway from Figure 3 is that members of Congress exert the strongest influence on the agenda of state legislators, as indicated by the dark gray bands in the first row. The sizable effects indicate that a permanent 10-point increase in attention to an issue by members of Congress is predicted to increase the cumulative attention of state legislators by 5.4 (2018) and 5.9 (2021) percentage points. These results support $\mathbf{H}_1$ and the argument that politics has become increasingly nationalized across all levels of government (Hopkins 2018). In contrast, we find that state legislators exert no influence on the overall agenda of Congress as a whole (the light gray bars in row one).

5.2 A Reciprocal Discourse Within States

Turning to the state actors in our main model, we find positive but contingent evidence that changes in issue attention by mass public partisans influences state legislators. These effects are shown in Figure 3 row 4 (State Partisans). In both 2018 and 2021, state legislators increased the attention they paid to an issue by around 2.2 (2018) and 4.7 (2021) points following a spike in attention by partisan twitter users in their state. The findings support $\mathbf{H}_2$ and the theoretical expectation that states can serve as laboratories of democracy from an issue attention perspective in which legislators react to the issue demands of their constituents.

In contrast to the similar level of influence exerted by members of Congress in both years, state legislators vary in how attentive they are to the issues being discussed by state partisans (with higher levels of responsiveness in 2021 compared to 2018). While beyond the scope of this paper, the observation that state legislators are generally responsive to the issue attention of the public but that this responsiveness fluctuates from year to year suggests that there are conditions under which state lawmakers are more attuned to public discourse, which will be an important area for further research.

In addition, the light gray bars shown in row 4 suggest that, unlike the findings with regard to members of Congress, the relationship between state legislators and constituent attention is bidirectional, as constituents are also somewhat responsive to state legislators. The light gray bars in row 4 indicate that a 10 percentage point increase in attention to an issue by state legislators leads to a 0.3 (2018) and 0.5 (2021) percentage point increase in attention by partisan members of the public within a state. Given that state partisans comprise by far the largest and most diverse group under study, even a small shift in issue attention is remarkable.

We now briefly describe several additional results generated by the model about the agenda setting process at the state level. Both the national media (row 2) and the state media (row 5), have a modest influence on the issues that state legislators discuss (dark gray bars). These effects are estimated to be roughly equal in magnitude, although state media exerted slightly more influence in 2021. Notably, state media outlets are also responsive to the twitter behavior of state legislators. And, as might be expected, the topics discussed by state legislators appear to have no effect on the topics discussed by national media.

We include President Trump and President Biden primarily as controls in the model but uncover several interesting findings. Contrary to the idea that President Trump had a strong influence on the political agenda (see Wells et al. (2016) for an overview), we observe that neither he nor President Biden had any influence on the issues that state legislators discussed. Although Trump sent over 11,000 tweets during his time in office and often used the platform to attack his opponents (Shear et al. 2019), the policy discourse at the state-level appeared to be largely immune from presidential influence in both 2018 and 2021.

Together, these results show that U.S. state legislators react most strongly to the public discourse of members of Congress while have little impact on the agenda of national level actors. On the other hand, state legislators are embedded in a local discourse. Both partisan members of the public within each state and state-level media help shape the issues to which state legislators pay attention. This state level discourse also reverberates, with state legislators impacting the agenda of these other state level actors.

5.3 Differentiating National Legislators by State

In Figure 3 we observe that members of Congress strongly influence the issue agenda of state legislators but uncover null effects in the opposite direction. But this dynamic might be different if we restrict the analyses to lawmakers from the same state at both the state and the federal level. In Figure 4, we replicate the main results but decompose the time series of members of Congress by state in order to look only at dynamics between legislators from the same state. The model controls for each group included in the main model in Figure 3, but in Figure 4 we focus on reporting only the effects for members of Congress.

Figure 4: Issue Responsiveness with Members of Congress Differentiated by State



Note: Unlike in the previous figure, colors differentiate models for different dynamics. Dark gray coefficients represent how much more cumulative attention (in percentage points) legislators pay to an issue as a result of a permanent 10 percentage-point increase in issue attention by legislators of the respectively other political level from their state 15 days ago. For comparison, light gray coefficients show responses in the model where members of Congress are combined in a single time series. The bands represent 95% confidence intervals.

In Figure 4, the dark gray bars represent issue responsiveness between state legislators and members of Congress from the same state. For comparison, we include the estimates of the previous model where all members of Congress are combined in a single time series shown in Figure 3 (lighter gray estimates). State legislators are more likely to respond to spikes in issue attention by Congress as a whole than they are to spikes in attention by the representatives of only their state (Figure 4 column 2). This makes sense given that Congressional members from a particular state represent a subset of the entire legislature.

In addition, column 1 of Figure 4 shows that members of Congress do sometimes respond to the issue agenda of state legislators — but only when those legislators are from the state they represent. For both 2018 and 2021, we find that members of Congress are responsive to changes in issue attention by lawmakers of their state. While the top-down influence still outweighs these effects, the data suggest that state legislators can sometimes influence the issue-attention of those members of Congress with reason to engage with the policy debates in their respective state.

5.4 Different Patterns for State *vs.* National Issues?

Next, we consider whether state-level issue attention dynamics vary by issue type. Given that states are more active in certain policy areas compared to others, we expected state legislators to be particularly responsive — and also influential — on issues that are primarily the domain of the state rather than the federal government.

Figure 5: Issue Responsiveness by Issue Domain



Note: In this figure, the columns differentiate the direction of the effect whereas band colors represent each of the two sets of issues as listed in Table 3. Dark gray bands represent the coefficients for state owned issues and light gray bands represent the coefficients for nationally owned issues with 95% confidence intervals. As in the previous figures, these coefficients represent how much more cumulative attention (in percentage points) a group pays to an issue as a result of a permanent 10 percentage-point increase in issue attention by another group 15 days ago.

We now break down the analysis by issue domain and estimate two distinct models: one for state owned issues and one for federally owned issues (both listed in Table 3). Figure 5 shows the results. Note that now, dark gray bands reflect issues that are the domain of the state government (such as education and transportation), and the light gray bands represent issues where the federal government holds legislative power (such as defense and foreign trade). The panel on the left shows how members of Congress and state partisans respond to state legislators' attention on the two sets of issues, while the panel on the right shows how state legislators respond to shifts in attention by each of these two groups. Because we only observed members of Congress to respond to shifts in issue attention by state legislators of the same state, we continue to distinguish members of Congress by their state for this analysis (as we did in the analyses presented in Figure 4). To avoid overcrowding the figure we only report the results for the three main groups of interest.

We observe that, contrary to our expectation, state legislators are not necessarily more likely to react to shifts in attention by members of Congress or state partisans when the topic being discussed is a policy area traditionally delegated to the states such as education and housing. If anything, we see some evidence to the contrary, suggesting that state legislators may be more responsive to national legislators on nationally owned issues. This difference is not particularly marked, however, and should be read as suggestive evidence. In the same vein, we do not see the two other groups reacting differently when state legislators increase their attention to state issues. With some minor differences, the findings are very similar for the two years we study. Together, these findings give new insights into what nationalized politics implies for state legislators. Not only are state legislators' issue agendas first and foremost driven by national lawmakers as we saw in section 5.1, but state legislators also seem to be at least as attuned to the national discourse in terms of the policy issues they discuss. At the same time, state lawmakers' ability to influence the issue attention of other actors is limited, even when it comes to issues that are most important to state government.

6 Discussion

Amid growing gridlock and partisan polarization in the federal government, state legislatures are increasingly the locus of key policy decisions. However, data limitations have constrained the ability of scholars to study issue responsiveness and agenda setting at the state-level. In this paper, we take advantage of recent computational advances. Using comprehensive Twitter data from two years, we study which issues state legislators discuss in their public communications and how these correspond to the issues being discussed by members of Congress, state constituents, and national and state media outlets. This allows us to generate dynamic estimates of agenda setting activity for these different groups and draw conclusions about who leads and who follows in the world of state politics issue attention.

We find that state legislators are particularly responsive to the public communications of Members of Congress and frequently shift their attention to issues being discussed at the national level. This is true for both Democratic and Republican state legislators and suggests that the increasing nationalization of politics in the U.S. has implications for the agenda stetting process in state legislatures. While we find legislators to have some influence on the issue agenda of members of Congress from their own state, this impact is comparatively modest. At the same time, state lawmakers are both responsive to and influence the political discourse of both partisans and media outlets in their states, suggesting a bidirectional relationship in terms of agenda setting power.

Interestingly, we find that state legislator responsiveness and ability to lead other actors differs little by whether the topics are traditionally associated with state government, such as education and public safety. Regardless of whether the policy under consideration speaks to national issues such as defense or foreign trade or local issues like law and crime, state legislators tend to respond to the issue attention of members of Congress and the partisan public while exerting only limited influence on the agendas of these groups.

These results lend support to recent researching suggesting that we are in an age where "all politics is national" (e.g., Hopkins 2018) and can perhaps help explain why we observe so little accountability in state legislative politics (e.g., Rogers 2017). At the same time, we find that state lawmakers play an important role in linking their constituents to national policy conversations. While we uncover substantial evidence that state legislators follow the discussions of Members of Congress in terms of the topics they discuss on Twitter, we also find that state lawmakers are quite responsive to members of the public in their states and in turn shape the public discourse of state partisans.

States are often described as "laboratories of democracy" where policy innovation can take root. If attention is a necessary condition for policy change, then a full understanding of the state-level policymaking process must take agenda setting and issue attention into account. This research represents the first effort that we know of to study the policy discourse of state legislators, national actors, the public, and the media on the same platform. It is our hope that the methodological approach and evidence offered in this paper can spearhead a research agenda focused on the intersection of agenda setting, policy-making, and public communication in state politics.

References

Abramowitz, Alan I, and Steven Webster. 2016. "The rise of negative partisanship and the nationalization of US elections in the 21st century." *Electoral Studies* 41: 12–22.

Achen, Christopher H. 1977. "Measuring representation: Perils of the correlation coefficient." *American Journal of Political Science* pp. 805–815.

Barbera, Pablo, Andreu Casas, Jonathan Nagler, Patrick Egan, Richard Bonneau, John Jost, and Joshua A Tucker. 2019. "Leaders or Followers? Measuring Political Responsiveness in the U.S. Congress Using Social Media Data." *American Political Science Review* 113(4).

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baumgartner, Frank R, and Bryan D Jones. 2010. *Agendas and instability in American politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Baumgartner, Frank R, Suzanna L De Boef, and Amber E Boydstun. 2008. *The decline of the death penalty and the discovery of innocence*. Cambridge University Press.

Berkowitz, Dan. 1992. "Who sets the media agenda? The ability of policymakers to determine news decisions." *Public opinion, the press, and public policy* 2: 81–102.

Boydstun, Amber E. 2013. *Making the News: Politics, the Media, and Agenda Setting*. University of Chicago Press.

Brayden, King G., Keith G. Bentele, and Sarah A. Soule. 2007. "Protest and Policymaking: Explaining Fluctuation in Congressional Attention to Rights Issues, 1960-1986." *Social Forces* 86(1): 137–163.

Caughey, Davin, and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936–2014." *American Political Science Review* 112(2): 249–266.

Caughey, Devin, and Christopher Warshaw. 2016. "The dynamics of state policy liberalism, 1936–2014." *American Journal of Political Science* 60(4): 899–913.

Collingwood, Loren, and John Wilkerson. 2012. "Tradeoffs in accuracy and efficiency in supervised learning methods." *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 9(3): 298–318.

Devlin, Jacob, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* .

Dexter, Lewis Anthony. 1957. "The representative and his district." *Human Organization* 16(1): 2–13.

Eady, Gregory, Frederik Hjorth, and Peter Thisted Dinesen. 2022. "Do Violent Protests Affect Expressions of Party Identity? Evidence from the Capitol Insurrection." *Working paper available at https://osf.io/h5vsu/*.

Eady, Gregory, Jonathan Nagler, Andy Guess, Jan Zilinsky, and Joshua A. Tucker. 2019. "How Many People Live in Political Bubbles on Social Media? Evidence From Linked Survey and Twitter Data." *SAGE Open* 9(1): 2158244019832705.

Edwards, George C, and B Dan Wood. 1999. "Who influences whom? The president, Congress, and the media." *American Political Science Review* 93(2): 327–344.

Erikson, Robert S. 1971. "The advantage of incumbency in congressional elections." *Polity* 3(3): 395–405.

Erikson, Robert S, Gerald C Wright, Gerald C Wright, and John P McIver. 1993. *Statehouse democracy: Public opinion and policy in the American states*. Cambridge University Press.

Fouirnaies, Alexander, and Andrew B Hall. 2018. "How Do Interest Groups Seek Access to Committees?" *American Journal of Political Science* 62(1): 132–147.

Freelon, Deen, Charlton McIlwain, and Meredith Clark. 2018. "Quantifying the power and consequences of social media protest." *New Media & Society* 20(3): 990–1011.

Freeman, John R., John T. Williams, and Tse-min Lin. 1989. "Vector Autoregression and the Study of Politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 33(4): 842–877.

Gray, Virginia. 1973. "Innovation in the states: A diffusion study." *American political science review* 67(4): 1174–1185.

Gray, Virginia, David Lowery, Matthew Fellowes, and Andrea McAtee. 2004. "Public opinion, public policy, and organized interests in the American states." *Political Research Quarterly* 57(3): 411–420.

Grodzins, Morton. 1966. *The American system: A new view of government in the United States*. Transaction Publishers.

Hopkins, Daniel J. 2018. *The increasingly united states: How and why American political behavior nationalized*. University of Chicago Press.

Jacob, Herbert, and Kenneth Nelson Vines. 1965. *Politics in the American states: A comparative analysis*. Little, Brown.

Jewell, Malcolm E. 1982. *Representation in State Legislatures (Lexington, KY*. University of Kentucky Press.

Jones, B.D., and F.R. Baumgartner. 2005. *The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems*. University of Chicago Press.

Jones, Bryan D., and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2004. "Representation and Agenda Setting." *Policy Studies Journal* 32(1): 1–24.

Jones, Bryan D., Heather Larsen-Price, and John Wilkerson. 2009. "Representation and American Governing Institutions." *The Journal of Politics* 71(1): 277–290.

Karch, Andrew. 2007. *Democratic laboratories: Policy diffusion among the American states*. University of Michigan Press.

Kingdon, John W. 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Little, Brown and Company.

Kingdon, John W. 2013. *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Updated 2nd ed ed. London, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Krane, Dale. 2007. "The middle tier in American federalism: State government policy activism during the Bush presidency." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 37(3): 453–477.

Laumann, Edward O, and David Knoke. 1987. *The organizational state: Social choice in national policy domains*. Univ of Wisconsin Press.

Lawrence, Regina G., and Amber E. Boydstun. 2017. "What We Should Really Be Asking About Media Attention to Trump." *Political Communication* 34(1): 150–153.

Lax, Jeffrey R, and Justin H Phillips. 2009. "Gay rights in the states: Public opinion and policy responsiveness." *American Political Science Review* 103(3): 367–386.

Lowery, David, Virginia Gray, and Frank R Baumgartner. 2011. "Policy attention in state and nation: Is anyone listening to the laboratories of democracy?" *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 41(2): 286–310.

Madison, James. 1961. "Federalist No. 51 (1788)." *Alexander Hamilton/James Madison/John Jay, The Federalist Papers (ed. by Clinton Rossiter), New York* 2003: 317.

McCombs, Maxwell E., and Donald L. Shaw. 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 36(2): 176–187.

Mikolov, Tomas, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. In *1st International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2013, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, May 2-4, 2013, Workshop Track Proceedings*.

Miller, Warren E, and Donald E Stokes. 1963. "Constituency influence in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 57(1): 45–56.

Moskowitz, Daniel J. 2019. "Local news, information, and the nationalization of US Elections." *American Political Science Review* pp. 1–16.

Neundorf, Anja, and James Adams. 2018. "The Micro-Foundations of Party Competition and Issue Ownership: The Reciprocal Effects of Citizens' Issue Salience and Party Attachments." *British Journal of Political Science* 48(2): 385–406.

O'Connor, Brendan, Ramnath Balasubramanyan, Bryan R. Routledge, and Noah A Smith. 2010. From Tweets to Polls: Linking Text Sentiment to Public Opinion Time Series. In *Fourth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. Vol. AAAI Press pp. 122–128.

Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1983. "Effects of Public Opinion on Policy." *American Political Science Review* 77(1): 175–190.

Payson, Julia, Andreu Casas, Jonathan Nagler, Richard Bonneau, and Joshua A Tucker. 2022. "Using Social Media Data to Reveal Patterns of Policy Engagement in State Legislatures." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* Forthcoming.

Rogers, Steven. 2016. "National forces in state legislative elections." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 667(1): 207–225.

Rogers, Steven. 2017. "Electoral Accountability for State Legislative Roll Calls and Ideological Representation." *American Political Science Review* 111(3): 555–571.

Russell, Annelise. 2018. "US senators on Twitter: Asymmetric party rhetoric in 140 characters." *American Politics Research* 46(4): 695–723.

Schattschneider, E. E. 1975. *The semisovereign people: a realist's view of democracy in America*. Hinsdale, Ill: Dryden Press.

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Shear, Michael D, Maggie Haberman, Nicholas Confessore, Karen Yourish, Larry Buchanan, and Keith Collins. 2019. "How Trump reshaped the presidency in over 11,000 tweets." *The New York Times* 2.

Sims, Christopher A. 1980. "Macroeconomics and reality." *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society* pp. 1–48.

Soroka, Stuart N., and Christopher Wlezien. 2009. *Degrees of Democracy: Politics, Public Opinion, and Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Squire, Peverill. 2007. "Measuring state legislative professionalism: The squire index revisited." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 7(2): 211–227.

Stimson, James A., Michael B. Mackuen, and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *American Political Science Review* 89(3): 543–565.

Sulkin, Tracy. 2005. *Issue Politics in Congress*. Cambridge University Press.

Tausanovitch, Chris. 2019. "Why Are Subnational Governments Responsive?" *The Journal of Politics* 81(1): 334–342.

Terechshenko, Zhanna, Fridolin Linder, Vishakh Padmakumar, Fengyuan Liu, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua A. Tucker, and Richard Bonneau. 2020. "A comparison of methods in political science text classification: Transfer learning language models for politics." *Presented at the XXXVII PolMeth Annual Meeting* .

True, James L, Bryan D Jones, and Frank R Baumgartner. 2019. "Punctuated-equilibrium theory: explaining stability and change in public policymaking." In *Theories of the policy process*. Routledge pp. 155–187.

Wallis, Kenneth F. 1987. "Time series analysis of bounded economic variables." *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 8(1): 115–123.

Wells, Chris, Dhavan V. Shah, Jon C. Pevehouse, JungHwan Yang, Ayellet Pelled, Frederick Boehm, Josephine Lukito, Shreenita Ghosh, and Jessica L. Schmidt. 2016. "How Trump Drove Coverage to the Nomination: Hybrid Media Campaigning." *Political Communication* 33(4): 669–676.

Wood, B Dan, and Jeffrey S Peake. 1998. "The dynamics of foreign policy agenda setting." *American Political Science Review* pp. 173–184.

Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A Training of the topic classifiers

We fine-tuned three times the same BERT model (`bert-base-uncased`) to predict the topics discussed in tweets sent by politicians, media accounts, and partisans (followers of state legislators). We relied on 20 topic categories from the Comparative Agendas Project (CAP) plus an additional *Gun Control* one, plus an additional non-policy category for those tweets that are not about politics: 22 classes in total. The training process worked as follows.

Table A1: Datasets coded using the CAP issue classification, used for fine-tuning the BERT classifiers predicting the policy areas discussed by politicians, the media, and the mass public.

Set	Dataset	Time	N
A	Congressional Quarterly Almanac	1948-2015	14,444
	New York Times Front Page	1996-2006	31,034
	New York Times Index	1946-2014	54,578
	Congressional Bills	1947-2016	463,762
	Congressional Hearings	1946-2015	97,593
	Public Law Titles	1948-2011	33,644
	Public Laws	1948-2017	20,928
	Executive Orders	1945-2017	4,294
	Presidential Veto Rhetoric	1985-2016	1,618
	State of the Union Speeches	1946-2018	22,289
	Democratic Party Platform	1948-2016	15,953
	Republican Party Platform	1948-2016	19,836
	Supreme Court Cases	1944-2009	9,031
B	Tweets sent by Senators 113th Congress	2013-2015	45,394
C	1. Tweets sent by media accounts	2018	8,802
	2. Tweets sent by followers of state legislators	2018	9,286
	3. Tweets sent by state legislators	2018	3,368
	Total	1944-2018	855,854

In our training datasets, each observation (document or tweet) has been coded as belonging to one (mutually exclusive) topic category or the no-topic one, 22 classes in total. We used three datasets to train the models, described in Table A1. In the first dataset (A) we combined all available CAP-labeled datasets for the United States available in the CAP website (789,004 observations in total). The second dataset (B) is comprised of 45,394 tweets from Senators who served during the 113th Congress and that were labeled by Russell (2018). The third set (C) consists of random samples of the tweets we collected and that we annotated for the purpose of this paper: (C.1) state legislators (N = 3,368), (C.2) state media accounts (N = 8,802), and (C.3) state partisans (N = 9,286).[12]

[12]The inter rater reliability for the tweets we coded is the following. (C.1) Tweets sent by media accounts:

We fine-tuned each of the three BERT models (the politicians, the media, and the partisans one) seven times using the following data combinations, with the goal of taking advantage of transfer learning and training more accurate models than simply training the model with the tweets from each group (politicians, media and partisans) that we had coded: (1) only set A, (2) only set C.n (so only training the politicians/media/partisans BERT with the tweets we coded from politicians/media/partisans) , (3) set A and set C.n, (4) set C.n and a small sample of set A (1,300 observations), (5) set C.n and set B, (6) set C.n and a small sample of set B (1,300 tweets), and (7) set C.n and the other C sets. For fine-tuning the original BERT model, we use an Adam optimizer (with a learning rate of 5e-5, and an epsilon of 1e-8), and in each occasion (model-data pair) we fine-tune the model for several epochs, until the test loss does not improve for three consecutive epochs. In addition, we fine-tune each model-data pair three times/folds, using a different random seed each time (1234, 54321, 123).

To assess the performance of these seven versions of each model we split the data used in each case into a train, test, and validation set. The validation set is composed of 30% of our own labeled tweets in the C.n set. The train and test sets are composed of 80 and 20% (respectively) of *all* labeled cases used for training (after excluding those tweets in the validation set when applicable – so when set C.n involved in the training).

In Tables A2, A3, and A4 we report the 3-fold cross-validated accuracy of the models (based only on the untouched validation sets, not on the training nor test sets involved in the actual training). We report the model's overall accuracy (*Acc.*: how often the model makes correct predictions) as well as the *Policy F1* weighted score after removing the non-policy category (so the average of how well the model makes correct predictions for each of the 21 topic categories). The accuracy allows us to assess overall model performance, while the policy F1 score allows us to judge whether the model is doing a good job across all the different topic categories. We particularly care about this F1 score, as we want to make sure the model does a good job at distinguishing policy-relevant tweets from non-policy ones, but especially at discerning between policy issue categories.

Different data combinations performed best for the different classifiers. For example, combining our own coded Tweets with Russell (2018)'s set leveraged the best results (highest Policy F1 weighted score) for the Politicians BERT model; whereas combining our own coded Tweets with the full set of CAP-labeled data leveraged the best results for the Media BERT model. As we show in Table A2, these BERT models outperform an n-gram based model (SVM) that previous research has found to perform well at classifying text into the CAP topic categories (Collingwood and Wilkerson 2012). Something that is very important to highlight is that transfer learning contributed to substantially improve accuracy across the board. In all cases, the models trained only with our own coded data performed worse than when we added additional data that had been coded following the same topic classification but for other projects. This indicates that further research on how transfer learning can improve classification tasks in the social science is crucial moving forward (see the work of

89% agreement and 0.7 Cohen's Kappa. (C.2) Tweets sent by followers of state legislators: 91% agreement and 0.77 Cohen's Kappa. (C.3) Tweets sent by state legislators: 87.1% agreement and 0.74 Cohen's Kappa.

Terechshenko et al. (2020) for further details on this). We hence chose the best performing model in each case (highlighted in gray) to then generate predictions for the rest of unlabeled tweets in our dataset. We used the best performing Politican BERT model to generate predictions for the tweets sent by state legislators, members of Congress, and the President; the best performing Media BERT model to generate predictions for the tweets sent by state and national media accounts; and the best performing Partisans BERT model to generate predictions for the tweets sent by the state partisans.

As additional validation exercise, in Tables 5-9 we show the more frequent words in tweets about each policy area, broken down by group (national and state legislators, national and state media, and state partisans). We pulled these by (a) first calculating, for each word in corpus, the proportion of tweets in which they appear, (b) then calculating the proportion of tweets about each issue in which each the same words appear, and (c) finally calculating the difference between (b) and (a), which indicates which words/features are more likely to show up in tweets about that topic than on tweets about other topics. From a face validity point of view, these top topic features make total sense, they are words one would expect to be used in tweets discussing these policy areas.

Table A2: Out of sample accuracy of the nine versions of the BERT model we fine-tuned to predict the political topics of the Comparative Agendas Project in tweets sent by **POLITICIANS** (state legislators).

	BERT		SVM	
Model version	Acc.	Policy F1	Acc	Policy F1
(5) set C.3 and B	**0.65**	**0.62**	0.38	0.40
(4) set C.3 and small A	0.66	0.62	0.58	0.27
(6) set C.3 and small B	0.66	0.61	0.59	0.27
(7) set C.3 and C.1&C.2	0.65	0.60	0.61	0.31
(3) set C.3 and A	0.64	0.58	0.44	0.45
(1) set A	0.28	0.55	0.23	0.47
(2) set C.3	0.64	0.53	0.57	0.19

Table A3: Out of sample accuracy of the nine versions of the BERT model we trained predicting the political topics of the Comparative Agendas Project in tweets sent by the **MEDIA** (state/regional media accounts).

Model version	Acc.	Policy F1
(3) set C.1 and A	**0.77**	**0.67**
(7) set C.1 and C.2&C.3	0.78	0.66
(5) set C.1 and B	0.77	0.64
(4) set C.1 and small A	0.78	0.63
(6) set C.1 and smmall B	0.78	0.61
(1) set A	0.21	0.60
(2) set C.1	0.78	0.57

Table A4: Out of sample accuracy of the nine versions of the BERT model we trained predicting the political topics of the Comparative Agendas Project in tweets sent by **PARTISANS** (followers of legislators from each state).

Model version	Acc.	Policy F1
(4) set C.2 and small A	**0.83**	**0.65**
(6) set C.2 and small B	0.81	0.63
(3) set C.2 and A	0.74	0.62
(7) set C.2 and C.1&C.3	0.81	0.61
(5) set C.2 and B	0.79	0.60
(2) set C.2	0.81	0.59
(1) set A	0.12	0.46

Table A5: Top topic features in tweets by MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Topic	Top Features
No policy issue	day, happy, me, thanks, family, time, honor, county, congratulations, morning, see, work, office, first, good, join, year, community, proud, service
Economy	tax, taxreform, taxcutsandjobsact, jobs, reform, economy, cuts, americans, thanks, employees, benefits, bonuses, families, news, because, taxes, see, american, money, act
Civil Rights	life, prolife, women, abortion, act, protect, people, fbi, house, american, unborn, right, protection, read, bill, government, memo, support, americans, day
Healthcare	health, opioid, help, care, bill, house, funding, chip, crisis, opioidcrisis, legislation, act, combat, cancer, patients, week, bipartisan, drug, epidemic, fight
Agriculture	farmers, bill, farm, ag, agriculture, house, 2018farmbill, farmbill, ranchers, work, committee, senate, support, food, across, help, rural, act, industry, hemp
Labor	jobs, job, work, workers, good, people, workforce, get, time, americans, employees, help, working, act, million, need, skills, training, american, find
Education	school, students, education, schools, high, service, children, help, young, academy, act, national, programs, work, college, meeting, support, week, many, thanks
Environment	water, epa, act, bipartisan, communities, work, earthday, release, community, introduced, lake, must, species, infrastructure, many, some, w, year, caucus, congress
Energy	energy, jobs, hearing, week, drilling, epa, nuclear, offshore, act, bill, help, read, bipartisan, committee, good, grid, housecommerce, important, live, meeting
Immigration	immigration, border, illegal, daca, security, bill, american, wall, secure, would, house, dreamers, children, immigrants, must, people, solution, borders, country, law
Transportation	infrastructure, act, state, transportation, economy, federal, house, law, nations, safety, traffic, week, critical, ensure, important, like, national, plan, projects, air
Law and Crime	law, enforcement, officers, protect, safe, families, day, keep, trafficking, work, children, communities, help, house, women, need, sex, support, act, bill
Social Welfare	help, food, snap, work, poverty, bank, need, bill, get, hunger, those, community, families, find, people, program, programs, service, children, continue
Housing	housing, bill, families, support, week, act, behind, last, local, opportunity, project, veterans, affordable, communities, hearing, home, house, hudgov, need, schumershutdown
Domestic Commerce	small, businesses, business, help, economy, bill, local, smallbusinessweek, community, disaster, relief, act, banks, week, communities, jobs, house, thanks, federal, financial
Defense	veterans, military, service, women, men, support, care, country, need, national, va, day, act, house, iran, defense, them, deal, honor, must
Technology	broadband, internet, rural, cyber, bill, access, security, congress, innovation, america, like, live, space, act, americans, federal, hearing, help, house, nation
Foreign Trade	trade, tariffs, american, steel, china, economy, nafta, workers, foreign, like, aluminum, imports, letter, need, other, see, companies, consumers, could, discuss
Intl. Affairs	north, must, korea, israel, russia, jerusalem, people, against, embassy, regime, kim, human, stand, support, world, continue, rights, american, iranian, syria
Gov. Operations	senate, government, house, vote, congress, support, state, time, work, shutdown, conservative, day, campaign, need, am, democrats, office, court, get, schumershutdown
Public Lands	national, bill, act, water, natresources, park, parks, week, help, infrastructure, interior, legislation, resources, wrda, land, secretaryzinke, bipartisan, critical, house, keep
Gun Control	violence, school, gun, would, act, bill, bipartisan, guns, schools, stop, house, laws, safety, support, teachers, working, enforcement, first, keep, law

Table A6: Top topic features in tweets by STATE LEGISLATORS

Topic	Top Features
No policy issue	day, community, happy, me, congratulations, thanks, annual, work, time, state, year, join, honor, morning, proud, school, students, city, ca
Economy	budget, tax, cabudget, state, funding, income, million, credit, jerrybrowngov, economy, earned, proud, help, bill, investments, passed, —
Civil Rights	women, proud, lgbt, rights, community, day, equality, womens, me, pride, work, support, sentoniatkins, vote, sexual, court, lgbtq, march
Healthcare	health, flu, care, people, get, day, disease, help, measles, healthcare, children, vaccine, state, bill, cases, need, medical, or, access
Agriculture	animal, food, animals, ag, ab, coast, day, fishing, large, protect, proud, support, week, adoption, asmgarcia, bill, did, diego
Labor	workers, job, working, jobs, proud, lorenasgonzalez, union, unions, childcare, support, work, workplace, bill, labor, thanks, workforce, californialabor, minimum
Education	students, education, college, school, student, schools, support,higher, state, important, teachers, public, early, funding, assembly, bill, join,
Environment	water, climate, clean, earthday, environmental, air, plastic, protect, change, environment, pollution, day, happy, community, need, bill, proud
Energy	energy, drilling, oil, offshore, clean, sb100, coast,future, gas, against, bill, decision, expand, proud, solar, trumps, assembly
Immigration	immigrants, immigration, immigrant, children, families, daca, dreamers, de, citizenship, proud, policy, border, administration, parents, san, back, question, trumps
Transportation	transportation, transit, bill, state, cars, funding, traffic, housing, near, projects, public, senate, committee, passed, road, san, million, ride
Law and Crime	sexual, bill, youth, help, senate, foster, harassment, police, support, violence, assembly, children, gun, end, committee, proud, victims, community
Social Welfare	food, nonprofit, meals, year, free, summer, kids, seniors, poverty, hunger, assembly, community, sacramento, thanks, work, state, million, nutrition
Housing	housing, homelessness, affordable, homeless, crisis, bill, support, home, need, people, help, working, build, city, community, state, thanks, communities
Domestic Commerce	county, business, evacuation, small, areas, disaster, businesses, please, area, calfire, help, evacuations, fire, recovery, state, bill, center, lake, sb
Defense	veterans, military, day, memorial, honored, remember, yountville, air, service, community, fallen, families, fire, forces, honor, members, annual, ceremony
Technology	netneutrality, net, neutrality, bill, internet, sb822, scottwiener, fcc, important, kdeleon, senate, industry, nasa, protect, discuss, fight, hard, law
Foreign Trade	arbitration, lorenasgonzalez, tomorrow, ab3080, agrees, any, asmaguiarcurry, assembly, assessment, awareness, billdoddca, cagobiz, camadegov, capitol, co, condition, consumer, dawniamarie
Intl. Affairs	armenian, assembly, million, state, children, genocide, honor, join, salvador, anniversary, armeniangenocide, celebrating, colleagues, day, must, russian, american, assemblydems
Gov. Operations	bill, senate, state, support, proud, assembly, vote, passed, day, me, san, election, year, governor, make, first, legislative, work
Public Lands	fire, state, wildfires, calfire, wildfire, community, county, water, parks, park, protect, senate, assembly, management, national, passed, bill
Gun Control	gun, violence, action, shooting, enoughisenough, guncontrolnow, guns, safety, students, against, call, notonemore, across, bill, join, joined, killed, like, lives, lost

Table A7: Top topic features in tweets by NATIONAL MEDIA

Topic	Top Features
No policy issue	man, police, state, cleveland, county, cincinnati, school, indians, cavs, day, game, high, shooting, dayton, first, breaking, fire, icymi, win
Economy	tax, budget, shutdown, levy, government, jobs, dow, percent, state, would, county, rate, down, dayton, latest, need, senate, voters, year
Civil Rights	court, state, metoo, racist, supreme, black, fight, police, abortion, case, woman, charged, federal, law, sex, voter, women, against, bill
Healthcare	opioid, health, drug, medical, marijuana, get, people, program, epidemic, pharmacy, breaking, crisis, medicaid, addiction, ban, blinfisherabj, care, akron, benefit
Agriculture	know, animal, before, county, foodservice, go, inspection, lucas, operations, products, recall, recently, released, reports, arizona, barbecued, beef, bill, cdc, coli
Labor	workers, labor, union, county, pension, program, summer, bill, dayton, employees, forced, job, jobs, law, pensions, retirement, take, ‘, 401k
Education	school, schools, students, state, board, education, threat, teachers, county, levy, children, city, officials, shooting, student, study, year, armed, community
Environment	water, toledo, lake, carp, plan, city, mayor, pollution, residents, advisory, akron, deer, erie, million, protect, trash, could, council, county
Energy	gas, power, davisbesse, energy, nuclear, oil, prices, city, leak, million, production, public, settlement, acres, arabia, boost, claims, companies, customers
Immigration	immigration, immigrant, border, bill, children, families, could, migrant, family, gop, help, ice, mexico, people, separation, agents, california, cities, coming, congress
Transportation	county, state, road, bridge, city, columbus, come, crash, million, streets, toledo, transit, would, council, downtown, keep, parking, part, plan
Law and Crime	police, marijuana, child, county, come, death, drug, breaking, jail, judge, man, federal, court, officers, pot, woman, car, cleveland, found
Social Welfare	food, make, america, awareness, b, box, breakfast, cardi, going, need, poor, really, rich, right, school, security, senio, senior, social, state
Housing	city, community, council, park, columbus, million, project, development, homeless, housing, county, plans, proposed, affordable, center, home, plan, purchase, residents, state
Domestic Commerce	sports, states, betting, amazon, bankruptcy, court, businesses, columbus, supreme, area, banks, bet, breaking, firstenergy, judge, latest, legalize, make, oppose
Defense	nuclear, north, korea, breaking, ap, baker, weapons, would, airstrikes, deal, dorsey, house, iran, jackson, korean, mayfield, military, missile, south, syria
Technology	facebook, americans, analytica, apnorc, apples, back, bankruptcy, call, cambridge, center, come, cook, could, data, debacle, declaring, down, facebooks, firm, ginni
Foreign Trade	tariffs, trade, chinese, china, steel, imports, announces, brown, ease, fight, heres, sensherrodbrown, stocks, administration, agree, aluminum, billion, cavs, deal, delivers
Intl. Affairs	north, summit, kim, korea, korean, un, jong, leader, russia, singapore, police, historic, latest, world, calls, south, syria, uk, arrive, breaking
Gov. Operations	election, house, primary, race, senate, state, county, gop, vote, republican, governor, candidate, may, breaking, candidates, rep, speaker, court, probe
Public Lands	indians, water, american, mayor, regional, advice, city, council, debate, enlist, indian, land, legal, may, memorial, museum, native, outside, remove, south
Gun Control	gun, shooting, school, violence, high, shootings, florida, guns, students, control, kasich, student, carry, house, mass, or, parkland, laws

Table A8: Top topic features in tweets by STATE MEDIA

Topic	Top Features
No policy issue	police, people, man, house, news, first, former, white, woman, killed, re, school, day, during, like, time, american, apcentralregion, apsports, home
Economy	shutdown, government, tax, economy, spending, dow, foxbusiness, house, bill, cuts, unemployment, budget, jobs, million, deal, people, plan, senate, breaking, during
Civil Rights	black, women, people, metoo, white, first, roseanne, woman, abortion, movement, rights, sex, students, racist, bias, gay, against, why, womens, breaking
Healthcare	health, opioid, aphealthscience, drug, people, flu, study, marijuana, cdc, first, medicaid, tells, could, finds, states, administration, apcentralregion, appolitics, apwestregion, babies
Agriculture	food, farm, meat, world, american, anim, aphealthscience, artificial, bakery, because, brands, bread, bureau, cafes, cheese, company, contamination, convention, cream, customers
Labor	workers, first, many, apwestregion, time, want, american, employees, strike, supreme, unions, could, court, get, help, job, jobs, kids, people, re
Education	school, florida, students, shooting, schools, teachers, teacher, student, high, apwestregion, college, oklahoma, pay, public, safety, texas, believe, california, education, funding
Environment	climate, epa, change, scientists, endangered, pruitt, found, help, scott, them, advisory, agency, apwestregion, boards, could, rhinos, somebody, water, white, actually
Energy	drilling, offshore, oil, power, coal, energy, general, administration, apcentralregion, attorney, could, electric, florida, gas, plan, ryan, solar, states, these, trumps
Immigration	immigration, border, illegal, daca, immigrant, immigrants, wall, sanctuary, children, house, people, families, trumps, california, democrats, government, caravan, country, migrant, migrants
Transportation	bridge, airport, breaking, infrastructure, people, air, carolina, florida, airline, coast, collapse, crash, injured, passenger, passengers, pedestrian, red, traffic, year, airlines
Law and Crime	border, breaking, fbi, marijuana, judge, police, law, security, federal, justice, child, florida, abuse, children, court, sessions, apcentralregion, during, people, state
Social Welfare	food, work, ambassador, amnesty, colin, conscience, does, go, international, kaepernick, named, people, poverty, reform, requirements, stamp, think, those, welfare, ablebodied
Housing	help, homeless, apcentralregion, autism, california, crisis, democratic, department, development, housing, kushner, people, those, travfed, urban, veterans, act, affecting, ago, allegations
Domestic Commerce	apwestregion, hurricane, maria, volcano, breaking, california, hawaiis, puerto, billion, kilauea, big, court, financial, hawaii, people, some, sports, still, business, businesses
Defense	nuclear, north, deal, iran, korea, military, nato, syria, weapons, breaking, defense, chemical, war, attack, fisa, house, summit, intelligence, memo, russia
Technology	zuckerberg, facebook, mark, data, first, space, ceo, facebooks, nasa, scandal, before, breaking, congress, mars, people, administration, aphealthscience, asks, company, did
Foreign Trade	trade, tariffs, china, steel, tariff, trumps, aluminum, world, countries, billion, united, war, deal, foxbusiness, going, states, american, canada, deficit, eu
Intl. Affairs	north, korea, kim, un, jong, korean, breaking, summit, south, leader, russian, meeting, russia, people, minister, state, first, latest, putin, between
Gov. Operations	house, senate, campaign, mueller, former, gop, fbi, trumps, white, special, breaking, primary, sen, russia, republican, investigation, state, court, democrats, election
Public Lands	american, apwestregion, native, indian, memorial, national, apeastregion, burial, public, state, court, dead, democrats, discovered, florida, land, mexico, park, pocahontas, puerto
Gun Control	gun, school, shooting, florida, guns, nra, students, control, high, parkland, violence, people, house, laws, mass, want, weapons, national, protest, shootings

Table A9: Top topic features in tweets by PARTISANS

Topic	Top Features
No policy issue	me, like, de, day, get, or, people, time, did, know, love, ve, go, good, see, some, am, why, re
Economy	tax, gop, shutdown, bill, government, down, trumpshutdown, republican, economy, jobs, last, budget, congress, cut, cuts, passed, republicans, spending, trillion, would
Civil Rights	women, white, people, black, rights, racist, children, or, them, against, racism, like, re, sexual, because, want, woman, america, house, lgbtq
Healthcare	health, care, healthcare, people, insurance, medicaid, need, or, medical, time, children, drug, kids, medicare, opioid, which, would, access, childrens
Agriculture	dairy, bill, canada, congress, farm, nations, water, —, 3rd, 4h, administration, afbf18, africa, afternoon, agriculture, approved, banning, billion, bo, bottled
Labor	workers, working, —, families, america, build, deserve, lets, work, address, american, better, broken, ca, demand, fight, hard, income, inequality, labor
Education	students, school, education, teachers, schools, public, texas, kids, student, them, , best, ca, like, teacher, work, act, charter, colleges, country
Environment	climate, water, change, because, environmental, flint, federal, still, against, air, big, clean, does, first, local, people, scott, work, world, year
Energy	energy, gas, oil, infrastructure, plan, solar, first, heres, lead, why, , administration, breaking, civilisation, companies, company, dakota, drilling, emissions, executives
Immigration	border, children, immigrant, immigration, immigrants, daca, families, parents, why, policy, trumps, dreamers, asylum, separated, separating, administration, people, illegal, or, wall
Transportation	transit, transportation, capmetroatx, public, also, always, because, credit, deaths, draft, funding, improve, like, offers, plan, since, take, texas, year, across
Law and Crime	police, justice, officer, people, marijuana, domestic, prison, because, department, violence, abuse, against, california, children, does, first, get, ice, officers, stop
Social Welfare	or, chip, food, against, children, contingency, fund, child, families, homeless, hr, million, plan, poverty, time, billion, childrens, conroy, coverage, cut
Housing	plan, city, housing, austin, enough, get, houstondon, imagine, income, infrastructure, local, low, lowincome, progress, residents, spent, 65xs
Domestic Commerce	hurricane, market, puerto, died, maria, people, rico, tax, because, business, businesses, companies, dow, law, news, stock, again, big, biggest, corporations
Defense	military, or, nuclear, war, iraq, parade, veterans, camps, detention, did, last, them, ve, attack, bin, children, end, families, family, korea
Technology	netneutrality, net, neutrality, vote, call, fcc, bill, democracy, public, senate, against, americans, cable, california, data, did, done, effort
Foreign Trade	trade, tariffs, canada, steel, war, trumps, could, get, tariff, would, •, act, aluminum, back, billion, china, country, easy, exports, fair
Intl. Affairs	russia, russian, north, people, russians, china, iran, korea, putin, state, sanctions, syria, breaking, israeli, trumps, gaza, house, killed, meeting, white
Gov. Operations	vote, gop, house, mueller, election, trumps, fbi, would, why, campaign, people, republican, or, did, breaking, never, state, me, against, cohen
Public Lands	native, americans, indigenous, american, hall, kylegriffin1, national, projects, survey, affairs, allow, americanindian8, asking, bought, bureau, challenges, cherokee, chronsnyder
Gun Control	nra, gun, school, guns, shooting, mass, people, children, students, violence, assault, parkland, take, weapons, breaking, high, ban, know, shootings, shannonrwatts

Appendix B Validating the method for identifying state partisans

In the paper we assess the extent to which shifts in issue attention by Democratic and Republican party supporters from each state are also predictive of shifts of attention by state legislators, to account for the fact that previous work finds partisans to have the ability to influence the issue preferences of their representatives (more than, e.g., the mass public at large). Following Barbera et al. (2019)'s method (designed to identify partisans at the national level in the United States), we collected the list of followers of all the state legislators on Twitter from the 13 states we analyze in the paper, and then looked for those who followed at least 2 Democratic legislators from a given state, and none Republican legislators from that state (and vice versa), a total of 245,709, and 'classified' them as state partisan for that particular state and party.[13] By matching Twitter users with their voter registration records from states that make the data available for research, Barbera et al. (2019) show that this method is highly accurate at identifying partisans at the national level (based on whether they follow members of Congress of a given party and none of the other). However, to ensure the method also works for identifying partisans from particular states, we conducted the following validation exercise.

Table C1: Example of the *location* and *description* Twitter fields.

Location	**Description**
Brooklyn NY	Conservative Republican living in People's Republic of New York
California, USA	Experienced Multi-Media publisher with XX
Vermont	Moderate Democrat, husband and father. Opinions are my own.
Houston, TX	Realtor with XX Properties. Foodie. Houstonian. Texan.

First, we used the Twitter API to collect the profile of these users, in particular, the self-reported location field and their profile description (see Table C1 for some anonymized examples from our dataset). We obtained a self-reported location for about 63% of the users (N = 156,021). Then we looked for whether the full state name (Arizona, California, etc.) or the state abbreviation (AZ, CA, etc.) was mentioned in the location (case insensitive): 33% of all the users (N = 81,058). For these, we calculated the proportion that we had considered to be about a particular state, and that we could match them to that state based on their self-reported location string: 90.3%, corroborating that the method worked for identifying users from a particular state.

We obtained a self-reported profile description for 65% of the users (N = 159,735). Then we looked for whether the word Democrat or Republican was mentioned in these descriptions (case insensitive): 3,223 mentions of Democrat (1.3% of all partisans) and 1,896 mentions of Republicans (0.7%). Existing work already shows that only a very few people reveal

[13] Not all these users were included in the analysis because some did not tweet during the period of analysis. See Table 1 for the exact number of users included in the analysis.

their party preferences on their Twitter profile (Eady, Hjorth, and Dinesen 2022), however, despite not being representative of the whole sample, this data allows us to run an additional validation to make sure that Barbera et al. (2019)'s method is likely to work well to identify partisans at the state level. We are confident that this is indeed the case, since 94% of those who mentioned the word Democrat in their descriptions we had classified as being democrats, and the same for 89% of those who mentioned the word Republican.

Appendix C Exploring Partisan Differences

Although we didn't have theoretical expectations about potential party differences, in this section we break down our analyses by party to examine how Democratic and Republican state lawmakers, members of Congress, and constituents influence each other in terms of issue attention. To do this, we generate independent time series for Democratic and Republican legislators and partisans. The goal is to have a better understanding of which party has a stronger influence on the aggregate patterns seen in Figure 3 as well as to provide some descriptive results that can inform future research on the topic.

Figure C2: Issue Responsiveness by Party



Note: The coefficients represent how much more cumulative attention (in percentage points) state legislators pay to an issue as a result of a permanent 10 percentage-point increase in issue attention by another group 15 days ago. The bands represent 95% confidence intervals. Dark gray bands represent the effect for legislators and partisans of the same party while the light gray bands represent effects between legislators and partisans of different parties.

In Figure C2, the dark gray bands represent the effect for legislators and partisans of the same party while the light gray bands represent effects between legislators and partisans of different parties.

For example, the very top coefficient in the first row indicates that a permanent 10-percent increase in issue attention by Democrat members of is associated with a cumulative 5.0 percentage point increase in issue attention by Democratic state legislators in 2021. The coefficient immediately below in light gray indicates that the same increase in issue attention by Democrat members of congress is associated with a 3.4 percentage point increase in issue attention by Republican state legislators in 2021.

The main results provided strong evidence that state legislators adjust their public communication in response to the agenda of national lawmakers in Congress. Overall, we see that influence is stronger within party than across. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that both Republican and Democratic state lawmakers are responsive to the issue attention of members of Congress by the respectively other party. It is, of course, likely that members of both parties are discussing policy areas in very different terms. For example, while lawmakers from both parties were more likely to discuss immigration after President Trump signed the executive order on family separation, the tone and content of tweets from Republicans were almost certainly distinct from those of Democrats.

State law makers also appear to be more responsive to partisan members of the public from their own party. At least, this is what we find for Democrat state legislators in both years and for Republican state legislators in 2021. The year 2018 provides a curious exception here with Republican state legislators being unresponsive to constituents of their own party.

Appendix D Differentiating between state legislators from low vs. highly professionalized legislatures

One of the key findings in the main analysis is that shifts in issue attention by members of Congress are highly predictive of congruent shifts in issue attention by state legislators, while we find no evidence for the vice versa effect. We do find however that state representatives follow (and also lead) shifts in issue attention by partisans from their states, as well as from state media accounts.

One caveat of the analysis in the main paper is that we do not distinguish between state representatives from more vs. less professionalized legislatures. State legislatures vary significantly on many professional dimensions, such as how often they meet, and the number of resources and staff available. These varying levels of professionalization could be predictive of different patterns in terms of how often they react or lead national conversations on relevant policy issues, or how they respond to key political actors in their states (e.g., media and partisans). For example, representatives from legislatures with more resources may be able to build a more solid portfolio of issues they want to push onto the agenda, and so be less likely to react to shifts in issue attention at the national level. More resource can also mean that they are better equipped to track the issues their constituents deem relevant and to more quickly react to shifts in issue attention by the public.

Table D1: Legislative professionalization scores.

Utah	0.06
Montana	0.08
Virginia	0.13
Nevada	0.14
Texas	0.20
Florida	0.22
Arizona	0.23
New Jersey	0.24
Illinois	0.26
Ohio	0.30
Massachusetts	0.38
New York	0.48
California	0.63

To assess the validity of these arguments, in this Appendix we run two versions of the model reported in Figure 3, where we use in both the same data for the national actors (members of Congress, national media, and the president), but vary the data we use from state actors (state legislators, state representatives, and state media). In one of the model we include data from state actors from states with less professionalized legislatures, and in the other one we include data from state actors from states with more professionalized legislatures.

We rely on data from Squire (2007) and *The Correlates of State Policy Project*[14] to obtain professionalization scores for the legislatures in the 13 states included in our analysis (see Table D1). For a more stark comparison, we drop the more 'middle-ground' states in terms of professionalization (Texas, Florida, Arizona, and New Jersey), and compare the ones with the lowest professionalization scores (Utah, Montana, Virginia, and Nevada) to the ones with the highest scores (Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, New York, and California).

Figure D2: Issue Responsiveness with state legislators differentiated by the level of professionalization of their legislatures.



In Figure D2 we report the results for these two models. For simplification, we only report the 15-day cummulative IRFs comparing members of Congress to state legislators (and vice versa) and state partisans and state legislators (and vice versa), although both models include all the actors included in the main model in Figure 3. The darker estimates show the results for the states with the least professionalized legislatures, while the lighter estimates report the results for the most professionalized. On the left panel (*Row groups' response*) we report how much *Members of Congress* (top row) and State Partisans (bottom row) increased their attention to a given issue 15 days after as a reaction to a shift in attention by state legislators. On the right panel we report the vice versa effect, by how much state legislators shifted the attention to a given issue in response to a previous shift in attention by members of Congress and by state partisans.

The findings are very similar for state legislators from the least and the most professionalized legislatures, indicating barely no difference between state representatives from these different states. The findings are also very consistent across time (2018 and 2021, indicated by the triangle and the circle on top of the estimates). In both years, and for

[14] http://ippsr.msu.edu/public-policy/correlates-state-policy

legislators from both types of legislatures, members of Congress did not react to changes in attention by the state representatives yet they had a strong (and equally large) influence on their issue attention. We see a very similar story when we look at the relationship between the issue attention distribution of state partisans and state legislators. Although in there we do appreciate a mild difference. Both in 2018 and 2021, representatives from the least professionalized legislatures slightly influenced to a larger extent the issues discussed by state partisans (the darker estimates are slightly higher, compared to the light ones, in the bottom-left panel). We do not see any consistent pattern for the vice versa effect. Although in 2021 state representatives from the most professional legislatures reacted more strongly than the least professionals to shifts in attention by state partisans, we observe the opposite for the 2018 data.

Overall, although as mentioned in the beginning, there are some reasons to expect state legislators from less vs. more professionalized legislatures to behave differently when it comes to influencing or adapting to shifts in attention by national legislators or from partisans within their states, the results in Figure D2 show that in practice state legislators from these different legislatures behave very similarly when it comes to influencing, and being influenced by, the issue agenda of other relevant political actors.

Appendix E Exploring whether spikes in attention to sub-issues of the main CAP topic categories are likely to happen simultaneously

In the analysis in the paper we rely on the 21 topic categories of the Comparative Agendas Project (CAP) to assess whether shifts in issue attention to one of these categories by one of the groups under analysis, is predictive of shifts in attention by the other groups. The CAP categories are rather broad (e.g., immigration, economy, civil rights, etc.), which means that a given one (e.g., civil liberties) encompasses many sub-issue dimensions (e.g., gender inequalities, race inequalities, etc.). A potential limitation of our approach is that if we find a correlation between a spike in attention to given topic by a given group, to be predictive of a spike in attention to the same topic by another group, these two groups may actually be increasing their attention to different sub-issues within the same category, and so the agenda of the former to not really be influencing the agenda of the latter.

Given the nature of our analysis, we believe this is unlikely to happen. Our models are based on day-level time series, which means that we calculate shifts in attention for a given topic and group in a given day. We believe that is unlikely that in the same (or closely subsequent days) two groups will be increasing their attention to two different sub-issue domains of the same CAP issue category.

Figure E2: Correlation between the issue attention to the LDA-based topics in Barbera et al. (2019) that have been classified into the same CAP topic category



We conducted the following analysis to assess whether this is indeed the case. We take advantage of the data used by Barbera et al. (2019) in their analysis. In their paper, rather than using a supervised approach and to classify their analyzed tweets into broad issue categories, they chose an inductive approach and used an unsupervised LDA model to identify more narrow topics discussed by members of Congress in 2013: 53 political topics in total. In their SI.A, they classified these 53 topics into the 21 CAP categories, and replicated their analysis based on these broader categories and found no meaningful differences. In here we used this mapping between their 53 topics and the 21 CAP categories, and the replication dataset of their paper, to assess the time correlation between the groups of topics they classified into the same CAP category. If indeed a given group of users (or different groups) is likely to increase their attention 'simultaneously' to more than one sub-issue domain of the same CAP category, we should see some substantial correlations between the attention devoted to these finer grained topics that have been matched to the same CAP category. If that's not the case, the correlation should be rather low.

In Figure E2 we show the results of this analysis. For the different subsets of the 53 political topics that Barbera et al. (2019) classified into the same CAP topic category, and for each group of users they studied in their paper, we calculated the average correlation for the daily issue attention to any potential pairs of topics in the set (and a 95% confidence interval around the average correlation). We excluded from this analysis the CAP topic categories for which they only had classified one of their 53 political issues. Across the board we observe null correlations: they are all either very small, or negative, and the 95%confidence interval cross zero. Only two are positive and the confidence intervals do not cross zero, but they are very small. Overall, we believe that this corroborates our intuition that it is highly unlikely to observe substantial spikes in attention to sub-issue domains of the same CAP topic category around the same days; and so we believe that the findings in the paper are not a function of this unlikely scenario.

Appendix F Issue prevalence and responsiveness between Members of Congress and State legislators

Finally, we examine whether a correlation exists between a group's ability to set the agenda and how much attention a group pays to that particular issue. In other words, are state legislators and members of Congress able to more strongly set the agenda of the other on those issues to which they devoted more attention?

Figure E2: Responsiveness by issue prevalence



Note: The figure shows issue prevalence plotted against issue responsiveness coefficients (between state legislators and members of Congress). The coefficients stem independent models for each issue. These follow the logic of the models presented in Figure 4 where members of Congress were differentiated by state. Note that issue prevalences shown here are smaller than in Figure 1 because percentages were computed without removing the tweets classified as referring to no policy issue.

In general, we find a positive correlation between issue prevalence and responsiveness, although this is more pronounced in 2018 compared to 2021.