

APPENDIX

Table A1: Policy Issue Items Used to Generate Economic and Social Liberalism Scales

		Raw N	Range	Liberal Position (pre-input)		
				<\$10K	>\$150K	
N	<\$10K >\$150K F					
Economic Policy Liberalism (2000)						
	Inheritance tax should be cut (Q113a & Q113b)	18,292	0 1	63%	75%	14.79
	Should spend on health care for uninsured (Q111b)	55,549	0 3	80%	61%	100.93
	Should spend on Medicare (Q111g)	24,501	0 3	81%	57%	60.09
	Favor universal health care for children (Q91d)	29,084	0 1	91%	76%	54.29
	Should spend on Medicaid (Q111h)	24,317	0 3	73%	47%	67.93
	Should reduce income differences (Q136e)	23,758	0 1	69%	26%	156.76
	Should spend on aid to mothers with young children (Q111e)	24,055	0 3	66%	43%	46.54
Social Policy Liberalism (2000)						
	Favor restricting abortion (Q91b & Q38c)	54,876	0 1	58%	78%	84.93
	Should ban abortion (Q136a)	24,010	0 1	66%	88%	68.07
	Favor death penalty (Q268b)	29,496	0 1	35%	25%	26.67
	Favor gays in the military (Q268c)	27,955	0 1	56%	66%	6.67
	Should stop job discrimination against gays (Q110a)	54,767	0 3	52%	37%	15.28
	Should allow school prayer (Q136d)	24,139	0 1	27%	59%	96.81
Economic Policy Liberalism (2004)						
	Favor Eliminating Estate Tax (Q48 & Q74 & Q75)	13,637	0 1	65%	70%	3.14
	Favor Spending More on Health Insurance (Q38)	19,662	0 3	86%	65%	48.92
	Favor Health Insurance for Children (Q62 & Q77)	19,569	0 1	92%	75%	36.31
	Favor Health Insurance for Workers (Q63 & Q78)	18,650	0 1	83%	65%	41.81
	Favor Assistance to schools (Q35)	28,317	0 3	79%	67%	21.98
	Should reduce income differences (Q22)	35,149	0 3	48%	27%	110.58
Social Policy Liberalism (2004)						
	Favor banning all abortions (Q20)	56,919	0 3	42%	60%	101.22
	Favor banning all late-term abortions (Q25 & Q26)	22,040	0 3	38%	38%	4.77
	Favor stem cell funding (Q65 & Q66 & Q83 & Q84)	16,076	0 1	67%	77%	8.88
	Favor marriage ammendment (Q17)	55,717	0 3	43%	45%	18.10
	Favor allowing same sex marriage (Q656 & Q 657)	17,052	0 3	18%	27%	37.28
	Favor gun control (Q32)	31,281	0 3	69%	62%	13.57

Note: Descriptive statistics from datasets prior to imputing for missing values. Income group responses indicate the percent of each income group selecting the most liberal response option for each item. F statistics drawn from one-way ANOVA tests across all nine income categories. F statistics for each question are significant at $p < .05$

Table 2A. Within-Party Income Group Effects on State Party Policy Positions

Part A

Dem Partisans' Preferences	Predicting State Democratic Party Economic Issues			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Low Income	0.387 (0.463)			-0.620 (0.620)
Middle Income		0.865*** (0.302)		0.702 (0.507)
High Income			1.198*** (0.281)	0.906** (0.355)
Constant	0.481*** (0.132)	0.376*** (0.078)	0.273*** (0.077)	0.350** (0.138)
Observations	47	47	47	47
Adj R ²	-0.00655	0.136	0.273	0.271

Part B

Repub Partisans' Preferences	Predicting State Republican Party Economic Issues			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Low Income	0.852*** (0.269)			0.350 (0.298)
Middle Income		0.997*** (0.300)		-0.178 (0.419)
High Income			1.290*** (0.251)	1.220*** (0.373)
Constant	-0.540*** (0.042)	-0.322*** (0.098)	-0.046 (0.117)	-0.095 (0.125)
Observations	47	47	47	47
Adj R ²	0.164	0.179	0.357	0.348

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 2A (continued). Within Party Income Group Effects on State Party Policy Positions

<u>Part C</u>				
Dem Partisans' Preferences	Predicting State Democratic Party Social Issues			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Low Income	1.632*** (0.209)			-0.159 (0.401)
Middle Income		1.704*** (0.159)		-0.014 (0.662)
High Income			1.867*** (0.143)	2.017*** (0.536)
Constant	0.255*** (0.0460)	-0.008 (0.053)	-0.366*** (0.069)	-0.408*** (0.114)
Observations	47	47	47	47
Adj R ²	0.565	0.712	0.785	0.777
<u>Part D</u>				
Repub Partisans' Preferences	Predicting State Republican Party Social Issues			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Low Income	1.612*** (0.232)			0.098 (0.445)
Middle Income		1.326*** (0.144)		1.288*** (0.420)
High Income			1.132*** (0.150)	-0.0248 (0.378)
Constant	-0.027 (0.090)	-0.130** (0.058)	-0.287*** (0.051)	-0.114 (0.094)
Observations	47	47	47	47
Adj R ²	0.507	0.646	0.550	0.630

Standard errors in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

- Achen, Christopher H. 1977. Measuring Representation: Perils of the Correlation Coefficient. *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (4): 805-815.
- . 1978. Measuring Representation. *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (3): 475-510.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Philip Edward Jones. 2010. Constituents' Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting. *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (3): 583-597.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2006. Purple America. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (2): 97–118.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M. Snyder, Jr., and Charles Stewart, III. 2001. Candidate Positioning in U.S. House Elections. *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (1): 136-159.
- Bafumi, Joseph, and Michael C. Herron. 2010. Leapfrog Representation and Extremism: A Study of American Voters and Their Members in Congress. *American Political Science Review* 104 (03): 519-542.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2006. What's the Matter with *What's the Matter with Kansas?* *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 1: 201–226.
- . 2008. *Unequal Democracy : The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. New York, and Princeton: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton University Press.
- . 2016. "Unequal Democracy, 2nd Edition." In, ed. N.J. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bhatti, Yosef, and Robert S. Erikson. 2011. "How Poorly Are the Poor Represented in the Us Senate?" In *Who Gets Represented?*, eds. Peter Enns and Christopher Wlezien. New York Russell Sage Foundation.
- Birkhead, Nathaniel A. 2015. The Role of Ideology in State Legislative Elections. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 40 (1): 55-82.
- Brady, David W., Hahrie Han, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2007. Primary Elections and Candidate Ideology: Out of Step with the Primary Electorate? *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 32 (1): 79-106.

- Brunner, Eric., Stephen. L. Ross, and Ebonya Washington. 2013. Does Less Income Mean Less Representation? *American Economic Journal-Economic Policy* 5 (2): 53-76.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2015. From Mass Preferences to Policy. *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 147-165.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, David W. Brady, and John F. Cogan. 2002. Out of Step, out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting. *American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 127-140.
- Carmines, Edward G., and Nicholas J. D'Amico. 2015. The New Look in Political Ideology Research. *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 205-216.
- Clinton, Joshua D. 2006. Representation in Congress: Constituents and Roll Calls in the 106th House *Journal of Politics* 68 (2): 397-409.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper.
- Enns, Peter K. 2015. Relative Policy Support and Coincidental Representation. *Perspectives on Politics* 13 (4): 1053-1064.
- . 2015. Relative Policy Support and Coincidental Representation. *Perspectives on Politics* 13 (04): 1053-1064.
- Erikson, Robert S. 1978. Constituency Opinion and Congressional Behavior: A Reexamination of the Miller-Stokes Representation Data. *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (3): 511-535.
- . 1981. Measuring Constituency Opinion: The 1978 U. S. Congressional Election Survey. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 6 (2): 235-245.
- Erikson, Robert S., Michael MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity. of Cambridge Studies in Political Psychology and Public Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Erikson, Robert S., and Gerald C. Wright. 1980. Policy Representation of Constituency Interests. *Political Behavior* 2 (1): 91-106.
- . 2000. "Representation of Constituency Ideology in Congress." In *Continuity and Change in U.S. House Elections*, eds. David Brady, John F. Cogan and Morris P. Fiorina. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 148-177.

- . 2009. "Voters, Candidates, and Issues in Congressional Elections." In *Congress Reconsidered*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 71-95.
- Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright, and John P. McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Feldman, Stanley, and Christopher Johnston. 2014. Understanding the Determinants of Political Ideology: Implications of Structural Complexity. *Political Psychology* 35 (3): 337-358.
- Flavin, Patrick. 2012. Income Inequality and Policy Representation in the American States. *American Politics Research* 40 (1): 29-59.
- Gilens, Martin. 2005. Inequality and Democratic Responsiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69 (5): 778-796.
- . 2011. "Policy Consequences of Representational Inequality." In *Who Gets Represented?* 247-284.
- . 2012. *Affluence and Influence : Economic Inequality and Political Power in America*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 2015. The Insufficiency of "Democracy by Coincidence": A Response to Peter K. Enns. *Perspectives on Politics* 13 (04): 1065-1071.
- . 2015. The Insufficiency of "Democracy by Coincidence": A Response to Peter K. Enns. *Perspectives on Politics* 13 (4): 1065-1071.
- Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. 2014. Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens. *Perspectives on Politics* (Fall).
- Grumbach, Jacob M. 2018. From Backwaters to Major Policymakers: Policy Polarization in the States, 1970–2014. *Perspectives on Politics* 16 (2): 416-435.
- Hall, Andrew B. 2015. What Happens When Extremists Win Primaries? *American Political Science Review* 109 (01): 18-42.
- Hetherington, Marc J. 2001. Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization. *The American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 619-631.

- Hogan, Robert E. 2004. Challenger Emergence, Incumbent Success, and Electoral Accountability in State Legislative Elections. *Journal of Politics* 66 (4): 1283-1303.
- . 2008. Policy Responsiveness and Incumbent Reelection in State Legislatures. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 858-873.
- Hollibaugh, Gary E., Lawrence S. Rothenberg, and Kristin K. Rulison. 2013. Does It Really Hurt to Be out of Step? *Political Research Quarterly* 66 (4): 856-867.
- Huddy, Leonie, Lilliana Mason, and Lene Aarøe. 2015. Expressive Partisanship: Campaign Involvement, Political Emotion, and Partisan Identity. *American Political Science Review* 109 (01): 1-17.
- Hussey, Wesley, and John Zaller. 2011. "Who Do Parties Represent?" In *Who Gets Represented?*, eds. Peter Enns and Christopher Wlezien. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 311-344.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Sean J. Westwood. 2015. Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 690-707.
- Jacobs, Lawrence, and Benjamin I. Page. 2005. Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy? *American Political Science Review* 99 (1): 107-123.
- Keith, Bruce E., David B. Magleby, Candice J. Nelson, Elizabeth Orr, Mark C. Westlye, and Raymond E. Wolfinger. 2009. The Partisan Affinities of Independent 'Leaners'. *British Journal of Political Science* 16 (2): 155-185.
- Layman, G. C., and T. M. Carsey. 2002. Party Polarization and "Conflict Extension" in the American Electorate. *American Journal of Political Science* 46: 786-802.
- Layman, Geoffrey C., Thomas M. Carsey, and Juliana Menasce Horowitz. 2006. Party Polarization in American Politics: Characteristics, Causes, and Consequences. *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 83-110.
- Legislatures, National Conference of State. 2018. "State Partisan Composition." In.
- Lupton, Robert N., William M. Myers, and Judd R. Thornton. 2015. Political Sophistication and the Dimensionality of Elite and Mass Attitudes, 1980–2004. *The Journal of Politics* 77 (2): 368-380.

- Miler, Kristina. 2016. Legislative Responsiveness to Constituency Change. *American Politics Research* 44 (5): 816-843.
- Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. Constituency Influence in Congress. *The American Political Science Review* 57 (1): 45-56.
- Poole, Keith T., and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Voting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rigby, Elizabeth, and Gerald C. Wright. 2013. Political Parties and Representation of the Poor in the American States. *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (3): 552-565.
- Shor, Boris, and Nolan McCarty. 2011. The Ideological Mapping of American Legislatures. *American Political Science Review* 105 (3): 530-551.
- Snyder, James M., Jr., and Michael M. Ting. 2002. An Informational Rationale for Political Parties. *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 90-110.
- Stoker, David A. Hopkins and Laura. 2011. "The Political Geography of Party Resurgence." In *Who Get Represented?*, ed. Peter K. Enns and Christopher Wlezien. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 93-128.
- Sulkin, Tracy, Paul Testa, and Kaye Usry. 2015. What Gets Rewarded? Legislative Activity and Constituency Approval. *Political Research Quarterly* 68 (4): 690-702.
- Tausanovitch, Chris, and Christopher Warshaw. 2013. Measuring Constituent Policy Preferences in Congress, State Legislatures, and Cities. *The Journal of Politics* 75 (02): 330-342.
- Times, New York. 2012. "State Government Control since 1938." In *New York Times*: New York Times.
- Treier, Shawn, and D. Sunshine Hillygus. 2009. The Nature of Political Ideology in the Contemporary Electorate. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73 (4): 679-703.
- Wlezien, Christopher. 1995. The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending. *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 981-1000.
- Wlezien, Christopher, and Stuart N. Soroka. 2011. "Inequality in Policy Responsiveness?" In *Who Gets Represented?* 285-310.

Wlezien, Christopher, and Stuart Soroka. 2008. On the Limits to Inequality in Representation. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41.

Wright, Gerald C. 1989a. Level-of-Analysis Effects on Explanations of Voting: The Case of the 1982 Us Senate Elections. *British Journal of Political Science* 19 (3): 381-398.

———. 1989b. Policy Voting in the U. S. Senate: Who Is Represented? *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 14 (4): 465-486.

Wright, Gerald C., and Michael B. Berkman. 1986. Candidates and Policy in United States Senate Elections. *The American Political Science Review* 80 (2): 567-588.