# Supplementary Materials

Table 1A: Roll Calls, CCES Variables, and Conservative Positions

Year	Roll Call	CCES Roll Call Variable	CCES Opinion Variable	Conservative Position
2008	Iraq Withdrawal	cc316a	cc316a	Nay
2008	Minimum Wage Increase	cc316b	cc316b	Nay
2008	Stem Cell Research	cc316c	cc316c	Nay
2008	FISA	cc316d	cc316d	Yea
2008	SCHIP	cc316e	cc316e	Nay
2008	Gay Marriage Ban	cc316f	cc316f	Yea
2008	Foreclosure Relief	cc316g	cc316g	Nay
2008	NAFTA Expansion	cc316h	cc316h	Yea
2008	TARP	cc316i	cc316i	Nay
2010	ARRA	v507_arra	cc332a	Nay
2010	Climate	v508_climate	cc332c	Nay
2010	Repeal DADT	v509_dadt	cc332g	Nay
2010	Financial Reform	v510_financial	cc332f	Nay
2010	ACA	v511_hcr	cc332d	Nay
2010	SCHIP	v512_schip	cc332b	Nay
2010	Warrentless Wiretapping	cc332ht_fisa	cc332h	Yea
2010	Stem Cell Funding	cc332it_stemcell	cc332i	Nay
2010	TARP	cc332jt_tarp	cc332j	Nay
2012	Ryan Budget	ryanbudget	cc332a	Yea
2012	Korea Free Trade	koreafreetrade	cc332f	Yea
2012	Simpson-Bowles	simpsonbowles	cc332b	Yea
2012	Repeal ACA	healthrepeal2	cc332g	Yea
2012	Keystone XL	keystonepipeline	cc332h	Yea
2014	Ryan Budget	rollcall_1	cc14_325_1	Yea
2014	Simpson-Bowles	rollcall_2	cc14_325_2	Yea
2014	Debt Ceiling	rollcall_5	cc14_325_5	Nay

Figure 1A: Distributions of CD Sample Sizes by Congress


110th: mean = 75
111th: mean = 127
112th: mean = 125
113th: mean = 129

Figure 2A: Models Predicting Lawmaker Approval for Each Congress Individually


Linear Multi-Level, Random Intercept Models. Each model controls for education, gender, race, age, and income.

Figure 3A: Effect of Each Dimension of Policy Congruence on Lawmaker Approval using Three-Point Party ID Measure

Multi-level, Random-Intercept Model. Model controls for education, gender, race, age, and income.

Figure 4A: Effect of Each Dimension of Policy Congruence on Lawmaker Approval with Split Sample between Democrats and Republicans

Linear multi-level models. Models controlled for education, gender, race, age, and income.

Robustness Checks for Study 2

Figure 5A: Effects of Operational and Symbolic Conservatism by Year for Each Party

Figure 6A: Key Coefficients from Mixed Effects Models with Congress Dummies

Table 2A: Logistic Roll Call Models Only Including Districts with n < 60

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	All MCs	*All MCs*	*Democrats*	*Republican*
Conservative Opinion	4.805**	5.186**	6.039**	2.449**
	(0.465)	(0.478)	(0.516)	(0.938)
Symbolic Conservatism	4.888**	1.875**	1.975**	2.065
	(0.619)	(0.675)	(0.730)	(1.918)
Republican MC	--	2.193**	--	--
	--	(0.312)	--	--
Constant	-5.811**	-4.910**	-5.410**	-1.561
	(0.362)	(0.382)	(0.409)	(1.492)
N	1037	1037	835	202
Wald χ^2	227.052**	243.353**	155.862**	8.102**

** denotes p < 0.05 Values are logit coefficients with standard errors clustered by district in parentheses.

Table 3A: Roll Call Models Only Including Districts with n > 158

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	All MCs	*All MCs*	*Democrats*	*Republican*
Conservative Opinion	2.702**	3.572**	5.351**	2.489**
	(0.387)	(0.502)	(0.858)	(0.580)
Symbolic Conservatism	9.874**	3.515**	-0.804	7.427**
	(1.169)	(1.114)	(1.196)	(1.353)
Republican MC	--	2.687**	--	--
	--	(0.195)	--	--
Constant	-7.242**	-5.371**	-3.895**	-4.719**
	(0.696)	(0.698)	(0.825)	(0.844)
N	1048	1048	453	595
Wald χ^2	146.597**	268.436**	39.628**	56.726**

** denotes p < 0.05 Values are logit coefficients with standard errors clustered by district in parentheses.