

# The Elusive “Elite Middle:” A Comment on Broockman and Kalla (2026)\*

Chris Tausanovitch<sup>†</sup>

April 6, 2026

## Abstract

One of the core arguments in Broockman and Kalla (2026) is that moderation only weakly improves candidate vote shares because on some issues candidates are moving towards an “elite middle” that differs from the moderate position among voters. However this empirical claim does not hold up to scrutiny. In the clearest cases where the analysis supports this claim, the characterization of the “elite middle” is inaccurate. And even if these characterizations were correct, the estimated effects of moderation are too large to account for the small effects of moderation in actual congressional elections. Additionally, Broockman and Kalla (2026) make an argument that public opinion is multidimensional, and that this causes moderation to lose some votes while it gains others. Whether or not their evidence supports this argument depends heavily on whether they have correctly presented the issues under study. Overall, participants in candidate choice experiments appear to prefer candidates who take positions that are in the middle of the spectrum of Congressional ideology. Broockman and Kalla (2026) argue, correctly, that candidates for public office need to be precise about what moderation means. The same is true for political scientists.

---

\*Although disagreements remain, I thank David Broockman and Joshua Kalla for their comments and a very constructive exchange regarding their work. For valuable feedback I thank Julia Payson and Alex Tausanovitch.

<sup>†</sup>Professor, Department of Political Science, UCLA, [ctausanovitch@ucla.edu](mailto:ctausanovitch@ucla.edu).

## Voters Like Moderation

Broockman and Kalla (2026) (henceforth BK) seek to explain why moderate candidates for Congress don't garner much more support than more partisan candidates<sup>1</sup>. They argue that whether politicians gain or lose vote share by moderating their policy stances depends on the policy issue. Using evidence from a randomized candidate choice experiment, they claim that politicians gain vote share when they moderate on issues where the moderate stance is popular, but they lose vote share when they moderate on issues where the more partisan position is popular.

This claim appears paradoxical at first. We typically think of moderate positions on issues as being the ones supported by majorities. When two-thirds of the public supports a left-leaning policy, that typically includes the most liberal third of the public and the most moderate third. When two-thirds of the public supports a right-leaning policy, that typically includes the most conservative third of the public as well as the most moderate third again. It's no accident that moderates are part of majorities on left-leaning policies and on right-leaning policies. In fact this is built into the definition of being a moderate. People on the right side of the political spectrum are most inclined to move policy to the right, and people on the left side of the political spectrum are most inclined to move policy to the left. It is the moderates who determine whether the majority is for or against a policy change. Hence moderate stances are popular by definition.

BK's claim is ultimately not paradoxical because they posit the existence of two types of moderate positions: positions that are moderate in the public, and positions that are moderate among political elites, which they dub the "elite middle." They argue that the "elite middle" is different from the public middle. Studies of the effects of moderation by congressional candidates on their vote shares typically measure moderation *within* Congress. Moving towards the middle of the congressional ideological spectrum could be different from moving towards the middle of the public ideological spectrum.

The logic of this argument is theoretically sound, and it doesn't require us to throw out the whole idea that there are moderates in the public. However, BK's empirical results hinge on how the "elite middle" is defined. For 29 policy issues, BK write descriptions of what they take to be the elite Republican position, the elite Democratic position, and the "elite middle" position on each issue. They provide no background on how they arrived at these descriptions. Although most of the time people clearly prefer the moderate

---

<sup>1</sup>I agree with BK's premise that the scholarly literature shows small returns to moderation even though the theory would suggest returns should be large. However they do not convey the fullness of this debate, citing only Ansolabehere, Snyder Jr, and Stewart III (2001); Bonica, Rhee, and Studen (2025); Canes-Wrone, Brady, and Cogan (2002) in support of the finding that moderation is not as beneficial to candidates as we might expect. This finding is also supported by Bonica and Cox (2017); Handan-Nader, Myers, and Hall (2025); Highton (2019); Tausanovitch and Warshaw (2018); Utych (2020) when it comes to the United States Congress and Handan-Nader, Myers, and Hall (2025); Rogers (2017) when it comes to state legislatures. For a competing perspective, see Canes-Wrone and Kistner (2022); Erikson and Wright (1997); Hall (2015); Nyhan et al. (2012). BK's experiment uses likely presidential candidates even though the findings to date are mostly about candidates for lower office. Results from Jessee (2009) suggest large effects of moderation in the case of presidential candidates.

position, they find that sometimes people are close to indifferent, and in a small minority of cases people prefer the Republican or Democratic position to the “elite middle” position.

How could we know what the “elite middle” position is? A central problem is that there is a yawning gap between the positions of the two parties in today’s polarized Congress. What does it mean to move towards a middle that does not exist? In some cases we can triangulate what an “elite middle” would look like by looking at the positions of people in each party. In particular, if a position is shared by *some* members of both parties then it’s reasonable to suppose that might be the position of someone in between the two parties, if such a member of Congress were to exist.

There are very few cases where BK find that moderation hurts candidates. Only three out of 58 cases are statistically significant on their own. I examine the three cases with the most negative point estimates for Republicans, and the three cases with the most negative point estimates for Democrats. I find that in each of these cases, BK have characterized the positions in a way that is highly questionable. The position they attribute to the party that loses vote share by moderating is actually at least as plausible as a characterization of the “elite middle” position, and usually more so than the position that BK use. Moving to the position they characterize as moderate could in fact be a move *all the way to the position of someone in the other party*. I present the details on how BK categorize these policies, and why their characterizations are highly questionable at best, in the next section.

Even if moderation *were* harmful, the effects that BK find are unable to account for the small effects of candidate moderation on vote shares. Before any correction, BK find that moderating on the *average issue* accounts for a 1.1% increase in vote shares in their experiment. But this effect is only for a single issue. BK employ a candidate choice experiment that uses real, high profile candidates who their respondents claim to recognize at high rates, and they provide party labels. Respondents may know the positions of the parties on these issues (in fact evidence in the paper suggests that they do) and they may even know the positions of these specific candidates, and discount what they are told accordingly. But even so, moderating on *a single policy issue* has a 1-point effect on choice. There is every reason to believe that this would cumulate to a much higher effect for a candidate who was able to credibly moderate on many things, particularly since some individual policy issues have effects up to *5 points*. Even more so once we have eliminated the few cases where effects are wrongfully estimated to be negative. This can’t explain why the actual estimated effects of moderating in papers on this topic are typically less than 2%. 5 point effects are considered large by the standard of modern electoral swings.

BK claim that the variance in effect sizes is evidence of multidimensional opinion in the public, or evidence that the space of public opinion and elite opinion are different. However the simpler explanation for variance in effect size is just that people care more about some issues than others (Sides, Tausanovitch, and Vavreck,

2022).

BK make the additional argument that the effect of moderation is tempered by multidimensionality in public opinion. According to this argument, some subset of people are *less* likely to vote for a candidate who moderates on an issue, because this moves them farther from that voter’s optimal policy mix. In a single-dimensional world with deterministic voting this can’t happen, as long as candidates maintain their left-right ordering. BK show that voters who agree with the position of the Republican are less likely to choose the Republican when they moderate (Figure 6). However I show that some of this moderation is better thought of as *overshooting* the middle, in which case the result is no longer surprising. Understanding the implications of this result for the dimensionality of voter preferences requires careful attention to how the policy options divide up the underlying policy space.

It is probably true that an issue can be found where the “elite middle” and the “public middle” disagree. I would look for issues that upon reflection involve difficult tradeoffs. The public may naively (and perhaps rationally) prefer the benefits of some policies without acknowledging the tradeoffs. However the results in Brookman and Kalla (2026) demonstrate that this would be a rare exception, and not enough to explain why voters don’t reward congressional candidates more for moderation. A better explanation is that voters simply don’t know very much about the positions of candidates. This is demonstrated elegantly by Colao et al. (2025).

## Defining the “Elite Middle”

In defining the “elite middle,” BK use an intuitive but erroneous procedure. For each policy issue, they classify the “conservative” position with a typical Republican position, and the “liberal” position with a typical Democratic position. Then it appears that they define the “elite middle” by choosing some position in between. But this is far from guaranteed to provide a good answer. Depending on the options provided, different policies split the political space differently. If the median Democrat preferred a tax rate of 40% and the median Republican preferred a tax rate of 30%, this does not necessarily mean that some hypothetical person between the two parties would prefer a tax rate of 35%. A better approach is to look at the lowest rates preferred by Democrats and the highest rates preferred by Republicans. If the lowest rate preferred by Democrats was 34% and the highest rate preferred by Republicans was 31%, then we could not say what position exactly is the “middle,” but it would be reasonable to bound it between 31% and 34%.

Table 1 shows the three policies with the most negative effects of moderation for Republicans in BK’s results. These are the only three cases out of 58 (29 policies and two parties) where moderating has a statistically significant negative effect. For Republicans, there are seven cases out of 29 with negative point

estimates, but only these three point estimates are closer to -.05 than to 0.

Table 1: Policies Where Republicans Lose Votes by Moving to Elite Middle, Reproduced from BK Table A10

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Conservative Position (BK)</b>	<b>Elite Middle Position (BK)</b>
Transgender sports	Transgender children should NOT be allowed to compete in the sports league of their choosing. For example, children who were assigned male at birth but now identify as women should NOT be allowed to compete in women’s sports.	Local schools and sports leagues should be allowed to decide whether to allow transgender children to compete in the sports league of their choosing.
Transgender minor transi-tions	Children under 18 should NOT be allowed to use puberty blockers, undergo hormone replacement therapy, or receive surgery to medically alter their gender, even with parental consent.	Children under 18 should be allowed to use puberty blockers or undergo hormone replacement therapy if doctors deem it medically necessary and their parents agree, but should be unable to receive surgery to medically alter their gender.
K-12 Teacher Accountability	Being a teacher should be like any other job, where better teachers get paid more and worse teachers can be easily fired or get paid less.	It should be difficult to fire teachers, but better teachers should get paid more than worse teachers.

The single most negative point estimate for moderation is the case of Republicans moderating their position on transgender people in sports. In the public, this is a squarely moderate position, with well over 70% supporting a ban on transwomen competing in women’s sports according to BK’s data. Where would a hypothetical moderate in Congress stand on this? Would their views be closer to the what BK have described as the “conservative” position, or closer to what BK have described as the “elite middle?” To triangulate this, we can think about the positions of the most moderate Democrats. If they agree with Republicans on this issue, then a hypothetical *real* moderate would also have to agree with the Republicans.

Luckily we have data on this point. The status quo in 2025 resembled what BK have described as the “elite middle.” Due to the newness of this issue as a matter of political concern, most sports leagues were free to decide whether to allow transgender people to compete. Republicans proposed the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, and it was voted on in the House in January of 2025. According to the Congressional

Research Service summary “This bill generally prohibits school athletic programs from allowing individuals whose biological sex at birth was male to participate in programs that are for women or girls.” The bill matches up very closely with the position that BK ascribe to Republicans. However two House Democrats, Reps. Vicente Gonzalez (TX-34) and Henry Cuellar (TX-28), voted for the bill. For a Republican to move to the “elite middle” would mean moving towards Gonzalez and Cuellar. But for a Republican to vote *against* the bill would mean positioning themselves to the *left* of Gonzalez and Cuellar. The position that BK are calling “conservative” is in fact the best estimate of the “elite middle,” and the position that they are calling the “elite middle” is somewhere to the left of Gonzalez and Cuellar.

It could be argued that Gonzalez and Cuellar are two House members out of 435, and that their behavior on this issue is idiosyncratic, and not representative of the ideological spectrum as other members see it. This is entirely possible. However, some data is better than none at all. BK are trying to explain why the rewards for candidate moderation are small, and some of this research measures candidate moderation using roll call votes (e.g. Canes-Wrone, Brady, and Cogan, 2002). These measures would consider Gonzalez and Cuellar more moderate because they voted with the Republicans on this issue. If BK wish to explain the results in the literature, it would be helpful to define positions the same way that the literature does.

What about “transgender minor transitions?” Again we have data from the roll call record. In December of 2025, three House Democrats voted for H.R. 3492, the “Protect Children’s Innocence Act,” which would make it a felony to provide puberty blockers, hormone therapy, or surgical procedures to transgender minors. Again BK have classified a position as “conservative” when in fact this position is better thought of as the “elite middle” with the data we have available to us.

A more difficult case is “K-12 teacher accountability.” There have not been any votes in Congress on this issue in recent years. The last relevant vote was in 2015 when Republicans actually voted to rescind federal accountability standards for schools that were put in place under the Obama administration, on the grounds that these standards represented too much federal involvement in local education. However those previous rules were part of a larger effort by President Obama and his education secretary, Arne Duncan, to put pressure on schools for greater teacher accountability. Obama’s Race to the Top program included requirements for states to have plans to “remove ineffective tenured and untenured teachers.” During this period, several states led by Democratic trifectas weakened teacher tenure, particularly Colorado, which renamed tenure “non-probationary status” and made ongoing employment contingent on performance. In North Carolina, most Democrats supported the first stages of a bill which in its final form eliminated teacher tenure in 2013. In the meantime, most states in the conservative Deep South still have some form of teacher tenure.

What is the “elite middle” position on K-12 teacher accountability? Some elite Democrats in the past

15 years have endorsed the position that tenure should be eliminated entirely. Say that an Independent was elected to Congress who voted often with Republicans and often with Democrats, and who claimed to be a moderate. And say further that they supported eliminating teacher tenure. It would not be reasonable to say that they were “not a moderate” due to this position. In fact we would have to take this position as evidence of their moderation.

Part of what makes this case difficult, and what opens up some room for the elite political spectrum to differ from the political spectrum as ordinary people define it, is that on issues like this one elites have a much better understanding of the actual tradeoffs that occur. In many cases, Republicans have foregone the opportunity to strip teachers of tenure protections. In all likelihood this is because they understand that teachers are poorly paid in many states, that weak forms of tenure are an alternative to increasing compensation, that teachers without tenure often have high job security due simply to the difficulty of recruiting qualified people, and that tenure protections are far from inviolable. Even in light of this, opposing teacher tenure looks like a consistent moderate position among “elites.”

In Appendix A, I contrast all 29 policies that BK study with what can be known from a search of the roll call record, although this search is not comprehensive. In most cases, the roll call record is not dispositive. But closer examination of these policies reveals further important cases where BK’s codings are misleading. For instance, BK find a negative point estimate for Republicans moderating on abortion, but they include “abortions should be legal as a matter of personal choice in the first two trimesters” as part of their categorization of the elite middle, when in fact it is clear from the roll call record that moderates have supported further restrictions. Policies such as “Asylum at the Border” show the importance of wording. In the conservative option, BK specify that “asylum should only be granted to those facing persecution by their own government, NOT high crime or poverty in their home countries.” However the question at issue is whether asylum should be granted to people facing personal acts of violence directed at them, such as domestic abuse or gang violence. Respondents may or may not understand that the rationale of high crime in an asylum seeker’s home country includes the rationale of crime directed at that individual asylum seeker.

Table 2 shows the three policies that have the greatest negative effects for Democrats. None of these effects are statistically significant on their own, although Social Security comes close. In each case, there are instances of Congressional Republicans unequivocally taking the position that BK define as “liberal,” although there is some nuance in the case of high-skilled immigration. Nonetheless, in every case the position that BK define as “liberal” is actually better thought of as the “elite middle” position.

Table 2: Policies Where Democrats Lose Votes by Moving to Elite Middle, Reproduced from BK Table A10

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Liberal Position (BK)</b>	<b>Elite Middle Position (BK)</b>
Social Security	Social Security cash benefits should remain at their current level forever, paid for by raising taxes on incomes above \$400,000 by 12.4%.	Social Security cash benefits should be maintained at their current level forever, paid for by raising taxes on incomes above \$400,000 by 5% and raising the age when people become eligible for Social Security from 65 to 68 years old.
High-Skilled Immigration	Allow more people with technical skills, such as doctors and engineers, to immigrate to the United States from foreign countries.	Keep the same how many people with technical skills, such as doctors and engineers, who are allowed to immigrate to the United States from foreign countries.
Minimum Wage	Raise the national minimum wage to \$15 per hour for all workers.	Raise the national minimum wage to \$10 per hour for all workers.

Take the example of social security. The way that BK define this policy issue adds a layer of complication, because they combine the issue of social security and taxes on high income people, and then add in the consideration of retirement ages in the middle category. Republican President Donald Trump has repeatedly pledged not to make any cuts to social security or to raise the retirement age. Many mainstream and moderate congressional Republicans have joined him in this pledge. In other words, even Republicans have ruled out BK’s “elite middle” category as too conservative. It would be a wild swing to the right for a Democrat to propose increasing the social security retirement age. Simply put, this is a significant error in how this policy area is coded.

High skilled immigration is an issue where until recently, the Republican party was associated with what BK define as the “liberal” position and the Democratic party was associated with what BK define as the “conservative” position, although in their defense the switch has been quite decisive. Nonetheless, as recently as December of 2024, President-elect Trump voiced support for the high skilled H-1B visa program after Elon Musk proposed expanding it, saying “I have many H-1B visas on my properties. I’ve been a believer in H-1B. I have used it many times. It’s a great program.” Despite this, President Trump has now imposed a new \$100,000 H-1B visa fee by presidential proclamation. In response, 2 Republicans in Congress have co-sponsored a bipartisan bill to exempt healthcare workers from the fee, and 5 Republicans in Congress

have signed a letter asking President Trump to exempt healthcare workers. They wish for “more people with technical skills, such as doctors” to immigrate to the United States, to quote from BK’s characterization of the “liberal” view. The number of H-1B visas has been capped since the program was created in 1990, but as recently as 2018, Republicans proposed legislation to substantially expand that cap. To call this a “liberal” position is an extrapolation that conflicts with the available data.

Regarding the minimum wage, in the summer of 2025 Republican Senator Josh Hawley co-sponsored a bill that would raise the minimum wage to \$15 per hour. In 2019, 3 House Republicans voted for the Raise The Wage Act, which would raise the federal minimum wage to \$15 per hour. BK code \$15 per hour as the “liberal” position and \$10 per hour as the “elite middle.” But for a Democrat to support only a \$10 minimum wage would not place them in the middle- it would place them to the right of these Republicans.

There are other cases where BK find small negative point estimates of moderation for Democrats where these may result from questionable categorizations. A good example of the kinds of important considerations that arise is in tariff policy, where the main difference between BK’s “liberal” category and the “elite middle” category is that the elite middle allows tariffs for “certain strategic industries such as semiconductors.” Of course as an alternative to tariffs, Democrats in Congress have aggressively pursued various kinds of subsidies for domestic semiconductor production, and they have made attempts to restrict access to strategically important semiconductor technologies for rivals such as China. The purpose, method, and effect of these policies bear a lot of similarity to tariffs.

Another example where BK’s coding could be distorting the effect of moderation is the issue of taxes. There they find the odd result that both Democrats and Republicans have a small (but again, not statistically significant) negative effect of moderating. How could it be that people prefer *either* the liberal or conservative option to the moderate one? BK conflate tax rates with the level of IRS enforcement, but they only provide the rationale for IRS enforcement (“reduce tax evasion, targeting the highest income earners”) in the liberal case. The “elite middle” case maintains spending on tax enforcement, and the “conservative” case reduces it. Voters may reason that either they would like a reduction in tax evasion or to pay as little as possible for enforcement. But of course this is not actually the choice on offer.

In summary, suppose that there was an Independent in Congress who:

- Supported a ban on transwomen competing in womens’ sports
- Supported a ban on gender transition surgery for minors
- Supported an end to tenure for K-12 teachers
- Opposed all cuts to Social Security even if this required raising taxes

- Supported expanding high-skill immigration
- Supported raising the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour

Every one of these positions would be consistent with the most moderate members of both parties, and so we would have to accept this person as a consistent moderate. A good measure of how moderate a member is would be how similar they are to this person. BK code the first three policies as “conservative” and the next three as “liberal,” but a better coding for all six is “moderate.”

If we correctly classified the policies, we might find that voters never penalize politicians for moderation for all 29 of the issues BK study. With greater statistical power, it is possible that we would find that voters reward politicians for moderation on most or all of these issues. But if they don't, we don't need to jump to the conclusion that this is because voters with complex multidimensional preferences are canceling each other out. It may simply be the case that voters don't care very much about some of these issues.

## References

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M Snyder Jr, and Charles Stewart III. 2001. "Candidate positioning in US House elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 136.
- Bonica, Adam, and Gary W Cox. 2017. "Ideological extremists in the US Congress: Out of step but still in office." *Available at SSRN 2970341* .
- Bonica, Adam, Kasey Rhee, and Nicolas Studen. 2025. "The electoral consequences of ideological persuasion: Evidence from a within-precinct analysis of us elections." *Available at SSRN* .
- Broockman, David, and Joshua Kalla. 2026. "Should Moving to the Middle Win Candidates Votes? It Depends Where Voters Are." *Working Paper* .
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, and Michael R Kistner. 2022. "Out of step and still in congress? Electoral consequences of incumbent and challenger positioning across time." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 17(3): 389–420.
- 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.
- Colao, Jacqueline, David Broockman, Gregory A Huber, and Joshua Kalla. 2025. "Tracing polarization's roots: A panel study of voter choice in congressional primary and general elections."
- Erikson, Robert S, and Gerald C Wright. 1997. Voters, candidates, and issues in congressional elections. In *Congress reconsidered*. Vol. 6 Congressional Quarterly Press Washington, DC pp. 91–106.
- Hall, Andrew B. 2015. "What happens when extremists win primaries?" *American Political Science Review* 109(1): 18–42.
- Handan-Nader, Cassandra, Andrew CW Myers, and Andrew B Hall. 2025. "Polarization and state legislative elections." *American Journal of Political Science* .
- Highton, Benjamin. 2019. "Issue accountability in US House elections." *Political Behavior* 41(2): 349–367.
- Jessee, Stephen A. 2009. "Spatial voting in the 2004 presidential election." *American Political Science Review* 103(1): 59–81.
- Nyhan, Brendan, Eric McGhee, John Sides, Seth Masket, and Steven Greene. 2012. "One vote out of step? The effects of salient roll call votes in the 2010 election." *American Politics Research* 40(5): 844–879.

- Rogers, Steven. 2017. "Electoral accountability for state legislative roll calls and ideological representation." *American Political Science Review* 111(3): 555–571.
- Sides, John, Chris Tausanovitch, and Lynn Vavreck. 2022. *The Bitter End: The 2020 Presidential Campaign and the Challenge to American Democracy*. Princeton University Press.
- Tausanovitch, Chris, and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Does the ideological proximity between candidates and voters affect voting in US house elections?" *Political Behavior* 40(1): 223–245.
- Utych, Stephen M. 2020. "Man bites blue dog: are moderates really more electable than ideologues?" *The Journal of Politics* 82(1): 392–396.

## A Appendix: Roll Calls on BK Policies

This Appendix contrasts BK’s categorization of thier 29 policy issues with what is known from a search of the roll call record. For each policy, the first table in each section reproduces BK’s stated liberal, elite middle, and conservative positions, and adds a “Roll Call Record” row summarizing the best classification of those positions based on congressional roll call votes. The second table lists the underlying roll call votes, with vote counts placed in the column corresponding to the ideological direction of the Yay or Nay position.

## A.1 Roll Calls Related to Abortion

Table 3 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on abortion with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 4 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a negative (but not statistically significant) effect of moving to the middle on abortion for Republicans. However the roll call record does not support the conclusion that the elite middle believes that “Abortions should be legal as a matter of personal choice in the first two trimesters,” so their classification of the elite middle is likely too liberal. The roll call record does not cleanly speak to the matter of funding for abortions.

Table 3: Classification of Elite Positions on Abortion

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Abortions should always be legal as a matter of personal choice and the government should cover the cost of abortions for low-income people without health insurance.	Abortions should be legal as a matter of personal choice in the first two trimesters, though the government should NOT play any role in financially supporting abortions.	Abortions should be legal as a matter of personal choice only in the first trimester of pregnancy. The government should NOT play any role in financially supporting abortions.
Roll Call Record	Do not ban partial birth abortion. Do not allow states to add abortion restrictions above and beyond federal law.	Ban partial birth abortion and allow states to place some additional restrictions on abortion that exceed federal law.	N/A

Table 4: Classification of Roll Calls on Abortion

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 137 Democrats and 4 Republicans	Yay: 218 Republicans and 63 Democrats	
Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 30 Democrats, 3 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Yay: 47 Republicans and 17 Democrats	
H.R. 3134: Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 184 Democrats and 3 Republicans		Yay: 239 Republicans and 2 Democrats
S.1881: Prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 42 Democrats and 2 Republicans		Yay: 51 Republicans and 2 Democrats
H.R.1797: Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act (20-week ban) <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 190 Democrats and 6 Republicans		Yay: 222 Republicans and 6 Democrats
H.R.3755 - Women's Health Protection Act of 2021 <i>Senate cloture vote</i>	Yay: 46 Democrats	Nay: 47 Republicans and 1 Democrat	

## A.2 Roll Calls Related to Affirmative Action

Table 5 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on affirmative action with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record; no relevant roll calls were identified.

BK find large effects of moderating on affirmative action for Democrats and point estimates just below 0 for Republicans. The point estimate for Republicans is not statistically significant.

Table 5: Classification of Elite Positions on Affirmative Action

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Universities should be allowed to consider race as a factor in making admission decisions in order to increase diversity.	Universities should NOT be allowed to consider an applicant’s race in admissions, but should be able to consider essays and other materials that indicate how applicants have been affected by racism.	Universities should NOT be allowed to consider an applicant’s race in admissions.
Roll Call Record	N/A	N/A	N/A

### A.3 Roll Calls Related to Alternatives to Public K-12 Education

Table 6 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on alternatives to public K-12 education with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 7 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find almost 0 effect of moderating on this issue for Democrats, and a negative but not significant effect for Republicans. Their categorization of the “elite middle” is reasonably close to what can be surmised from the roll call record. However the move from the right hinges on how the conservative option is defined. BK include access to vouchers for religious schools in the conservative option, which is indeed in the roll call record as one part of the Student Success Act of 2015. However, rather than limiting vouchers to “low- and moderate-income parents,” the Student Success Act proposed to *broaden* eligibility for vouchers. BK exclude this aspect of the status quo from the elite middle. Given multiple moving parts, it is difficult to know how this effect would change if they had excluded this aspect of the policy, or specified that the elite middle actually distributes vouchers more progressively.

Table 6: Classification of Elite Positions on Alternatives to Public K-12 Education

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	The government should play no active role in funding private K-12 education.	The government should allow parents to choose between traditional public schools and government-funded, government-regulated, but privately-run charter schools.	Give low- and moderate-income parents vouchers that they can use to pay the cost of private school tuition, including religious schools.
Roll Call Record	Oppose government-funded private school vouchers.	Support charter-school frameworks with reduced federal mandates (ESSA); oppose expanded charter options without bipartisan consensus (Student Success Act).	Support government-funded private school vouchers; support expanded charter options beyond the ESSA framework (Student Success Act).

Table 7: Classification of Roll Calls on Alternatives to Public K-12 Education

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R. 2765: DC Appropriations FY2004 (included DC Opportunity Scholarship Program/vouchers) <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 194 Democrats and 11 Republicans		Yay: 209 Republicans and 1 Democrat
DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (embedded in DC Appropriations conference report) <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 47 Democrats, 2 Republicans, and 1 Independent		Yay: 49 Republicans and 1 Democrat
S.1177: Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (reduced federal mandates; bipartisan support for charter-school framework) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 44 Democrats, 40 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Nay: 12 Republicans
S.1177: Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 <i>House vote (conference report)</i>		Yay: 181 Democrats and 178 Republicans	Nay: 64 Republicans
H.R.5: Student Success Act of 2015 (expanded charter school options and state flexibility; precursor to ESSA) <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 186 Democrats and 27 Republicans	Yay: 218 Republicans

#### A.4 Roll Calls Related to Asylum at the Border

Table 8 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on asylum at the border with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 9 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find positive but insignificant effects of moderating on asylum at the border for Democrats, and negative but insignificant effects for Republicans. BK’s characterization of positions here is fair, but the precise wording could be important. The Securing America’s Future Act would limit asylum for victims of crimes such as gang violence and domestic abuse. Respondents may or may not understand “high crime or poverty in their home countries” to mean that victims of specific crimes would be excluded from asylum.

Table 8: Classification of Elite Positions on Asylum at the Border

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	People fleeing danger in their home countries should be allowed to request asylum when they arrive at the US border and stay in the United States while their cases are reviewed.	People fleeing danger should be required to request asylum at official border crossing stations. People coming from Central or South America should request asylum in Mexico or other countries they pass through, rather than continuing to the US border.	People requesting asylum should be required to wait in Mexico or another country while their cases are reviewed, and asylum should only be granted to those facing persecution by their own government, NOT high crime or poverty in their home countries.
Roll Call Record	Preserve the right to request asylum at the US border and remain in the US during case review.	Support strict enforcement measures limiting asylum access (HR.2); oppose requiring asylum seekers to remain in Mexico pending review (HR.4760).	Require asylum seekers to remain in Mexico during case review and limit the conditions under which asylum can be sought.

Table 9: Classification of Roll Calls on Asylum at the Border

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Bipartisan Border Security Act of 2024 (S.4361) — cloture on motion to proceed <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 41 Democrats, 1 Republican, and 1 Independent		Nay: 44 Republicans, 4 Democrats, and 2 Independents
H.R.2: Secure the Border Act of 2023 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 211 Democrats	Yay: 219 Republicans and 2 Democrats	
H.R. 4760: Securing America’s Future Act of 2018 (“Remain in Mexico” provisions) <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 190 Democrats and 41 Republicans	Yay: 193 Republicans

## A.5 Roll Calls Related to Asylum Seekers

Table 10 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on asylum seekers with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record; no relevant roll calls were identified.

BK find positive but insignificant effects of moderating on asylum seekers for Democrats, and negative but insignificant effects for Republicans.

Table 10: Classification of Elite Positions on Asylum Seekers

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	The United States should increase how many refugees and asylum-seekers it admits from poor or war-torn countries.	The United States should keep the same how many refugees and asylum-seekers it admits from poor or war-torn countries.	The United States should decrease how many refugees and asylum-seekers it admits from poor or war-torn countries.
Roll Call Record	N/A	N/A	N/A

## A.6 Roll Calls Related to Criminal Sentencing

Table 11 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on criminal sentencing with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 12 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find negative but insignificant effects of moderating on criminal sentencing for Democrats, and positive effects for Republicans. There have not been any votes recently that pit the left against the middle, and so we have little information from the roll call record about what it would mean to moderate for Democrats.

Table 11: Classification of Elite Positions on Criminal Sentencing

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Prison sentences for committing a non-violent crime (such as car break-ins) should be shorter.	Prison sentences for committing a non-violent crime (such as car break-ins) should be kept the same.	Prison sentences for committing a non-violent crime (such as car break-ins) should be increased.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Reduce mandatory minimum sentences for certain nonviolent drug offenses.	Impose mandatory minimums for repeat offenders.

Table 12: Classification of Roll Calls on Criminal Sentencing

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.756: First Step Act of 2018 (reduced mandatory minimums for nonviolent offenses) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 47 Democrats, 38 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 12 Republicans
S.756: First Step Act of 2018 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 176 Democrats and 182 Republicans	Nay: 36 Republicans
H.R.3355: Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Crime Bill, mandatory minimums) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 54 Democrats and 7 Republicans		Nay: 36 Republicans and 2 Democrats
H.R.3355: Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Crime Bill) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 188 Democrats and 46 Republicans		Nay: 131 Republicans and 64 Democrats

## A.7 Roll Calls Related to the Environment

Table 13 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on the environment with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 14 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find positive effects of moderating on the environment for both parties. Recent votes have fallen along party lines, so it is difficult to assess the elite middle based on the roll call record.

Table 13: Classification of Elite Positions on the Environment

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Increase spending on renewable energy with the goal of generating 100% of power from renewable sources by 2035. End government financial support for fossil fuels such as oil and gas.	Support all forms of energy production equally, including both renewable energy and fossil fuels.	End government support for renewable energy, and make it easier to drill for oil and natural gas here in the United States.
Roll Call Record	Support major clean energy investment and end fossil fuel subsidies.	N/A	Oppose clean energy investment and carbon pricing mandates.

Table 14: Classification of Roll Calls on the Environment

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (major clean energy investments) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 50 Democrats		Nay: 50 Republicans
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 220 Democrats		Nay: 207 Republicans
H.R.2454: American Clean Energy and Security Act (Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 211 Democrats and 8 Republicans		Nay: 168 Republicans and 44 Democrats

### A.8 Roll Calls Related to Gays and Lesbians

Table 15 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on gays and lesbians with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 16 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find positive effects of moderating on gays and lesbians for both parties. The roll call record does not speak directly to the issue of K-12 curriculum about gays and lesbians, or the positions of liberals vis-a-vis the elite middle.

Table 15: Classification of Elite Positions on Gays and Lesbians

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Companies should NOT be allowed to deny services to individuals because they are gay or lesbian. In addition, schools should include lessons about gays and lesbians in their classes.	Companies should NOT be allowed to deny services to individuals because they are gay or lesbian. In addition, local schools should be allowed to decide for themselves if they wish to include lessons about gays and lesbians in their classes.	Allow businesses to refuse service to or to fire people because they are gay or lesbian. Ban schools from teaching about gays and lesbians in their classes.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Codify same-sex marriage (Respect for Marriage Act); repeal DADT in Senate cloture; extend civil rights protections to sexual orientation and gender identity (Equality Act).	Oppose codifying same sex marriage, repealing DADT ad extending civil rights protections to sexual orientation and gender identity.

Table 16: Classification of Roll Calls on Gays and Lesbians

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.8404: Respect for Marriage Act of 2022 <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 47 Democrats, 12 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 36 Republicans
H.R.8404: Respect for Marriage Act of 2022 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 220 Democrats and 47 Republicans	Nay: 157 Republicans
H.R.2965: Don't Ask Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 57 Democrats, 6 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 31 Republicans
H.R.2965: Don't Ask Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 235 Democrats and 15 Republicans		Nay: 160 Republicans and 15 Democrats
H.R.5: Equality Act of 2021 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 221 Democrats and 3 Republicans	Nay: 206 Republicans
H.R.3685: Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2007 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 200 Democrats and 35 Republicans		Nay: 159 Republicans and 25 Democrats

## A.9 Roll Calls Related to Guns

Table 17 contrasts BK's categorization of elite positions on guns with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 18 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find positive but insignificant effects of moderating on guns for both parties. The roll call record does not distinguish the left from the elite middle.

Table 17: Classification of Elite Positions on Guns

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Ban assault-style weapons. Do NOT allow people to carry concealed firearms. Everyone who purchases a gun should have to pass a background check.	Allow purchasing assault-style weapons. Do NOT allow people to carry concealed firearms. Everyone who purchases a gun should have to pass a background check.	Allow purchasing assault-style weapons. Allow concealed carry of firearms. Buyers should have to pass a background check when purchasing a gun from a store, but NOT from a friend, family member, or a gun show.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Support enhanced background checks for young buyers and school security funding (Bipartisan Safer Communities Act).	Oppose enhanced background checks for young buyers and school security funding.

Table 18: Classification of Roll Calls on Guns

<b>Roll Call</b>	<b>Liberal Position</b>	<b>Elite Middle Position</b>	<b>Conservative Position</b>
S.2938: Bipartisan Safer Communities Act of 2022 <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 48 Democrats, 15 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 33 Republicans
S.2938: Bipartisan Safer Communities Act of 2022 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 220 Democrats and 14 Republicans	Nay: 193 Republicans
H.R.8: Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 232 Democrats and 8 Republicans		Nay: 188 Republicans and 2 Democrats
H.R.8: Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 219 Democrats and 8 Republicans		Nay: 202 Republicans and 1 Democrat
H.R.1808: Assault Weapons Ban of 2022 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 215 Democrats and 2 Republicans		Nay: 208 Republicans and 5 Democrats
H.R.38: Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 184 Democrats and 14 Republicans		Yay: 225 Republicans and 6 Democrats

## A.10 Roll Calls Related to Healthcare

Table 19 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on healthcare with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 20 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find negative but insignificant effects of moderating on healthcare for Democrats, and positive effects for Republicans. The descriptions BK offer extrapolate significantly from what we know from the roll call record.

Table 19: Classification of Elite Positions on Healthcare

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Offer all Americans the choice to enroll in Medicare. The government should also help pay for health insurance for the elderly, children, and those with low and moderate incomes.	The government should help pay for health insurance for the elderly, children, and those with low and moderate incomes.	The government should help pay for health insurance for the elderly, children, and only those with low incomes who are working or looking for a job. Also allow insurance companies to charge higher rates to people with pre-existing medical conditions.
Roll Call Record	Enact the Affordable Care Act including Medicaid expansion and subsidies for moderate incomes.	Oppose the ACE but also oppose full ACA repeal.	Fully repeal the ACA and replace with block grants.

Table 20: Classification of Roll Calls on Healthcare

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.3590: Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 58 Democrats and 2 Independents		Nay: 39 Republicans
H.R.3590: Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 219 Democrats and 0 Republicans	Nay: 178 Republicans and 34 Democrats	
H.R.1628: Better Care Reconciliation Act (“skinny repeal” of ACA) <i>Senate vote</i>		Nay: 46 Democrats, 2 Independents, and 3 Republicans	Yay: 49 Republicans
H.R.1628: American Health Care Act (ACA repeal) <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 193 Democrats and 20 Republicans	Yay: 217 Republicans
H.R.3: Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 228 Democrats and 2 Republicans	Nay: 191 Republicans

### A.11 Roll Calls Related to High-Skilled Immigration

Table 21 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on high-skilled immigration with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 22 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a negative but insignificant effect of moderating on high-skilled immigration for Democrats, and positive effect for Republicans. However their description of the elite middle is too conservative, based on

the roll call record.

Table 21: Classification of Elite Positions on High-Skilled Immigration

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Brockman and Kalla (2026)	Allow more people with technical skills, such as doctors and engineers, to immigrate to the United States from foreign countries.	Keep the same how many people with technical skills, such as doctors and engineers, who are allowed to immigrate to the United States from foreign countries.	Reduce how many people with technical skills, such as doctors and engineers, who are allowed to immigrate to the United States from foreign countries.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Expand H-1B high-skilled visa caps (AC21 2000); include H-1B expansion in comprehensive immigration reform (Gang of Eight 2013).	N/A

Table 22: Classification of Roll Calls on High-Skilled Immigration

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.2045: American Competitiveness in the 21st Century Act (AC21) — H-1B visa expansion <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 1 Democrat	Yay: 54 Republicans and 42 Democrats	
S.744: Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 (Gang of Eight — H-1B provisions) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 52 Democrats, 14 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 32 Republicans

## A.12 Roll Calls Related to Immigration Enforcement

Table 23 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on immigration enforcement with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 24 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a positive but insignificant effect of moderating on immigration enforcement for Democrats, and a positive effect for Republicans. Their description of the positions extrapolates significantly from the roll call record.

Table 23: Classification of Elite Positions on Immigration Enforcement

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Brockman and Kalla (2026)	Only unauthorized immigrants who have been convicted of serious violent crimes should be deported.	Any unauthorized immigrant who is convicted of a crime should be deported.	The government should try to deport every unauthorized immigrant, regardless of whether they have committed a crime.
Roll Call Record	Oppose mandatory deportation of all unauthorized immigrants including Dreamers.	Create path to legality for most unauthorized immigrants with criminal deportation requirement; protect Dreamers from deportation; oppose defunding DACA; support strict enforcement with very few Democratic crossovers (HR.2).	Defund DACA and deferred deportation programs.

Table 24: Classification of Roll Calls on Immigration Enforcement

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.744: Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 (Gang of Eight) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 52 Democrats, 14 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 32 Republicans
H.R.240: Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act — Blackburn Amendment to defund deferred deportation programs <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 183 Democrats and 26 Republicans	Yay: 218 Republicans
H.R.6: American Dream and Promise Act of 2019 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 230 Democrats and 7 Republicans	Nay: 187 Republicans
H.R.2: Secure the Border Act of 2023 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 211 Democrats	Yay: 219 Republicans and 2 Democrats	

### A.13 Roll Calls Related to Israel and Gaza

Table 25 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on Israel and Gaza with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 26 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a positive and insignificant effect of moderating on Israel and Gaza for both parties. The roll call record is unusually ambiguous on this issue because of the mixed partisanship of the votes.

Table 25: Classification of Elite Positions on Israel and Gaza

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Due to the situation in Gaza, the US should refuse to sell any weapons to Israel and cut off all military aid.	The US should continue its policy of giving military aid to Israel while encouraging Israel to improve the humanitarian situation in Gaza.	The US should increase how much military aid it gives to Israel.
Roll Call Record	Oppose emergency military aid to Israel.	Continue US military aid to Israel, including large emergency packages with bipartisan support.	N/A

Table 26: Classification of Roll Calls on Israel and Gaza

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.815: National Security Supplemental Appropriations Act (Israel/Ukraine/Taiwan aid package) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 46 Democrats, 22 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 26 Republicans, 2 Democrats, and 1 Independent
H.R.8034: Israel Security Assistance Support Act of 2024 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 37 Democrats and 21 Republicans	Yay: 193 Republicans and 173 Democrats	

#### A.14 Roll Calls Related to K-12 Teacher Accountability

Table 27 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on K-12 teacher accountability with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 28 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a negative effect of moderating on K-12 teacher accountability for Republicans, and a positive effect for Democrats. The roll call record is ambiguous about whether BK’s categorization is correct.

Table 27: Classification of Elite Positions on K-12 Teacher Accountability

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	It should be difficult to fire teachers, and teacher pay should primarily depend on how long they have worked as a teacher.	It should be difficult to fire teachers, but better teachers should get paid more than worse teachers.	Being a teacher should be like any other job, where better teachers get paid more and worse teachers can be easily fired or get paid less.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Reduce federal teacher evaluation mandates while maintaining accountability frameworks (ESSA); establish federal highly-qualified teacher requirements (NCLB).	N/A

Table 28: Classification of Roll Calls on K-12 Teacher Accountability

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.1177: Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (reduced federal teacher evaluation mandates from No Child Left Behind) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 44 Democrats, 40 Republicans, and 1 Independent (reduced federal accountability requirements)	Nay: 12 Republicans
S.1177: Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 <i>House vote (conference report)</i>		Yay: 181 Democrats and 178 Republicans	Nay: 64 Republicans
H.R.1: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (established teacher “highly qualified” requirements and performance standards) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 43 Democrats, 44 Republicans, and 0 Independents	Nay: 6 Democrats, 3 Republicans, and 1 Independent
H.R.1: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 197 Democrats and 186 Republicans	Nay: 34 Republicans and 10 Democrats

## A.15 Roll Calls Related to Medicaid

Table 29 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on Medicaid with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 30 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a negative but insignificant effect of moderating on Medicaid for Democrats and a positive effect for Republicans. The roll call record is consistent with their coding, but relies on complex omnibus bills that cover many other issues.

Table 29: Classification of Elite Positions on Medicaid

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Medicaid should be expanded to provide more low-income Americans with health insurance.	Medicaid should continue to provide low-income Americans with health insurance, while implementing reforms to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and give states more flexibility in program administration.	Medicaid should be reformed by requiring recipients to have a job if they are physically able to work.
Roll Call Record	Expand Medicaid to 138% FPL.	Oppose both full Medicaid expansion and full repeal of Medicaid.	Replace Medicaid expansion with block grants and per-capita caps.

Table 30: Classification of Roll Calls on Medicaid

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.3590: Affordable Care Act (Medicaid expansion to 138% FPL) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 58 Democrats and 2 Independents		Nay: 39 Republicans
H.R.3590: Affordable Care Act <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 219 Democrats and 0 Republicans	Nay: 178 Republicans and 34 Democrats	
H.R.1628: American Health Care Act of 2017 (Medicaid block grant/per-capita cap) <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 193 Democrats and 20 Republicans	Yay: 217 Republicans
H.R.1628: Better Care Reconciliation Act (Medicaid cuts, “skinny repeal”) <i>Senate vote</i>		Nay: 46 Democrats, 2 Independents, and 3 Republicans	Yay: 49 Republicans

## A.16 Roll Calls Related to Medicare

Table 31 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on Medicare with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 32 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a positive but insignificant effect of moderating on Medicare for Democrats and a positive effect for Republicans. This case is ambiguous because BK mix the issue of Medicare with raising taxes on high income people specifically.

Table 31: Classification of Elite Positions on Medicare

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Increase Medicare benefits to include dental, vision, and hearing services, by raising income taxes for people making over \$400,000 per year by 3%.	Maintain Medicare’s financial stability, by raising income taxes for people making over \$400,000 per year by 1%.	Maintain Medicare’s financial stability, by raising the eligibility age to 67.
Roll Call Record	Expand Medicare benefits and fund by taxing high incomes.	Support Medicare drug price negotiation with limited Republican support; oppose raising Medicare eligibility age.	Raise Medicare eligibility age and convert to premium-support vouchers.

Table 32: Classification of Roll Calls on Medicare

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.5376: Build Back Better Act (included Medicare dental/vision/hearing expansion) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 220 Democrats and 0 Republicans		Nay: 212 Republicans
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (included Medicare drug negotiation, excluded dental expansion) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 50 Democrats and 0 Republicans		Nay: 50 Republicans
H.R.3: Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act (Medicare drug price negotiation) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 228 Democrats and 2 Republicans	Nay: 191 Republicans
H.Con.Res.112: FY2013 Budget Resolution (Ryan Budget — Medicare voucher/premium support) <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 181 Democrats and 10 Republicans	Yay: 228 Republicans
H.Con.Res.34: FY2012 Budget Resolution (Ryan Budget with Medicare overhaul) <i>Senate vote</i>		Nay: 50 Democrats, 5 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Yay: 40 Republicans

### A.17 Roll Calls Related to the Minimum Wage

Table 33 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on the minimum wage with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 34 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a negative but insignificant effect of moderating on the minimum wage for Democrats, and a positive effect for Republicans. The roll call record cannot directly speak to BK’s categorizations because the value of the minimum wage has changed over time, and the one vote on a \$15 was wrapped up in a separate debate over the appropriate use of the budget process.

Table 33: Classification of Elite Positions on the Minimum Wage

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Raise the national minimum wage to \$15 per hour for all workers.	Raise the national minimum wage to \$10 per hour for all workers.	Maintain the current national minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour for all workers.
Roll Call Record	Raise minimum wage to \$15 per hour.	Raise minimum wage to \$7.25 per hour; oppose raising it to \$15 through the budget process.	N/A

Table 34: Classification of Roll Calls on the Minimum Wage

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.582: Raise the Wage Act of 2019 (\$15 minimum wage) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 228 Democrats and 3 Republicans		Nay: 192 Republicans and 6 Democrats
H.R.1319: American Rescue Plan — budget point of order on \$15 minimum wage provision <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay (to waive): 41 Democrats and 1 Independent	Nay (point of order sustained): 50 Republicans, 7 Democrats, and 1 Independent	
H.R.2: Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (\$7.25 increase) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 47 Democrats, 45 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Nay: 3 Republicans
H.R.2: Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 233 Democrats and 82 Republicans	Nay: 116 Republicans

## A.18 Roll Calls Related to Minor Crimes

Table 35 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on minor crimes with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. The roll call record does not provide clear information about this issue.

BK find a positive effect for both parties on moderating on minor crimes.

Table 35: Classification of Elite Positions on Minor Crimes

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	People who commit minor crimes (such as stealing from grocery stores) should not be arrested or sent to prison.	People who commit minor crimes (such as stealing from grocery stores) should be arrested, but only sent to prison if they have committed crimes before.	People who commit minor crimes (such as stealing from grocery stores) should be arrested and sent to prison.
Roll Call Record	N/A	N/A	N/A

### A.19 Roll Calls Related to Police

Table 36 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on police with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 37 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a positive but insignificant effect for both parties of moderating on police. Their categorization is consistent with the roll call record.

Table 36: Classification of Elite Positions on Police

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Keep police funding levels the same, spend more on non-police social services (e.g., crisis counselors and summer jobs for at-risk youth), and significantly increase regulation of police activities (e.g., banning choke holds and removing legal protections for police officers).	Spend more money on police, but significantly increase regulation of police activities (e.g., banning choke holds and removing legal protections for police officers).	Spend more money on police and do NOT increase regulation of police activities.
Roll Call Record	Oppose weaker police reform as insufficient; support comprehensive police accountability legislation.	Support both Republican compromise police reform (JUSTICE Act) and Democratic police reform bills with minimal Republican crossover.	Oppose police accountability and reform bills.

Table 37: Classification of Roll Calls on Police

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.1280: George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 219 Democrats and 1 Republican		Nay: 210 Republicans and 2 Democrats
S.3985: JUSTICE Act (Tim Scott police reform bill) — cloture vote <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 43 Democrats and 1 Independent (against weaker reform)	Yay: 52 Republicans and 2 Democrats	
H.R.7120: George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 233 Democrats and 3 Republicans	Nay: 180 Republicans
H.R.3684: INVEST in America Act (included community violence intervention funding) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 219 Democrats and 2 Republicans	Nay: 201 Republicans

## A.20 Roll Calls Related to Prescription Drugs

Table 38 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on prescription drugs with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 39 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a barely negative and insignificant effect of moderating on prescription drugs for Democrats, and a positive effect for Republicans. The roll call record does not speak to regulation of domestic drug production.

Table 38: Classification of Elite Positions on Prescription Drugs

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Americans should be allowed to buy prescription drugs from pharmacies in other countries, such as Canada. However, existing regulation on American drug factories should remain.	The government should cut regulations that make it hard to build drug factories in America, AND Americans should be allowed to buy prescription drugs from pharmacies in other countries, such as Canada.	The government should cut regulations that make it hard to build drug factories in America. However, Americans should NOT be allowed to buy prescription drugs from pharmacies in other countries.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Allow drug reimportation from Canada; support Medicare drug price negotiation.	Oppose drug reimportation and Medicare price negotiation.

Table 39: Classification of Roll Calls on Prescription Drugs

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.2427: Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2003 (drug reimportation from Canada) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 155 Democrats and 87 Republicans		Nay: 141 Republicans and 45 Democrats
S.Amdt. 946 (Dorgan) to S.1: Drug reimportation amendment to Medicare Modernization Act <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 40 Democrats, 21 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Nay: 25 Republicans and 3 Democrats
H.R.3: Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act (Medicare drug negotiation) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 228 Democrats and 2 Republicans	Nay: 191 Republicans
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act (Medicare drug price negotiation) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 50 Democrats and 0 Republicans		Nay: 50 Republicans

## A.21 Roll Calls Related to Public Health

Table 40 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on public health with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 41 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a positive but insignificant effect of moderating on public health for both parties. The roll call record is only loosely related to the way that BK frame this issue.

Table 40: Classification of Elite Positions on Public Health

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Government health agencies should follow the recommendations of academic experts.	Government health agencies should balance following the recommendations of academic experts with other views.	Government health agencies should be skeptical of the recommendations of academic experts and seek out other views.
Roll Call Record	Maintain OSHA COVID-19 vaccine mandate for large employers.	Support overturning OSHA vaccine mandate (2 Democrats joined Republicans); end COVID-19 National Emergency (21 Democrats and 2 Independents joined Republicans).	N/A

Table 41: Classification of Roll Calls on Public Health

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.J.Res.29: Disapproval of OSHA COVID vaccine mandate rule <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 46 Democrats and 2 Independents	Yay: 50 Republicans and 2 Democrats	
H.J.Res.7: Terminating the COVID-19 National Emergency <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 21 Democrats and 2 Independents	Yay also: 45 Republicans

## A.22 Roll Calls Related to Small Business Support with Racial Preferences

Table 42 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on small business support with racial preferences with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. The roll call record on this issue is ambiguous because the issues are mainly included in omnibus legislation. Table 43 lists related roll nonetheless.

BK find a positive effect of moderating for Democrats on small business support with racial preferences, and a positive but insignificant effect for Republicans.

Table 42: Classification of Elite Positions on Small Business Support with Racial Preferences

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	The government should provide special loan programs and business support specifically for small businesses owned by Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, and Asian Americans.	The government should provide special loan programs and business support for small businesses in low-income neighborhoods, regardless of the owner’s race.	All small business owners should compete for loans and government contracts on an equal basis without special treatment based on race or location.
Roll Call Record	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 43: Classification of Roll Calls on Small Business Support with Racial Preferences

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.1319: American Rescue Plan Act (included Restaurant Revitalization Fund with priority for minority-owned businesses) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 48 Democrats and 2 Independents		Nay: 49 Republicans
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act (included SBA programs for socially disadvantaged farmers and businesses) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 220 Democrats and 0 Republicans		Nay: 207 Republicans
H.R.1799: Paycheck Protection Program Extension Act (included set-asides for underserved communities) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 216 Democrats and 199 Republicans	Nay: 3 Republicans
H.R.748: CARES Act (included SBA small business grants broadly available) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 45 Democrats, 49 Republicans, and 2 Independents	

### A.23 Roll Calls Related to Social Security

Table 44 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on Social Security with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 45 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find a negative but not-quite-significant effect of moderating on social security for Democrats, and a positive effect for Republicans. However the roll call record contradicts their categorization of the elite middle position, which is better represented by their categorization of the liberal position, notwithstanding the fact that they have conflated social security with the issue of taxes on high income individuals.

Table 44: Classification of Elite Positions on Social Security

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Social Security cash benefits should remain at their current level forever, paid for by raising taxes on incomes above \$400,000 by 12.4%.	Social Security cash benefits should be maintained at their current level forever, paid for by raising taxes on incomes above \$400,000 by 5% and raising the age when people become eligible for Social Security from 65 to 68 years old.	Social Security cash benefits should decrease slightly over time and the age when people become eligible for Social Security should increase from 65 to 68 years old, in order to avoid raising taxes.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Oppose both privatization and benefit cuts or eligibility age increases.	Support Social Security private accounts; reduce benefits and raise eligibility age.

Table 45: Classification of Roll Calls on Social Security

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.Amdt. 150 to S.Con.Res.18: DeMint Amendment on Social Security private accounts <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 40 Democrats, 2 Republicans, and 1 Independent		Yay: 53 Republicans and 3 Democrats
H.Con.Res.112: FY2013 Budget Resolution (Ryan Budget — Social Security benefit reductions via eligibility age increase) <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 181 Democrats and 10 Republicans	Yay: 228 Republicans
H.Con.Res.34: FY2012 Budget Resolution (Ryan Budget) <i>Senate vote</i>		Nay: 50 Democrats, 5 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Yay: 40 Republicans
H.R.1319: American Rescue Plan (no structural Social Security changes) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 48 Democrats and 2 Independents		Nay: 49 Republicans

## A.24 Roll Calls Related to Tariffs

Table 46 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on tariffs with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 47 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find effects of moderating on tariffs that are negative but insignificant for Democrats and positive for Republicans. The roll call record on this issue is ambiguous, but left has shown an overwhelming willingness to support “strategic industries such as semiconductors” if not necessarily using tariffs as the mechanism.

This suggests that BK’s categorization does not accurately portray the spirit of the disagreement.

Table 46: Classification of Elite Positions on Tariffs

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	The US should NOT charge tariffs on goods imported from allied countries.	The US should NOT charge tariffs on goods imported from allied countries, except in certain strategic industries such as semiconductors.	The US should charge tariffs on goods imported from ALL other countries.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Support strategic domestic manufacturing subsidies with otherwise free trade for allies (CHIPS Act); support free trade agreements (USMCA, TPA).	Oppose strategic industry subsidies; prefer broader tariff protection.

Table 47: Classification of Roll Calls on Tariffs

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.4346: CHIPS and Science Act of 2022 (strategic industry support) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 46 Democrats, 17 Republicans, and 1 Independent	Nay: 32 Republicans and 1 Independent
H.R.4346: CHIPS and Science Act of 2022 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 219 Democrats and 24 Republicans	Nay: 187 Republicans
H.R.5430: United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement Implementation Act (USMCA) <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 8 Democrats, 1 Republican, and 1 Independent	Yay: 37 Democrats, 51 Republicans, and 1 Independent	
H.R.5430: USMCA Implementation Act <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 193 Democrats and 192 Republicans	Nay: 38 Democrats, 2 Republicans, and 1 Independent
H.R.2146: Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Promotion Authority/Fast Track) <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 32 Democrats	Yay: 53 Republicans and 14 Democrats	
H.R.2146: Trade Promotion Authority (Fast Track) <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 158 Democrats and 54 Republicans		Yay: 190 Republicans and 28 Democrats

## A.25 Roll Calls Related to Taxes

Table 48 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on taxes with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 49 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find effects of moderating on taxes that are negative but insignificant for Democrats and *also* negative and insignificant for Republicans. This is a very odd case because both ends of the spectrum appear to be less popular than the middle. This could be because of how BK describe spending on tax enforcement. Only for the liberal case to they provide the rationale for tax enforcement which makes it seem desirable. In the other two cases, less spending would appear to be better, because it does not necessarily affect the outcome.

It is difficult to assess BK’s coding of preferences because they use effective rates, and policy is set in marginal rates. However Republicans have overwhelmingly supported cuts in the top marginal rate to 37%, which would reduce effective rates well below 39% for high earners, particularly if we take into account Republicans’ past opposition to higher medicare taxes for high earners.

Table 48: Classification of Elite Positions on Taxes

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Brockman and Kalla (2026)	People making over \$400,000 per year should pay 45% of their income in federal taxes. Increase spending on tax enforcement to reduce tax evasion, targeting the highest income earners.	People making over \$400,000 per year should pay 42% of their income in federal taxes. Keep spending on tax enforcement the same.	People making over \$400,000 per year should pay 39% of their income in federal taxes. Reduce spending on tax enforcement.
Roll Call Record	Set top income tax rate at 39.6% on incomes over \$450,000; enact corporate minimum tax and IRS enforcement funding.	Oppose cutting top rate to 37% and corporate rate to 21%.	Cut top income tax rate to 37% and corporate tax rate to 21%.

Table 49: Classification of Roll Calls on Taxes

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.1: Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (cut top rate to 37%) <i>Senate vote</i>		Nay: 46 Democrats, 2 Independents, and 1 Republican	Yay: 51 Republicans
H.R.1: Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 <i>House vote</i>		Nay: 189 Democrats and 12 Republicans	Yay: 224 Republicans
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (15% corporate minimum tax, IRS enforcement funding) <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 50 Democrats and 0 Republicans		Nay: 50 Republicans
H.R.5376: Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 220 Democrats and 0 Republicans		Nay: 207 Republicans
H.R.8: American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (39.6% rate on incomes over \$450,000) <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 172 Democrats and 85 Republicans		Nay: 151 Republicans and 16 Democrats
H.R.8: American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 47 Democrats, 40 Republicans, and 2 Independents		Nay: 3 Democrats and 5 Republicans

## A.26 Roll Calls Related to Transgender Minor Transitions

Table 50 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on transgender minor transitions with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 51 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find effects of moderating on transgender minor transitions that are positive for Democrats and negative for Republicans. However it is unclear from the roll call record whether disallowing gender affirming/altering medical treatments for minors should be considered moderate, when three House Democrats have supported such treatments.

Table 50: Classification of Elite Positions on Transgender Minor Transitions

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Children under 18 should be allowed to use puberty blockers, undergo hormone replacement therapy, or receive surgery to medically alter their gender if doctors deem it medically necessary and their parents agree.	Children under 18 should be allowed to use puberty blockers or undergo hormone replacement therapy if doctors deem it medically necessary and their parents agree, but should be unable to receive surgery to medically alter their gender.	Children under 18 should NOT be allowed to use puberty blockers, undergo hormone replacement therapy, or receive surgery to medically alter their gender, even with parental consent.
Roll Call Record	N/A	Protect gender identity in healthcare as a federally protected category (Equality Act, 3 Republicans joined all Democrats).	N/A

Table 51: Classification of Roll Calls on Transgender Minor Transitions

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.5: Equality Act of 2021 (would have protected gender identity in healthcare) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 221 Democrats and 3 Republicans	Nay: 206 Republicans
H.R.3492: Protect Children’s Innocence Act <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 207 Democrats and 4 Republicans		Yay: 213 Republicans and 3 Democrats

## A.27 Roll Calls Related to Transgender Sports

Table 52 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on transgender sports with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 53 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find effects of moderating on transgender sports that are positive for Democrats and negative for Republicans. However their conservative position better aligns with the elite middle in the roll call record.

Table 52: Classification of Elite Positions on Transgender Sports

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	Transgender children should be allowed to compete in the sports league of their choosing, meaning that children who were assigned male at birth but now identify as women should be allowed to compete in women's sports.	Local schools and sports leagues should be allowed to decide whether to allow transgender children to compete in the sports league of their choosing.	Transgender children should NOT be allowed to compete in the sports league of their choosing. For example, children who were assigned male at birth but now identify as women should NOT be allowed to compete in women's sports.
Roll Call Record	Oppose banning transgender athletes from women's sports.	Support banning transgender athletes with minimal Democratic crossover (HR.28 House 2025); protect gender identity in sports (Equality Act 2021).	N/A

Table 53: Classification of Roll Calls on Transgender Sports

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
H.R.734: Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2023 (ban on transgender athletes in women's sports) <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 203 Democrats		Yay: 219 Republicans
H.R.28: Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2025 <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 206 Democrats	Yay: 216 Republicans and 2 Democrats	
H.R.28: Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2025 — cloture on motion to proceed <i>Senate vote</i>	Nay: 45 Democrats and 2 Independents		Yay: 51 Republicans
H.R.5: Equality Act of 2021 (would have prohibited sex discrimination based on gender identity in federally funded sports programs) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 221 Democrats and 3 Republicans	Nay: 206 Republicans

## A.28 Roll Calls Related to Unauthorized Immigrants

Table 54 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on unauthorized immigrants with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 55 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find effects of moderating on unauthorized immigrants that are positive but insignificant for Democrats and positive for Republicans. Their categorizations are roughly consistent with the roll call record.

Table 54: Classification of Elite Positions on Unauthorized Immigrants

Source	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
Brockman and Kalla (2026)	Allow all people who immigrated to the US illegally in the past to become US citizens, if they pass a background check.	Allow people whose parents brought them to the US illegally as children to become US citizens, if they pass a background check.	Require people who immigrated to the US illegally in the past to return to their home countries, even if their parents brought them here as children.
Roll Call Record	Provide path to citizenship for Dreamers; oppose mandatory deportation of all unauthorized immigrants.	Provide comprehensive path to citizenship for most unauthorized immigrants with enforcement measures (Gang of Eight); protect Dreamers from deportation without requiring citizenship (ADAPA); support strict enforcement with near-universal Republican support (HR.2).	Oppose any path to citizenship, including for Dreamers.

Table 55: Classification of Roll Calls on Unauthorized Immigrants

Roll Call	Liberal Position	Elite Middle Position	Conservative Position
S.744: Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 (Gang of Eight — path to citizenship for most unauthorized immigrants) <i>Senate vote</i>		Yay: 52 Democrats, 14 Republicans, and 2 Independents	Nay: 32 Republicans
H.R.6: American Dream and Promise Act of 2019 (DREAM Act — path to citizenship for Dreamers only) <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 230 Democrats and 7 Republicans	Nay: 187 Republicans
H.R.6: American Dream and Promise Act of 2021 <i>House vote</i>		Yay: 219 Democrats and 9 Republicans	Nay: 197 Republicans
H.R.5281: DREAM Act of 2010 <i>Senate vote</i>	Yay: 55 Democrats and 3 Republicans		Nay: 36 Republicans and 5 Democrats
H.R.5281: DREAM Act of 2010 <i>House vote</i>	Yay: 208 Democrats and 8 Republicans		Nay: 160 Republicans and 38 Democrats
H.R.2: Secure the Border Act of 2023 (mandatory deportation including for Dreamers) <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 211 Democrats	Yay: 219 Republicans and 2 Democrats	

## A.29 Roll Calls Related to Universities

Table 56 contrasts BK’s categorization of elite positions on universities with the best categorization of those positions based on a search of the roll call record. Table 57 lists the roll calls underlying these conclusions.

BK find effects of moderating on universities that are positive but insignificant for Democrats and positive for Republicans. However the elite middle cannot be identified from the roll call record, because the only relevant vote was a large omnibus bill voted on along party lines.

Table 56: Classification of Elite Positions on Universities

<b>Source</b>	<b>Liberal Position</b>	<b>Elite Middle Position</b>	<b>Conservative Position</b>
Broockman and Kalla (2026)	The government should decide what university research to fund based only on its quality.	The government should withhold research funding from universities that charge tuition too high for middle-class students to afford.	The government should withhold research funding from universities that it decides are politically biased.
Roll Call Record	Fund university research based on quality only; oppose ideological or DEI-based funding restrictions.	N/A	Withhold research funding from universities deemed politically biased or with DEI programs.

Table 57: Classification of Roll Calls on Universities

<b>Roll Call</b>	<b>Liberal Position</b>	<b>Elite Middle Position</b>	<b>Conservative Position</b>
H.R.1: One Big Beautiful Bill Act (included provisions restricting federal funding to universities with DEI programs or that are deemed politically disfavored) <i>House vote</i>	Nay: 212 Democrats		Yay: 215 Republicans