Supplemental Material for "House Republican Decision-Making Following the Capitol Riot"

Appendix A: Variable Construction

1. **Legislator Ideology: We** use judgments provided by respondents in the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 surveys about the ideology they perceive or attribute to the Democratic and Republican candidates running in their district. These five CCES data sets were chosen because the congressional district boundaries should be identical across these years. However, we also re-run our analysis while omitting districts affected by mid-decade redistricting.

2. Note that the CCES surveys strive to be representative of each state, but not necessarily each congressional district. There are over 296,000 respondents across these five CCES datasets. Approximately half of the CCES respondents are not even willing to guess each candidate's ideology, so we lose a lot of data there. We took the following steps to maximize the number and reliability of judgments available to us.

    a. All of the respondents in the 2020 survey were asked their opinion about the ideology of the Republican and Democratic candidates running for Congress in their district. We have data from all of those respondents who were willing to offer a judgment, and retained the judgments about the Republican candidates who actually won the election (and thus had a vote in President Trump's second impeachment trial).

    b. Many of those same Republican candidates were running for that same seat in earlier elections, of course; and all respondents to earlier CCES surveys were asked the same two questions about the Republican and Democratic candidates running for Congress in that earlier year. To increase the number of judgments available to us, we saved the judgments about the perceived ideology of the Republican candidate from the 2018, 2016, 2014, and 2012 CCES surveys, whenever the same Republican candidate who *won* the election in 2020 had been running in those earlier years.

    c. All told, we have reports from72,264 respondents across the five election studies. The variable *IdeoRHCALL* reports the mean judgment about the ideology of the Republican candidate of all of the respondents offering an opinion, who live in each of the 213 congressional districts won by Republican in 2020. The number of respondents in each congressional district upon which the calculated district mean is based, varies widely, of course, between 15 and 630 with a mean of 166.

    d. Even with only half of the respondents willing to offer an opinion about the ideology of the Republican House candidate running in their district, some of those judgments are going to be a lot more accurate than others. To try to refine the estimates, we calculated measures of political knowledge in each survey, and then defined political "experts" as those respondents in the upper third of the

distribution of political knowledge in each survey. The variable *IdeoRHCExperts* reports the mean judgment of the ideology of the Republican House candidate in each district, as reported by these political experts. We believe that the judgments reported by experts are going to be more accurate than the judgments of the non-experts. The major drawback of this second estimate is that the mean is based on many fewer respondents in each district, varying between 5 and 387, with a mean across districts of 88.

e. IdeoRHCX2All is a compromise between these first two measures. It calculates the mean judgment from all available data but weighs the opinions of experts twice as much as the opinions of non-experts. It is this last variable that we utilize in our analyses as the ideology of the Republican members of the 117th Congress.

3. **Party Leadership:** Party leadership positions include:
    https://www.gop.gov/about/members/
    a. Minority Party Leader: Kevin McCarthy
    b. Minority Whip: Steve Scalise
    c. Conference Chair: Liz Cheney/Elise Stefanik (for the 4th vote)
    d. Republican Congressional Committee Chairman: Tom Emmer
    e. Conference Vice Chair: Mike Johnson
    f. Conference Secretary: Richard Hudson
    g. Policy Committee Chairman: Gary Palmer
    h. Ranking Members
        i. Glenn Thompson (Agriculture)
        ii. Kay Granger (Appropriations)
        iii. Mike Rogers (Armed Services)
        iv. Jason Smith (Budget)
        v. Virginia Foxx (Education and Labor)
        vi. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (Energy and Commerce)
        vii. Jackie Walorski (Ethics)
        viii. Patrick McHenry (Financial Services)
        ix. Michael McCaul (Foreign Affairs)
        x. John Katko (Homeland Security)
        xi. Rodney Davis (House Administration)
        xii. David Schweikert (Joint Economic Committee)
        xiii. Jim Jordan (Judiciary)
        xiv. Bruce Westerman (Natural Resources)
        xv. James Comer (Oversight and Reform)
        xvi. Devin Nunes (Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence)
        xvii. Tom Cole (Rules)
        xviii. Frank Lucas (Science, Space, and Technology)
        xix. Garret Graves (Select Committee on the Climate Crisis)
        xx. William Timmons (Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress)
        xxi. Blaine Luetkemeyer (Small Business)
        xxii. Sam Graves (Transportation and Infrastructure)
        xxiii. Mike Bost (Veteran's Affairs)

xxiv.   Kevin Brady (Ways and Means)

4. House Freedom Caucus Members

The HFC is by invitation only and does not officially disclose membership. We rely on the unofficial list constructed by
https://www.legistorm.com/organization/summary/128166/House_Freedom_Caucus.html.

Rep. Andy Biggs (**R**-AZ) - Chair	Rep. Diana Harshbarger (**R**-TN)
Rep. Jody Hice (**R**-GA) - Chair for Communications	Rep. Yvette Herrell (**R**-NM)
Rep. Warren Davidson (**R**-OH) - First Policy Chair	Rep. Clay Higgins (**R**-LA)
Rep. Jim Jordan (**R**-OH) - Vice Chair	Rep. Darrell Issa (**R**-CA)
Rep. Dan Bishop (**R**-NC)	Rep. Ronny Jackson (**R**-TX)
Rep. Lauren Boebert (**R**-CO)	Rep. Mike Johnson (**R**-LA)
Rep. Mo Brooks (**R**-AL)	Rep. Fred Keller (**R**-PA)
Rep. Ken Buck (**R**-CO)	Rep. Debbie Lesko (**R**-AZ)
Rep. Ted Budd (**R**-NC)	Rep. Mary Miller (**R**-IL)
Rep. Michael Burgess (**R**-TX)	Rep. Alex Mooney (**R**-WV)
Rep. Madison Cawthorn (**R**-NC)	Rep. Barry Moore (**R**-AL)
Rep. Ben Cline (**R**-VA)	Rep. Greg Murphy (**R**-NC)
Rep. Michael Cloud (**R**-TX)	Rep. Ralph Norman (**R**-SC)
Rep. Andrew Clyde (**R**-GA)	Rep. Devin Nunes (**R**-CA)
Rep. Scott DesJarlais (**R**-TN)	Rep. Gary Palmer (**R**-AL)
Rep. Byron Donalds (**R**-FL)	Rep. Scott Perry (**R**-PA)
Rep. Jeff Duncan (**R**-SC)	Rep. Bill Posey (**R**-FL)
Rep. Russ Fulcher (**R**-ID)	Rep. Matt Rosendale (**R**-MT)
Rep. Louie Gohmert (**R**-TX)	Rep. Chip Roy (**R**-TX)
Rep. Bob Good (**R**-VA)	Rep. David Schweikert (**R**-AZ)
Rep. Paul Gosar (**R**-AZ)	Rep. Greg Steube (**R**-FL)
Rep. Mark Green (**R**-TN)	Rep. Tom Tiffany (**R**-WI)
Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene (**R**-GA)	Rep. Randy Weber (**R**-TX)
Rep. Morgan Griffith (**R**-VA)	
Rep. Andy Harris (**R**-MD)	

Appendix B: Alternative Models

Table B1: Predicting Objection Votes Only for Observations Not Redistricted[1]

	AZ Objection (1)	PA Objection (2)
District Partisanship	7.77***	8.72***
	(2.27)	(2.29)
Member 2020 Vote Share	-2.02	-3.42
	(2.28)	(2.18)
Trump Popularity	9.51***	8.92***
	(2.39)	(2.34)
Legislator Ideology	3.38	3.34
	(2.22)	(2.19)
HFC Member	2.24***	3.15***
	(0.70)	(1.07)
Party Leader	-0.31	-0.17
	(0.58)	(0.60)
Tenure	-0.78	-0.45
	(1.23)	(1.23)
Not White	-0.50	0.04
	(0.94)	(0.91)
Woman	0.17	0.07
	(0.62)	(0.62)
% District Not White	6.35***	4.84***
	(1.40)	(1.26)
AZ Legislator	-0.32	
	(1.48)	
Constant	-12.12***	-11.09***
	(2.77)	(2.68)
Pseudo R^2	.34	.33
Num. obs.	172	170

SE in Parentheses.   ***$p < 0.01$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.1$

Note: There are no important differences between these results and those reported in Table 1 of the paper.

---

[1] Complete redistricting occurred in Florida, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania, while partial redistricting occurred in Virginia (1, 2, 3, 4, 7). After omitting these observations, Model 2 no longer controls for legislators from Pennsylvania.

Table B2: Predicting Objection Votes Without Controlling for HFC Membership

	AZ Objection (1)	PA Objection (2)
District Partisanship	5.81***	7.67***
	(1.79)	(1.93)
Member 2020 Vote Share	0.19	-1.22
	(1.70)	(1.68)
Trump Popularity	7.87***	8.09***
	(1.90)	(1.93)
Legislator Ideology	4.09**	4.83***
	(1.71)	(1.75)
Party Leader	-0.81	-0.34
	(0.52)	(0.55)
Tenure	-1.47	-1.08
	(1.11)	(1.16)
Not White	0.89	1.16
	(0.66)	(0.73)
Woman	-0.09	-0.00
	(0.53)	(0.55)
% District Not White	6.07***	5.16***
	(1.22)	(1.19)
AZ Legislator	1.74	
	(1.41)	
PA Legislator		2.98*
		(1.53)
Constant	-10.87***	-11.34***
	(2.22)	(2.27)
Pseudo R^2	.23	.24
Num. obs.	204	202

SE in Parentheses. ***$p < 0.01$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.1$

Note: Without HFC membership in the equations, Legislator Ideology becomes statistically significant, and the Pseudo R^2 declines a bit, compared to Table 1 in the paper.

Table B3: Predicting Objection Votes Using DW-Nominate Scores from 116th Congress (omitting newcomers) and Without Controlling for HFC Membership

	AZ Objection (1)	PA Objection (2)
District Partisanship	3.01	4.67**
	(2.00)	(2.13)
Member 2020 Vote Share	1.07	-0.79
	(1.82)	(1.72)
Trump Popularity	5.69***	6.53***
	(2.06)	(2.14)
Legislator Ideology (DW Nominate)	3.76***	4.84***
	(1.25)	(1.39)
Party Leader	-0.46	-0.15
	(0.53)	(0.57)
Tenure	0.07	0.43
	(1.27)	(1.34)
Not White	1.02	2.06**
	(0.81)	(0.95)
Woman	-0.19	0.47
	(0.82)	(0.84)
% District Not White	4.60***	4.20***
	(1.33)	(1.43)
AZ Legislator	1.30	
	(1.41)	
PA Legislator		3.12**
		(1.39)
Constant	-7.75***	-8.47***
	(1.74)	(1.85)
Pseudo R^2	.24	.28
Num. obs.	164	162

SE in Parentheses.   ***$p < 0.01$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.1$

Note: No newly-elected members included in this analysis. Compared to Table B2, District Partisanship is no longer statistically significant, but all other important results replicated.

Table B4: Predicting Objection Votes Using DW-Nominate Scores from 116th Congress (omitting newcomers)

	AZ Objection	PA Objection
District Partisanship	3.32	5.50**
	(2.04)	(2.22)
Member 2020 Vote Share	0.91	-1.25
	(1.86)	(1.84)
Trump Popularity	5.71***	7.16***
	(2.10)	(2.29)
Legislator Ideology (DW Nominate)	2.66*	2.72*
	(1.44)	(1.57)
HFC Member	0.94	2.62**
	(0.64)	(1.13)
Party Leader	-0.44	-0.23
	(0.53)	(0.59)
Tenure	-0.05	0.19
	(1.27)	(1.34)
Not White	0.85	1.94**
	(0.83)	(0.97)
Woman	-0.10	0.47
	(0.82)	(0.87)
% District Not White	4.64***	4.50***
	(1.33)	(1.47)
AZ Legislator	0.67	
	(1.45)	
PA Legislator		2.83**
		(1.34)
Constant	-7.49***	-8.39***
	(1.75)	(1.92)
Pseudo R^2	.25	.32
Num. obs.	164	162

SE in Parentheses.   ***$p < 0.01$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.1$

Note: No newly-elected members included in this analysis. Compared to Table 1 in the paper, Legislator Ideology is now statistically significant in both equations, while District Partisanship and HFC membership are no longer statistically significant in the first equation.

Table B5: Predicting Objection Votes using Trump 2016 for District Partisanship

	AZ Objection (1)	PA Objection (2)
District Partisanship	5.39***	5.63***
	(1.77)	(1.84)
Member 2020 Vote Share	0.48	0.30
	(1.72)	(1.76)
Trump Popularity	3.06**	1.73
	(1.52)	(1.52)
Legislator Ideology	2.42	2.40
	(1.88)	(1.95)
HFC Member	1.68***	3.20***
	(0.56)	(1.06)
Party Leader	-0.73	-0.32
	(0.52)	(0.55)
Tenure	-1.15	-0.71
	(1.12)	(1.14)
Not White	1.22	1.46*
	(0.82)	(0.87)
Woman	-0.00	0.07
	(0.55)	(0.57)
% District Not White	5.52***	4.32***
	(1.26)	(1.23)
AZ Legislator	0.40	
	(1.46)	
PA Legislator		2.40*
		(1.32)
Constant	-7.51***	-6.28***
	(2.09)	(2.05)
Pseudo R^2	.28	.31
Num. obs.	204	202

SE in Parentheses.   ***$p < 0.01$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.1$

Note: When District Partisanship is presented by Trump vote share from 2016 rather than Romney vote share from 2012, the estimated importance of Trump Popularity declines noticeably.

Table B6: Contrasting Measures of District Partisanship

	AZ Objection	PA Objection	AZ Objection	PA Objection	AZ Objection	PA Objection
Romney 2012 Vote Share	-0.19	1.12				
	(1.37)	(1.39)				
Trump 2016 Vote Share			5.74***	6.01***		
			(1.70)	(1.78)		
Trump 2020 Vote Share					5.98***	7.28***
					(1.73)	(1.89)
Member 2020 Vote Share	5.75***	4.28**	0.67	0.32	-0.26	-1.43
	(1.98)	(1.95)	(1.65)	(1.70)	(1.74)	(1.81)
Legislator Ideology	1.78	1.90	0.98	1.52	1.35	1.92
	(1.70)	(1.83)	(1.67)	(1.76)	(1.66)	(1.80)
HFC Member	1.86***	3.30***	1.71***	3.18***	1.78***	3.25***
	(0.54)	(1.05)	(0.55)	(1.06)	(0.55)	(1.06)
Party Leader	-0.41	-0.09	-0.64	-0.30	-0.67	-0.37
	(0.48)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.55)	(0.52)	(0.57)
Tenure	-1.30	-0.82	-1.26	-0.76	-1.13	-0.59
	(1.07)	(1.08)	(1.11)	(1.13)	(1.11)	(1.17)
Not White	0.31	0.43	1.23	1.50*	0.68	0.97
	(0.69)	(0.74)	(0.79)	(0.86)	(0.70)	(0.77)
Woman	0.31	0.35	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.19
	(0.51)	(0.54)	(0.54)	(0.56)	(0.55)	(0.58)
% District Not White	4.05***	3.21***	4.20***	3.63***	4.84***	4.52***
	(1.06)	(1.07)	(1.00)	(1.04)	(1.05)	(1.10)
AZ Legislator	-0.31		-0.13		-0.09	
	(1.36)		(1.39)		(1.40)	
PA Legislator		2.23*		2.27*		2.57*
		(1.16)		(1.26)		(1.36)
Constant	-3.77***	-3.60**	-4.74***	-4.75***	-4.63***	-4.93***
	(1.34)	(1.43)	(1.42)	(1.47)	(1.41)	(1.51)
Num. obs.	204	202	204	202	204	202

***$p < 0.01$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.1$

Note: Trump popularity not included in this analysis. Comparing district partisanship as measured by Romney's 2012 vote share, Trump's 2016 vote share, and Trump's 2020 vote share in each district, Romney 2012 does not similarly explain voting behavior despite the high correlation between these variables. All other important results replicated.