The Working-Class Win-o-meter

Online Appendix: Data, Design, and Methods

A report of the Center for Working-Class Politics

Jared Abbott & Joan C. Williams

Survey sample, conjoint design, estimation, and descriptive tables — September 14, 2026

This appendix documents the data and methods behind *The Working-Class Win-o-meter*. It reports the survey sample and how it was weighted, how we define social class, the full design of the candidate-choice (conjoint) experiment and its randomized attributes, the estimation approach, and a set of descriptive tables (including marginal means by candidate attribute and voter class).

Contents

1. The survey sample

Fielding

The survey was fielded online to a non-probability opt-in panel (CINT) between April and June 2026. Each respondent answered a battery of background questions and then a series of head-to-head candidate match-ups (the conjoint experiment, Section 3). The pooled raw file contains 57,049 responses; after the exclusions below the analysis sample is 40,214 respondents. Median completion time in the analysis sample is 12.0 minutes. *Because this is an opt-in panel rather than a probability sample, all population-level estimates rely on the survey weights described below; unweighted figures describe the raw respondent pool.*

Exclusions and data-quality checks

Responses were removed in the following order. Percentages are of the raw pooled file.

Exclusion	Removed	Remaining
Raw pooled responses	—	57,049
Incomplete (unfinished, or progress below 100%)	0	57,049
Flagged by the platform as preview, spam, or bot	0	57,049
Failed attention check	4,436	52,613
Flagged by automated-typing detection	71	52,542
reCAPTCHA score below 0.5	438	52,104
More than half of the 21 core items missing	8,631	43,473
Completion time under 5 minutes or above the 99th percentile	3,259	**40,214**
Total removed	**16,835 (29.5%)**	

The 21 core items are eleven demographic questions and the ten conjoint choices. The duration rule applies an absolute five-minute floor and trims the top one percent (above 6,019 seconds), which removes abandoned sessions left open in a browser tab.

Demographic composition

The table reports the unweighted count and share of respondents in each category, alongside the weighted share after raking (Section 1.2). Cells exclude the small number of respondents missing a given item. Total $N = 40,214$.

Characteristic	N	Unweighted	Weighted
Gender			
Female	23,160	57.6%	51.8%
Male	17,041	42.4%	48.2%
Age group			
18-29	6,622	16.5%	19.2%
30-44	13,091	32.6%	25.2%
45-59	10,607	26.4%	22.3%
60-74	7,798	19.4%	23.7%
75+	2,084	5.2%	9.6%
Race/ethnicity			
White	24,710	61.4%	59.5%
Black	6,420	16.0%	12.9%
Hispanic	5,652	14.1%	18.7%
Asian	1,859	4.6%	6.0%

Characteristic	N	Unweighted	Weighted
Other	1,573	3.9%	2.9%
Education			
Less than HS	2,043	5.1%	9.3%
HS/GED	10,985	27.4%	27.3%
Some college	9,057	22.6%	20.0%
Associate's	4,218	10.5%	8.7%
Bachelor's	7,567	18.9%	21.8%
Graduate+	6,177	15.4%	12.9%
Household income			
<$30k	11,269	28.6%	17.1%
$30-50k	6,841	17.4%	15.4%
$50-80k	8,505	21.6%	18.5%
$80-100k	3,029	7.7%	10.5%
$100-150k	4,976	12.6%	17.4%
$150k+	4,802	12.2%	21.0%
Census region			
Northeast	7,481	18.6%	17.1%
Midwest	8,230	20.5%	21.1%
South	16,516	41.1%	38.7%
West	7,973	19.8%	23.2%
Party identification (7-pt, collapsed)			
Democrat	13,780	37.3%	29.0%
Lean Dem	2,713	7.3%	10.8%
Pure Indep	5,976	16.2%	22.2%
Lean Rep	2,171	5.9%	8.9%
Republican	12,297	33.3%	29.0%
Ideology			
Liberal	12,264	30.5%	28.6%
Moderate	12,342	30.7%	34.5%
Conservative	11,779	29.3%	30.8%
Don't know/NA	3,829	9.5%	6.1%

Survey weighting

Population estimates use survey weights constructed by iterative proportional fitting (raking). The rake matches the weighted sample to external population benchmarks on seven margins simultaneously: gender, race/ethnicity, education, age group, Census region, household income, and *party identification*. Including party in the rake is deliberate: it anchors the partisan composition of the weighted sample to the electorate, so that the candidate-choice estimates are net of the single most powerful predictor of vote, rather than reflecting any partisan skew in the panel. Weights are trimmed so that no single respondent carries extreme influence, and are then rescaled to average one, which simply makes the weighted sample size equal the number of respondents. As a validity check, the working-class *recalled* 2024 Harris two-party vote in the weighted sample is 46%, in line with validated-voter estimates of the 2024 electorate (the Pew Research Center validated-voter study and Catalist's 2024 analysis).

Comparison to population benchmarks

The table compares the *unweighted* respondent pool to external population benchmarks (ACS 2023, Census 2023), and shows the *weighted* sample after raking. The "gap" is the *weighted* share minus the benchmark (pp), so it reports how closely the raked sample matches its targets; the

unweighted column shows where the raw opt-in panel skews before weighting (toward lower-income, more educated, and younger respondents). On the six demographic margins the rake targets, the remaining gaps are within roughly a point, the largest being the lowest education and highest income categories.

Characteristic	Unwtd	Wtd	Benchmark	Gap
Gender (ACS 2023)				
Female	57.6%	51.8%	51.5%	+0.3
Male	42.4%	48.2%	48.5%	-0.3
Age group (ACS 2023)				
18-29	16.5%	19.2%	19.4%	-0.3
30-44	32.6%	25.2%	24.4%	+0.8
45-59	26.4%	22.3%	21.7%	+0.6
60-74	19.4%	23.7%	23.9%	-0.2
75+	5.2%	9.6%	10.6%	-0.9
Race/ethnicity (ACS 2023)				
White	61.4%	59.5%	59.3%	+0.2
Black	16.0%	12.9%	12.6%	+0.3
Hispanic	14.1%	18.7%	19.1%	-0.4
Asian	4.6%	6.0%	6.1%	-0.1
Other	3.9%	2.9%	2.9%	+0.0
Education (ACS 2023 (25+))				
Less than HS	5.1%	9.3%	11.0%	-1.7
HS/GED	27.4%	27.3%	27.0%	+0.3
Some college	22.6%	20.0%	19.5%	+0.5
Associate's	10.5%	8.7%	8.5%	+0.2
Bachelor's	18.9%	21.8%	21.5%	+0.3
Graduate+	15.4%	12.9%	12.5%	+0.4
Census region (Census 2023)				
Northeast	18.6%	17.1%	17.0%	+0.1
Midwest	20.5%	21.1%	21.0%	+0.1
South	41.1%	38.7%	38.5%	+0.2
West	19.8%	23.2%	23.5%	-0.3
Household income (ACS 2023)				
<$30k	28.6%	17.1%	16.5%	+0.6
$30-50k	17.4%	15.4%	14.9%	+0.5
$50-80k	21.6%	18.5%	18.0%	+0.5
$80-100k	7.7%	10.5%	10.3%	+0.2
$100-150k	12.6%	17.4%	17.5%	-0.1
$150k+	12.2%	21.0%	22.7%	-1.6

Shares are computed only among the categories listed here. On income a small number of respondents answered "refused" or "other". No census category corresponds to those answers, so for this table those respondents are left out of the denominator for that characteristic; they remain in the analysis everywhere else. The sample shares and the published benchmarks are then each rescaled to total exactly 100% across the listed levels, so that the gap column compares like with like. Benchmarks: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2023 (gender, age, race, education, income), and Census 2023 population estimates (region). The weighted column reflects the seven-margin rake.

2. Defining social class

The report's primary class definition follows our Williams–Abbott *Class Gaps* report, broadened slightly to make fuller use of the data. The working class (WC) is respondents with *no four-year*

college degree and a household income in roughly the middle of the national distribution (about $30,000–$150,000). The middle/upper class (MUC) comparison group is respondents with a *four-year degree and* household income of at least $80,000. Respondents who fall in neither group (e.g. low-income college graduates, high-income non-graduates) are unclassified on this scheme and are excluded from class contrasts but retained for full-sample estimates. For robustness we also report an *education-only* cut (WC = no four-year degree; MUC = degree). The table gives the unweighted respondent counts under each.

Class scheme	Working class	Middle/upper	Unclassified
Income × education (primary)	14,587	8,076	16,604
Education only	25,753	13,514	0

"Unclassified" respondents do not meet either the WC or the MUC criteria under that scheme; they remain in full-sample (population) estimates but not in WC-vs-MUC contrasts.

Reestimating results using a stricter "middle 50%" income band. The primary working-class income band ($30,000–$150,000) spans roughly the 17th–79th percentile of household income. As a check we re-estimated every working-class result under a tighter band restricted to the income *interquartile range*—$35,000–$137,500, the literal "middle 50%"—holding the no-four-year-degree rule and the estimator fixed. The results are essentially unchanged. We use the broader band for the estimates reported throughout because it retains about a fifth more working-class respondents, which gives us substantially greater statistical precision, particularly for the working-class subgroups we focus on in the report.

3. The candidate-choice (conjoint) experiment

Each respondent worked through a series of 10 head-to-head match-ups (tasks). In each task they saw two candidates, one randomly designated the *Democrat* and one the *Republican*, each described by a profile whose features were drawn *at random and independently* from the menus below. Because features are randomized, the average difference in vote choice between candidates who do and do not carry a given feature is the *causal* effect of that feature. The analysis dataset contains 387,960 candidate-task observations from 39,159 respondents.

The outcome measure

On each match-up respondents could vote for the Democrat, vote for the Republican, vote for someone else, or not vote, exactly the options a real voter has. This captures turnout and defection, not just a forced preference. Across all task-rows, the weighted choice distribution is: Democrat 47.1%, Republican 40.3%, would not vote 5.5%, someone else 7.1%. Every effect estimate in the report uses this ballot; the outcome is whether the respondent chose the Democratic candidate.

Question wording

Respondents were introduced to the task with the following text, verbatim:

> *"You are about to evaluate pairs of candidates running for U.S. Congress. For each pair, please indicate which candidate you would be more likely to vote for."*

Each task then displayed the two candidates side by side in a table, above the note *"Note that some candidates list only one policy priority, while others list additional positions."* The table opened with *Party*, followed by three demographic rows (race, gender, and occupation), a block of three

statement rows (the candidate's campaign rhetoric, which is the *populist tone* attribute analyzed throughout this report, a values message, and a group appeal naming whom they would listen to), and a *Policy positions* block giving a main policy priority and, for most candidates, a secondary one. **The row order was randomized**: the three demographic rows were shuffled, the three statement rows were shuffled, and whether the statement block or the policy block came first was decided by a coin flip. Each respondent drew one such ordering at their first task and kept it for all ten, so the screenshot below shows one realized layout rather than a fixed one. The outcome question read, verbatim:

> *"If these two candidates were running in a congressional election, how would you vote?"*
>
> Vote for candidate A | Vote for candidate B | Vote for a different candidate not listed | Not vote in the election

The rows map onto the analytic attributes as follows. On screen the three statement rows sat together under a single heading reading *Values*, but they are three separate randomized attributes, distinguishable by their opening words.

Row as it appeared	**What it varied**
Party	Democrat or Republican; every pair had one of each
Race	The candidate's race
Gender	The candidate's gender
Occupation	The candidate's job: 21 specific occupations, grouped for analysis into five occupational tiers
The three statement rows, shown on screen under the heading "Values"	
"Thinks that…"	Campaign rhetoric, i.e. the populist-tone attribute, drawn from 20 statements: people-centric, anti-political-elite, anti-economic-elite, or the non-populist residual
"Says that…"	The values message, drawn from 17 statements
"Believes that leaders should listen more to…"	The group appeal, drawn from 10 statements
The policy rows	
Main policy priority	Whether the candidate leads on an economic or a social issue
Secondary policy priority	A second policy position, left blank for some candidates

What a task looked like

The table below reproduces one fielded task, with a single randomly drawn pair, in the layout respondents saw. Candidate A is the Democrat here; which side of the screen the Democrat occupied was randomized across respondents.

Note that some candidates list only one policy priority, while others list additional positions.

Candidate A	Candidate B
Party: Democrat **Race:** White **Occupation:** Civil engineer **Gender:** Male	**Party:** Republican **Race:** Latino **Occupation:** Social worker **Gender:** Male
Values	
Thinks that we should give the American people a real voice.	Thinks that we should work with both parties to get things done.
Says that people who play by the rules shouldn't be the ones falling behind.	Says that keeping families and communities safe has to be a top priority.
Believes that leaders should listen more to blue-collar workers when making decisions.	Believes that leaders should listen more to women when making decisions.
Policy positions	
Main policy priority: Make abortion legal in all cases.	*Main policy priority:* Block any new requirements on ICE agents—including body cameras, mask bans, or warrant mandates—that would interfere with their ability to enforce immigration law.
Secondary policy priority: Fund job training programs to help people get jobs in construction and skilled trades.	*Secondary policy priority:* Limit federal welfare cash payments to two years, with mandatory work or job training requirements after six months.

One fielded task, reproduced from the live questionnaire. Every attribute below Party *was randomized independently, and the Republican's positions were drawn from a separate Republican pool. The row order shown here is one of the randomized orderings described above, not a fixed layout.*

Randomization

Every attribute was drawn independently of every other, separately for the Democrat and the Republican, and redrawn in each of a respondent's ten tasks. **No attribute combinations were prohibited**, so no level appears with a restricted set of partners and every marginal mean is estimated over the full design. Draws were *not*, however, uniform across levels in every case. The shares in the tables below record the design as it was fielded, and they depart from uniformity for the following reasons.

- *Race* was drawn in a 9:2:2:1 ratio over White, Black, Latino, and Asian (64.3%, 14.3%, 14.3%, 7.1%), and *gender* in a 3:1 ratio of men to women. Most candidates on actual ballots are White men, and a balanced design would have made race and gender the obvious focus of the study. The cost is that race and gender are themselves estimated less precisely than the substantive attributes.

- *Occupation* was drawn uniformly over the twenty-one occupations fielded in this version of the questionnaire.

- *Campaign rhetoric* was drawn by group with fixed unequal probabilities: people-centric one-third, anti-political-elite one-sixth, anti-economic-elite one-sixth, and the non-populist residual group one-third. Within the people-centric group, a short and a long wording were equally likely.

- The *group appeal* and *values* statements were each drawn uniformly over their batteries. The unequal category shares in the tables below therefore reflect how many statements fall into each

category, not unequal sampling of the statements themselves: the group appeal battery, for instance, contains two working-class statements and three middle/upper-class ones out of ten.

- Every candidate showed a main policy priority, economic or social with equal probability. A secondary priority was left blank with probability 2/14 on economic draws and 2/12 on social draws, which is what the on-screen note about candidates listing only one policy priority referred to.

We also randomized whether the Democrat appeared on the left or the right side of the screen. Like the row order, this was randomized *across* respondents but held fixed *within* each respondent, so a Democrat who appeared on the left in a respondent's first task appeared on the left in all ten. Switching the parties from side to side between tasks would have made the pairs needlessly hard to follow, and any left-right presentation effect is therefore averaged out across respondents rather than within them. Candidate race and gender were randomized alongside the substantive attributes, on the weights given above.

Randomized attributes and levels

Each candidate profile varies on the following attributes. The table lists every analytic level, the number of candidate-task observations at that level, and its share of the design. Counts are over all 387,960 candidate-task rows. **Candidate occupation/background.** The candidate's job, classified into five occupational tiers (from 21 specific occupations). Comparisons in the report are against an elite-professional (upper-middle-class) occupation.

Level	Obs.	Share
Upper-middle class	92,591	23.9%
Middle-class	92,430	23.8%
Pink-collar	73,510	18.9%
Small business	18,517	4.8%
Working-class	110,912	28.6%

Campaign rhetoric (populist tone). The campaign's rhetorical register, from 20 statements. "Other" is the non-populist establishment/technocratic group, used as the comparison for the populist contrasts; the three populist families are people-centric and two anti-elite variants.

Level	Obs.	Share
People-centric	129,310	33.3%
Anti-political elite	65,070	16.8%
Anti-economic elite	64,694	16.7%
Other	128,886	33.2%

Issue priority. Whether the candidate leads on an economic or a cultural/social issue.

Level	Obs.	Share
Economic	193,883	50.0%
Social	194,077	50.0%

Economic position. The progressivism of the candidate's economic stance, dichotomized (more-left vs. less-left) from 45 economic policy options.

Level	Obs.	Share
more-left	179,601	49.9%
less-left	180,475	50.1%
Silent	27,884	7.2%

Values message. The values/worldview the candidate's message invokes (17-item Democratic pool: 7 working-class (WC) and 7 professional-managerial (PMC) framings across 7 dimensions, plus 3 democracy/anti-Trump appeals for Democrats).

Level	Obs.	Share
WC	167,039	43.1%
PMC	166,195	42.8%
Democracy/anti-Trump	54,726	14.1%

Group appeal. Whom the candidate says politicians should listen to more: working-class people (WC), the middle/upper class (MU), everyone (Neutral), or a demographic group.

Level	Obs.	Share
WC	77,712	20.0%
MU	116,308	30.0%
Neutral	116,082	29.9%
Demographic	77,858	20.1%

Social/cultural position. The candidate's stance on culture and climate issues (19 options): progressive, moderate, or no stated position (silent).

Level	Obs.	Share
Progressive	203,536	52.5%
Moderate	152,628	39.3%
Silent	31,796	8.2%

In addition, each candidate is randomly assigned a *race* and *gender*; these are analyzed in the report's demographic-affinity section and are documented with the rest of the supplementary tables.

4. Estimation

Marginal means

For each attribute level we report the marginal mean: the weighted share of voters who choose the Democratic candidate, averaged over all other randomized features, when the Democrat carries that level. A marginal mean describes the level of support at one attribute level and stands on its own, which is what makes it readable as "the Democrat draws 49.7% of working-class voters when running on tuition-free community college." Every effect in the report is the difference between two such marginal means, and each section states the two levels being compared. We report differences this way, rather than as coefficients relative to a fixed reference level, because the comparison stays meaningful when we move between voter groups: a difference between two levels means the same thing in every subgroup, whereas a coefficient depends on which level was designated the reference. We multiply by 100 to express effects in percentage points.

Weighting, clustering, and standard errors

Estimates are produced with survey-design methods (the `survey` package in R). The design declares the rake `weight` and clusters observations by respondent, so standard errors account both for the weighting and for the fact that each respondent contributes multiple correlated task-rows:

```
svydesign(ids = ~respondent_id, weights = ~weight, data = tasks)
```

Marginal means use `svymean`/`svyby`; level differences and interaction effects use weighted linear models (`svyglm`) on the binary Democratic-choice outcome, with the same design. Point estimates are robust to the choice of linear vs. logistic link; we report linear-probability effects because they are directly interpretable in percentage points.

Statistical significance and multiple comparisons

To keep the text readable the report does not print individual p-values: every cited estimate is significant at the .05 level or better *unless* explicitly flagged "not significant" (n.s.). Because the report makes many subgroup claims, the main report separately re-tests every executive-summary claim under a correction for multiple comparisons; the central dials survive even the strictest correction.

5. Descriptive results: marginal means by attribute and class

The table gives the weighted Democratic-vote marginal mean (in %) for every attribute level, among all respondents and within the two main class groups, with survey-clustered standard errors in parentheses. Reading down an attribute shows which levels help the Democrat; differences between levels are the effects discussed in the report.

Attribute/level	All	Working class	Middle/upper
Candidate occupation/background			
Upper-middle class	46.9 (0.3)	45.8 (0.5)	48.9 (0.6)
Middle-class	47.1 (0.3)	46.5 (0.5)	48.9 (0.6)
Pink-collar	47.5 (0.3)	47.0 (0.5)	48.8 (0.7)
Small business	47.4 (0.5)	47.3 (0.8)	48.9 (1.0)
Working-class	47.0 (0.3)	46.7 (0.4)	48.0 (0.6)
Campaign rhetoric (populist tone)			
People-centric	47.4 (0.3)	47.0 (0.4)	48.5 (0.6)
Anti-political elite	48.0 (0.3)	47.4 (0.5)	49.6 (0.7)
Anti-economic elite	47.4 (0.3)	46.9 (0.5)	48.6 (0.7)
Other	46.3 (0.3)	45.4 (0.4)	48.2 (0.6)
Issue priority			
Economic	47.6 (0.3)	47.0 (0.4)	48.8 (0.5)
Social	46.6 (0.3)	46.1 (0.4)	48.4 (0.5)
Economic position			
more-left	46.9 (0.3)	46.4 (0.4)	48.3 (0.5)
less-left	47.9 (0.3)	47.3 (0.4)	49.4 (0.5)
Values message			
WC	47.4 (0.3)	46.9 (0.4)	49.0 (0.5)
PMC	46.8 (0.3)	46.2 (0.4)	48.1 (0.5)
Democracy/anti-Trump	47.2 (0.4)	46.5 (0.6)	49.0 (0.7)
Group appeal			
WC	48.3 (0.3)	48.0 (0.5)	49.9 (0.6)

Attribute/level	All	Working class	Middle/upper
MU	46.9 (0.3)	46.1 (0.4)	48.6 (0.6)
Neutral	47.6 (0.3)	46.9 (0.4)	49.1 (0.6)
Demographic	45.5 (0.3)	45.2 (0.5)	46.7 (0.6)
Social/cultural position			
Progressive	46.2 (0.3)	45.6 (0.4)	47.7 (0.5)
Moderate	48.4 (0.3)	47.8 (0.4)	49.9 (0.5)
Silent	47.0 (0.4)	46.4 (0.7)	48.4 (0.9)

Cells are weighted Democratic-vote shares (%); survey-clustered standard errors in parentheses. "All" uses the full weighted sample (party-balanced rake); the class columns use our income × education definition.

Candidate race and gender

Each candidate is also randomly assigned a race and a gender. Unlike the other attributes, these barely move the vote: the marginal means are flat across levels and the differences are not statistically significant. The table reports the weighted Democratic-vote marginal mean (%) by candidate race and gender, overall and by voter class, with standard errors in parentheses.

Candidate attribute	All	Working class	Middle/upper
Candidate race			
White	46.7 (0.2)	46.0 (0.4)	48.6 (0.5)
Black	47.2 (0.3)	46.3 (0.5)	49.1 (0.6)
Latino	46.6 (0.3)	46.8 (0.5)	47.6 (0.6)
Asian	47.0 (0.4)	46.5 (0.7)	50.0 (0.8)
Candidate gender			
Female	46.8 (0.3)	46.3 (0.5)	48.3 (0.5)
Male	46.8 (0.2)	46.2 (0.4)	48.7 (0.4)

Weighted Democratic-vote marginal means (%), with standard errors. None of the within-attribute differences are statistically significant: voters do not reward or penalize a candidate's race or gender on average (the report's demographic-affinity section examines the small shared-race affinities in detail).

6. Additional results and coding detail

Candidate occupation in full

Full detail behind the candidate-background dial (see the candidate-background section of the main report). All numbers are survey-weighted working-class (income×education) Democratic support; occupation is randomly assigned to each candidate, so differences are causal marginal effects. Each occupation is reported as the difference between its own marginal mean and that of the upper-middle/elite-professional occupations (lawyer, corporate executive, investment banker, management consultant, hospital administrator), whose marginal mean averages 46.1%. That group is the comparison chosen for this section, not a reference level in an estimated model: as everywhere else in the report, both quantities are marginal means and the effect is their difference.

A.1 Every specific occupation, ranked (most to least popular). Working-class Democratic support when the candidate holds each specific job; the last column is the gap versus the average elite-professional occupation.

#	Occupation	Category	WC support	95% CI	vs. elite-prof.
1	Receptionist	Working-class	48.1%	46.5–49.7	+1.9
2	Elementary school teacher	Pink-collar	48.1%	46.4–49.7	+1.9
3	Civil engineer	Middle-class	47.4%	45.7–49.0	+1.2
4	Small business owner	Small business	47.3%	45.7–48.9	+1.1
5	Mechanic	Working-class	47.3%	45.7–48.9	+1.1
6	Librarian	Pink-collar	47.2%	45.6–48.8	+1.0
7	Manager at a non-profit	Middle-class	46.9%	45.3–48.5	+0.8
8	Software developer	Middle-class	46.8%	45.3–48.4	+0.7
9	Nurse	Pink-collar	46.8%	45.2–48.3	+0.6
10	Factory worker	Working-class	46.7%	45.1–48.3	+0.6
11	Bank teller	Working-class	46.6%	45.0–48.2	+0.4
12	Investment banker	Upper-middle class	46.6%	45.0–48.2	+0.4
13	Bartender	Working-class	46.3%	44.7–48.0	+0.2
14	Social worker	Pink-collar	46.1%	44.4–47.7	-0.1
15	Architect	Middle-class	45.9%	44.3–47.5	-0.2
16	Management consultant	Upper-middle class	45.9%	44.3–47.5	-0.3
17	Corporate executive	Upper-middle class	45.9%	44.2–47.5	-0.3
18	Retail sales associate	Working-class	45.6%	44.0–47.2	-0.5
19	Lawyer	Upper-middle class	45.6%	44.0–47.2	-0.5
20	Journalist	Middle-class	45.5%	43.9–47.1	-0.7
21	Hospital administrator	Upper-middle class	45.0%	43.4–46.6	-1.2

The 95% confidence interval is the ordinary sampling interval around each occupation's estimate. Intervals for neighboring occupations overlap heavily, so the ranking should be read as a rough ordering rather than a precise one.

A.2 The five occupation categories.

Occupation category	WC support	vs. elite-prof.	p
Upper-middle/elite professional	45.8%	— (comparison)	—
Small business	47.3%	+1.5 pp	0.068
Pink-collar	47.0%	+1.2 pp	0.015
Working-class	46.7%	+0.9 pp	0.038
Middle-class	46.5%	+0.7 pp	0.133
Non-elite (pooled)	—	**+1.0 pp**	**0.011**

A.3 Non-elite vs. elite-professional gap, by working-class subgroup. *Every row is working-class respondents only; the subgroups are defined within the working class, so "Non-white" means working-class voters of color.*

Cut	Working-class subgroup	Gap (pp)	p	n
Overall	*All working class*	+1.0	0.011	14,559
Race	Non-white	+1.6	0.009	5,831
Place	Big city/suburb	+1.6	0.002	8,657
Race	Hispanic	+1.4	0.127	2,296
Gender	Male	+1.4	0.018	6,330
Age	Under 45	+1.4	0.011	7,342
Ideology	Moderate	+1.3	0.056	4,792
Union	Union household	+1.2	0.030	6,510
Party	Republican	+1.2	0.012	4,755
Party	Independent	+1.2	0.078	3,893
2024 vote	Trump '24	+1.2	0.012	5,821
Union	Non-union	+1.1	0.053	6,963
2024 vote	Harris '24	+1.1	0.060	5,208
Anti-elite attitudes	Govt run by big interests	+1.0	0.041	9,454
2024 vote	Didn't vote '24	+0.9	0.307	2,967
Anti-elite attitudes	Govt for all	+0.9	0.389	2,149
Race	Black	+0.8	0.373	2,408
Place	Rural/small town	+0.7	0.365	3,091
Ideology	Conservative	+0.7	0.228	4,581
Gender	Female	+0.6	0.210	8,229
Ideology	Liberal	+0.6	0.363	4,003
Age	45 or older	+0.6	0.274	7,217
Race	White	+0.5	0.319	8,728
Party	Democrat	+0.2	0.760	4,830
Place	Small city/big town	-0.3	0.755	2,742

A.4 Which occupational *category* matters most, within each working-class subgroup. Effect of each category vs. elite-professional (pp).

Working-class subgroup	Category	vs. elite-prof. (pp)	p
Big city/suburb	Small business	+2.5	0.015
Big city/suburb	Pink-collar	+2.1	0.002
Big city/suburb	Working-class	+1.5	0.012
Big city/suburb	Middle-class	+1.1	0.066
Govt run by big interests	Small business	+0.7	0.488
Govt run by big interests	Pink-collar	+1.2	0.057
Govt run by big interests	Working-class	+1.1	0.056
Govt run by big interests	Middle-class	+0.7	0.208
Male	Small business	+2.2	0.076
Male	Pink-collar	+1.3	0.086
Male	Working-class	+1.5	0.037
Male	Middle-class	+1.2	0.090
Non-white	Small business	+2.1	0.096
Non-white	Pink-collar	+1.7	0.031
Non-white	Working-class	+1.9	0.007
Non-white	Middle-class	+1.0	0.182
Republican	Small business	+2.0	0.060
Republican	Pink-collar	+1.0	0.124
Republican	Working-class	+1.2	0.031
Republican	Middle-class	+1.2	0.052

Working-class subgroup	Category	vs. elite-prof. (pp)	p
Trump '24	Small business	+1.1	0.283
Trump '24	Pink-collar	+1.1	0.083
Trump '24	Working-class	+1.3	0.018
Trump '24	Middle-class	+1.1	0.062
Under 45	Small business	+2.7	0.019
Under 45	Pink-collar	+1.7	0.021
Under 45	Working-class	+1.4	0.027
Under 45	Middle-class	+0.8	0.232

Significant differences between all individual levels

This table shows results for every individual attribute level (all 21 occupations, all 19 social-issue positions, and all 45 economic-policy variants) rather than the grouped categories. **Working-class respondents only.** It lists the largest significant differences within each attribute (up to 12 per attribute, by size):

Attribute	Level A	Level B	Diff (pp)
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should give the American peo...	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	+5.0
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	Thinks that we should respond to the needs ...	-4.4
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	Thinks that we should respond to the needs ...	-4.3
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should give the American peo...	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	+4.0
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should avoid extreme positio...	Thinks that we should give the American peo...	-3.7
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	Thinks that we should listen more to the Am...	-3.5
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	Thinks that we should listen more to what t...	-3.4
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should give the American peo...	Thinks that we should listen more to expert...	+3.3
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should give the American peo...	Thinks that we should make government work ...	+3.3
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should avoid extreme positio...	Thinks that we should respond to the needs ...	-3.1
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should give the American peo...	Thinks that we should listen more to the Am...	+3.0
Campaign rhetoric	Thinks that we should avoid extreme positio...	Thinks that we should respond to the needs ...	-3.0
Candidate background (occupation)	Hospital administrator	Receptionist	-3.1
Candidate background (occupation)	Elementary school teacher	Hospital administrator	+3.1
Candidate background (occupation)	Journalist	Receptionist	-2.6
Candidate background (occupation)	Elementary school teacher	Journalist	+2.6
Candidate background (occupation)	Lawyer	Receptionist	-2.5
Candidate background (occupation)	Receptionist	Retail sales associate	+2.5
Candidate background (occupation)	Elementary school teacher	Lawyer	+2.4
Candidate background (occupation)	Elementary school teacher	Retail sales associate	+2.4
Candidate background (occupation)	Civil engineer	Hospital administrator	+2.4
Candidate background (occupation)	Hospital administrator	Small business owner	-2.3
Candidate background (occupation)	Hospital administrator	Mechanic	-2.3
Candidate background (occupation)	Corporate executive	Receptionist	-2.2
Economic policy	Cap medical debt payments at 10% of income ...	Make community college tuition-free for all...	-6.4

Attribute	Level A	Level B	Diff (pp)
Economic policy	Make community college tuition-free for all...	Provide $500 per month to all adults regard...	+6.2
Economic policy	Allow large business mergers as long as com...	Make community college tuition-free for all...	-6.1
Economic policy	Make community college tuition-free for all...	Raise the corporate tax rate from 21% to 28%.	+5.9
Economic policy	Cap medical debt payments at 10% of income ...	Remove medical debt from credit reports.	-5.9
Economic policy	Break up large companies that crowd out sma...	Make community college tuition-free for all...	-5.8
Economic policy	Provide $500 per month to all adults regard...	Remove medical debt from credit reports.	-5.8
Economic policy	Allow large business mergers as long as com...	Remove medical debt from credit reports.	-5.6
Economic policy	Raise the corporate tax rate from 21% to 28%.	Remove medical debt from credit reports.	-5.5
Economic policy	Cap medical debt payments at 10% of income ...	Protect workers from being fired for union ...	-5.4
Economic policy	Break up large companies that crowd out sma...	Remove medical debt from credit reports.	-5.4
Economic policy	Make community college tuition-free for all...	Provide unemployment benefits that replace ...	+5.3
Group appeal	people with political experience	working-class people	-4.6
Group appeal	business leaders	working-class people	-4.5
Group appeal	Black and Hispanic Americans	working-class people	-4.3
Group appeal	women	working-class people	-4.3
Group appeal	people from all walks of life	people with political experience	+4.2
Group appeal	business leaders	people from all walks of life	-4.1
Group appeal	policy experts and scientists	working-class people	-4.0
Group appeal	Black and Hispanic Americans	people from all walks of life	-3.9
Group appeal	people from all walks of life	women	+3.9
Group appeal	people from all walks of life	policy experts and scientists	+3.6
Group appeal	middle-class people	people with political experience	+3.0
Group appeal	blue-collar workers	working-class people	-2.9
Issue priority	Economic	Social	+0.9
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Increase federal funding for local police d...	-11.6
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Require ICE agents to wear uniforms and bod...	-11.4
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Secure the border first, then provide a pat...	-11.3
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Require background checks for most gun sale...	-10.6
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Require energy companies to gradually shift...	-10.3
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Require 100% clean energy by 2050, end all ...	-9.9
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Provide a path to citizenship for immigrant...	-9.8
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Offer tax incentives to companies that crea...	-9.7

Attribute	Level A	Level B	Diff (pp)
Social/cultural position	Abolish ICE and ban enforcement actions aga...	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	+9.3
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Provide a path to citizenship for all undoc...	-8.7
Social/cultural position	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	Restore the right to abortion up to viabili...	-7.9
Social/cultural position	Allow abortion up to 15 weeks of pregnancy,...	Allow transgender girls to play on girls' s...	+7.5
Values	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	that we should take care of our own communi...	-3.3
Values	that keeping families and communities safe ...	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	+2.7
Values	that people should be able to express their...	that we should take care of our own communi...	-2.6
Values	that America is stronger when we learn from...	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	+2.6
Values	that people who play by the rules shouldn't...	that we should take care of our own communi...	-2.5
Values	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	we must strengthen enforcement of democrati...	-2.4
Values	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	that strong families are the backbone of a ...	-2.4
Values	Republicans use culture war fights to divid...	that we should take care of our own communi...	-2.3
Values	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	that politicians should tell it like it is ...	-2.3
Values	that it's important to take time to explain...	that we should take care of our own communi...	-2.3
Values	that life is about finding your own path an...	that people shouldn't be defined by traditi...	+2.1
Values	that keeping families and communities safe ...	that people should be able to express their...	+2.0

Every executive-summary claim under multiple-comparison correction

Because the report makes many quantitative claims, especially subgroup claims, and because with enough comparisons a few will cross the .05 line by chance, we re-test *every* claim in the executive summary jointly, as one family of 33 hypotheses, and adjust the p-values for multiple comparisons. We use two corrections. Benjamini–Hochberg (FDR) controls the *false-discovery rate*, the expected share of the "significant" findings that are false; it is the right correction when many of the tests are correlated subgroup cuts, as here. Bonferroni controls the *family-wise error rate*, the chance of even one false positive; it is the most conservative option and is over-strict for positively correlated tests, so failing Bonferroni does not mean a claim is false, only that it is not among the very strongest.

The result. Of the 33 claims, 30 are significant at the raw .05 level; 30 survive the FDR correction and 12 survive Bonferroni. The central dials, working-class-resonant culture (and its subgroups), leading on economics, the populist-vs-technocratic effect, centering working-class people, and the redistribution-not-predistribution penalty, survive *every* correction. The finer subgroup and smaller-dial claims survive the FDR correction but not Bonferroni.

Executive-summary claim	**Effect**	**raw p**	**FDR p**	**Bonf. p**	**FDR**	**Bonf.**
Resonance: white WC	+3.9	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	Y	Y
Dial: WC-resonant culture (overall)	+2.9	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	Y	Y

Executive-summary claim	Effect	raw p	FDR p	Bonf. p	FDR	Bonf.
Resonance: WC Republicans	+3.4	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	Y	Y
Dial: lead on economics (overall)	+2.8	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	Y	Y
Resonance: 2024 Trump voters	+2.9	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	Y	Y
Resonance: independents	+3.6	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	Y	Y
Dial: populist vs technocratic tone (overall)	+1.8	<.0001	<.0001	.0002	Y	Y
Appeal: high anti-elite attitudes	+3.4	<.0001	<.0001	.0003	Y	Y
Appeal: high resentment of rich	+3.2	<.0001	<.0001	.0003	Y	Y
Dial: working-class appeal (overall)	+1.9	<.0001	.0001	.0015	Y	Y
Progressive redistribution vs moderate	−1.9	<.0001	.0001	.0015	Y	Y
Appeal: independents	+2.8	.0007	.0020	.0243	Y	Y
Background: big-city/suburb	+1.6	.0015	.0039	.0508	Y	–
Appeal: moderates	+2.5	.0017	.0040	.0576	Y	–
Values: 2024 Trump voters	+1.4	.0018	.0040	.0607	Y	–
WC vs elite candidate (WC by BOTH defs)	+2.5	.0070	.0140	.2310	Y	–
Populism (anti-political): 2024 Trump voters	+1.7	.0072	.0140	.2372	Y	–
Background: WC of color	+1.6	.0087	.0159	.2865	Y	–
Background: under-45	+1.4	.0112	.0186	.3711	Y	–
Dial: non-elite background (overall)	+1.0	.0113	.0186	.3744	Y	–
Background: 2024 Trump voters	+1.2	.0118	.0186	.3904	Y	–
Background: men	+1.4	.0184	.0275	.6065	Y	–
Populism (anti-political): conservatives	+1.8	.0194	.0275	.6415	Y	–
Any non-elite vs elite candidate (tactics WC)	+1.0	.0200	.0275	.6600	Y	–
Values x policy interaction	+1.6	.0255	.0337	.8413	Y	–
$15-17 minimum wage: WC Democrats	+4.2	.0282	.0357	.9290	Y	–
Right-to-organize gain: WC of color	+4.7	.0301	.0357	.9922	Y	–
Background: union households	+1.2	.0303	.0357	1.0000	Y	–
Dial: working-class values (overall)	+0.7	.0439	.0497	1.0000	Y	–
Values: WC Republicans	+0.9	.0452	.0497	1.0000	Y	–
WC vs elite candidate (tactics WC, realistic)	+1.0	.0500	.0532	1.0000	–	–
Populism (anti-political): independents	+1.1	.1924	.1984	1.0000	–	–
Progressive predistribution vs moderate	+0.1	.7570	.7570	1.0000	–	–

Effects are in percentage points and reproduce the figure cited in the executive summary; rows are sorted from smallest to largest raw p. "Y" means the claim is still significant (adjusted $p < .05$) under that correction. p-values come from survey-weighted, respondent-clustered models; adjustments are computed over the full 33-claim family.

Working-class values and the position-by-position resonance coding

*This gives the value definitions and the full coding behind the working-class-*resonance *cut of the social dial used in the main results. The framework, and the validation behind it, come from the Williams–Abbott* Class Gaps *report and the related CWCP/Williams tactics report.* The values we map each position onto are the five working-class values named in the Class Gaps report. Our working definitions:

- *Loyalty to community and country*, putting one's own community and country first; local solidarity and patriotism rather than a cosmopolitan or global frame.
- *Family and self-discipline*, "family comes first," pride in hard work and personal responsibility, and a preference for stability, rewarding people who work hard and "play by the rules" rather than prizing self-actualization and personal growth.
- *Traditionalism*, a preference for the familiar anchors of family, faith, and community and for the proven over the experimental. For voters whose economic lives are already precarious, continuity

and stability are themselves valued goods, and rapid, elite-driven cultural change can read as one more disruption imposed from above; positions that respect established institutions and ways of life therefore land better than those that signal a break with them.

- *Safety as a priority*, a view of the world as a place of real threats, in which protecting one's family and following the rules are core duties and safe streets and a secure border are first-order concerns, rather than safety treated as a given.
- *Resentment/skepticism of experts*, distrust of credentialed elites and institutions seen as talking down to, or overlooking, working people.

A position is coded *WC-resonant* if it taps one of these and *not-resonant* if it cuts against them. The "value it taps" column is *illustrative*. Each position:

Social position	**Issue**	**Resonant?**	**Working-class value it taps**
Abortion legal in all cases	Abortion	No	Elite focus on career and sexual self-actualization vs. WC "family comes first"
100% clean energy by 2050, end fossil subsidies	Climate	No	Elite focus on the end of the world vs. WC "the end of the month"
Ban assault rifles	Guns	No	Elite trust of regulation vs. WC suspicion of it
Abolish ICE	ICE	No	Elite cosmopolitanism vs. WC loyalty to community and country
Citizenship for all undocumented	Immigration	No	Elite cosmopolitanism vs. WC loyalty to community and country
Reduce police funding/redirect	Police	No	Elite "security as a given" vs. WC "security as a priority"
Allow trans girls on girls' teams	Trans sports	No	WC embrace of traditional gender roles
Abortion up to 15 weeks w/ exceptions	Abortion	**Yes**	WC "family comes first"
Restore up to viability w/ exceptions	Abortion	**Yes**	WC "family comes first"
Climate via clean-energy jobs/incentives	Climate	**Yes**	WC jobs
Clean-energy transition + help displaced workers	Climate	**Yes**	WC jobs
Background checks incl. gun shows	Guns	**Yes**	Personal security as a priority
ICE uniforms & body cameras	ICE	**Yes**	Personal responsibility
Secure border first, then path to status	Immigration	**Yes**	Personal security as a priority
Citizenship for those who worked & paid taxes	Immigration	**Yes**	Reward hard work & personal responsibility
Police body cameras + de-escalation	Police	**Yes**	Personal responsibility
Leave trans-sports to local districts	Trans sports	**Yes**	Loyalty to community vs. distant elites

Economic policies: the working-class-value coding. Each economic policy is scored on the working-class value it engages, using the same five-value framework as the social positions above.

Economic policy	**Position**	**Resonant?**	**Value judged against**	**WC %**
Make community college tuition-free for all students.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	49.7

Economic policy	Position	Resonant?	Value judged against	WC %
Remove medical debt from credit reports.	moderate	No	Personal security	49.3
Protect workers from being fired for union organizing, actively make it easier to form ...	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	48.8
Cap the monthly cost of insulin and other essential medications at $35 for all Americans.	moderate	**Yes**	Personal security	48.7
Maintain food assistance programs and ensure all eligible families can access their ben...	moderate	No	Work & self-discipline	48.4
Maintain existing federal grants and income-based repayment plans that help low- and mi...	moderate	No	Work & self-discipline	48.3
Provide tax incentives to employers that create apprenticeship and job training program...	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	48.3
Provide unemployment benefits that replace about half of a worker's wages for up to fou...	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	48.3
Fund 500,000 new apprenticeship and job training slots in skilled trades each year.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	48.2
Maintain current Social Security benefits and oppose any cuts or changes to eligibility.	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.9
Raise the federal minimum wage to $17 an hour.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.8
Fund job training programs to help people get jobs in construction and skilled trades.	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.7
Provide a $500 annual tax rebate to every working American earning under $75,000 per year.	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.6
Increase monthly Social Security checks by 2%.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.6
Protect workers from being fired for union organizing and require companies to negotiat...	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.6
Create 1 million public jobs rebuilding roads, bridges, and public buildings.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.5
Increase monthly Social Security checks by 5%.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	47.4
Increase food assistance benefits by 30% for current recipients.	progressive	No	Work & self-discipline	47.4
Fine large companies for major unjustified price increases on groceries, gas, housing, ...	progressive	**Yes**	Resentment of elites	47.2
Offer tax credits to American companies that invest in U.S. manufacturing and create ne...	moderate	**Yes**	Place loyalty	47.1
Allow any American to buy into Medicare if they choose.	progressive	No	Personal security	47.0
Close tax loopholes and deductions that let large corporations pay less than the offici...	moderate	**Yes**	Resentment of elites	46.9
Require large corporations to disclose profit margins when they raise prices on groceri...	moderate	**Yes**	Resentment of elites	46.8
Expand Medicare to cover all Americans.	progressive	No	Personal security	46.7
Raise the federal minimum wage to $10 an hour.	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	46.7
Invest $150 billion every year in U.S. manufacturing and infrastructure to create new j...	progressive	**Yes**	Place loyalty	46.6

Economic policy	Position	Resonant?	Value judged against	WC %
Provide unemployment benefits that replace most of a worker's wages for up to one year.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	46.5
Expand Medicaid to cover low-income adults in all states.	moderate	No	Personal security	46.4
Make public college tuition-free for all students.	progressive	No	Work & self-discipline	46.2
Provide $1,000 per month to all adults regardless of income or work status.	progressive	No	Work & self-discipline	46.2
Cap out-of-pocket health care costs at $2,000 per year for families.	progressive	No	Personal security	46.2
Cap out-of-pocket health care costs at $5,000 per year for families.	progressive	No	Personal security	46.0
Require companies that move jobs overseas to give workers at least 90 days advance notice.	moderate	**Yes**	Place loyalty	45.8
Raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour.	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	45.8
Cap medical debt payments at 20% of income per year.	progressive	No	Personal security	45.6
Increase food assistance benefits by 15% for current recipients.	progressive	No	Work & self-discipline	45.3
Raise the corporate tax rate from 21% to 35%.	progressive	No	Resentment of elites	45.0
Require companies that move jobs overseas to pay back any federal tax breaks they recei...	progressive	**Yes**	Place loyalty	44.9
Raise the federal minimum wage to $12 an hour.	moderate	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	44.6
Provide unemployment benefits that replace about 60% of a worker's wages for up to six ...	progressive	**Yes**	Work & self-discipline	44.4
Break up large companies that crowd out small businesses and raise prices.	progressive	**Yes**	Resentment of elites	43.9
Raise the corporate tax rate from 21% to 28%.	progressive	No	Resentment of elites	43.8
Allow large business mergers as long as companies can show they will not significantly ...	moderate	No	Resentment of elites	43.6
Provide $500 per month to all adults regardless of income or work status.	progressive	No	Work & self-discipline	43.5
Cap medical debt payments at 10% of income per year.	progressive	No	Personal security	43.4

The values messages we tested (the values dial). The values dial randomized the candidate's values *message* across seven paired dimensions, each with a working-class (WC) and a middle/upper-class (M/U) version, plus three Democratic "defend democracy" messages. The full battery:

Value dimension	Working-class message	Middle/upper-class message
Discipline & self-reliance vs. self-expression	"Self-discipline, self-reliance, and doing what needs to be done are core values."	"Life is about finding your own path and personal fulfillment."
Security vs. freedom	"Keeping families and communities safe has to be a top priority."	"We should never give up our freedoms in the name of security."

Value dimension	Working-class message	Middle/upper-class message
Talk style	"Politicians should tell it like it is and not hide behind fancy words."	"It's important to take time to explain the nuances and tradeoffs of different policy options."
Rootedness vs. cosmopolitanism	"We should take care of our own communities and country first."	"America is stronger when we learn from other cultures and ideas."
Rules vs. autonomy	"People who play by the rules shouldn't be the ones falling behind."	"People should be able to express their individuality so they can live up to their potential."
Family vs. individual identity	"Strong families are the backbone of a strong community."	"People shouldn't be defined by traditional family roles."
Tradition vs. change	"Our traditions and values hold us together."	"Our institutions need to be updated to keep up with social change and allow for individuality."

"Defend democracy" messages (Democratic candidates only): (1) "Republicans use culture war fights to divide and distract us from the issues that matter to most Americans." (2) "We must strengthen enforcement of democratic norms and prosecute officials like Trump who undermine our institutions." (3) "Officials who break the rules, including Trump, must be held accountable, so the American people don't pay the price."

7. Support for individual policies and messages

Social and cultural positions

Social/cultural position	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Increase federal funding for local police departments to purchase body cameras and provide de-escalation training.	49.9%	+3.2	4,733
Require ICE agents to wear uniforms and body cameras, and ban enforcement actions against immigrants with no criminal record.	49.7%	+2.9	9,526
Secure the border first, then provide a path to legal status for immigrants who have been here long-term, paid taxes, and stayed out of trouble.	49.6%	+2.8	4,873
Require background checks for most gun sales, including sales at gun shows.	48.9%	+2.2	9,442
Require energy companies to gradually shift to cleaner power sources, and help workers whose jobs are lost in the process find new ones.	48.6%	+1.9	4,737
Require 100% clean energy by 2050, end all subsidies for fossil fuel companies, and help workers whose jobs are lost in the process find new ones.	48.2%	+1.4	9,426
Provide a path to citizenship for immigrants who have held jobs, paid taxes, and stayed out of trouble.	48.1%	+1.3	4,552
Offer tax incentives to companies that create jobs building solar panels, wind turbines, and batteries.	48.0%	+1.3	4,727
Abolish ICE and ban enforcement actions against immigrants with no criminal record.	47.7%	+0.9	9,635
Provide a path to citizenship for all undocumented immigrants living in the U.S.	47.1%	+0.3	9,377

Social/cultural position	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Require students to compete on sports teams that match their sex at birth, while treating all students fairly and without discrimination.	46.9%	+0.1	4,580
Increase federal funding for local police departments to hire more officers and put more officers on the street.	46.5%	-0.3	4,718
Restore the right to abortion up to viability (around 24 weeks) with exceptions for rape, incest, fetal death or the mother's health after that point.	46.2%	-0.5	4,786
Allow abortion up to 15 weeks of pregnancy, with exceptions for rape, incest, fetal death or the mother's health after that point.	45.9%	-0.9	9,328
Make abortion legal in all cases.	45.9%	-0.9	4,760
Ban the sale of military-style assault rifles.	44.9%	-1.9	9,317
Reduce police funding and redirect resources to mental health responders, social workers, and community programs.	44.2%	-2.6	9,616
Leave decisions about which sports teams transgender students can join to local school districts and sports governing bodies.	43.9%	-2.8	4,841
Allow transgender girls to play on girls' sports teams, while treating all students fairly and without discrimination.	38.3%	-8.4	9,527
Set average	**46.8%**		

Economic policies, pooled by issue

Issue area	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Apprenticeships	48.2%	+1.4	8,310
Unions	48.2%	+1.3	8,339
Higher education	48.1%	+1.3	7,503
Social Security	47.7%	+0.9	7,678
Jobs programs	47.6%	+0.8	8,129
Food assistance	47.4%	+0.5	7,413
Health costs	47.4%	+0.5	7,184
Price gouging	47.0%	+0.2	8,271
Medical debt	46.9%	+0.1	7,240
Manufacturing	46.9%	+0.0	8,460
Unemployment ins.	46.8%	+0.0	7,581
Medicaid/Medicare	46.6%	-0.2	7,523
Cash/UBI	46.2%	-0.6	7,576
Minimum wage	46.2%	-0.6	8,522
Corporate taxes	45.7%	-1.2	7,473
Offshoring/layoffs	45.3%	-1.5	8,337
Antitrust	43.8%	-3.1	8,376
Set average	**46.8%**		

Issue areas pool every policy variant tested within the area, weighted by the number of observations.

Economic policies, every variant

Economic policy	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Make community college tuition-free for all students.	49.7%	+3.1	1,749
Remove medical debt from credit reports.	49.3%	+2.6	3,616

Economic policy	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Protect workers from being fired for union organizing, actively make it easier to form unions, and penalize companies that try to stop them.	48.8%	+2.1	4,153
Cap the monthly cost of insulin and other essential medications at $35 for all Americans.	48.7%	+2.1	3,548
Maintain food assistance programs and ensure all eligible families can access their benefits.	48.4%	+1.7	3,713
Maintain existing federal grants and income-based repayment plans that help low- and middle-income students.	48.3%	+1.7	3,786
Provide tax incentives to employers that create apprenticeship and job training programs in skilled trades.	48.3%	+1.6	4,173
Provide unemployment benefits that replace about half of a worker's wages for up to four months, with a requirement to participate in job training after the first three months.	48.3%	+1.6	3,735
Fund 500,000 new apprenticeship and job training slots in skilled trades each year.	48.2%	+1.6	4,137
Maintain current Social Security benefits and oppose any cuts or changes to eligibility.	47.9%	+1.2	3,893
Raise the federal minimum wage to $17 an hour.	47.8%	+1.2	2,094
Fund job training programs to help people get jobs in construction and skilled trades.	47.7%	+1.0	4,038
Provide a $500 annual tax rebate to every working American earning under $75,000 per year.	47.6%	+1.0	3,811
Increase monthly Social Security checks by 2%.	47.6%	+1.0	1,957
Protect workers from being fired for union organizing and require companies to negotiate once workers vote to unionize.	47.6%	+0.9	4,186
Create 1 million public jobs rebuilding roads, bridges, and public buildings.	47.5%	+0.9	4,091
Increase monthly Social Security checks by 5%.	47.4%	+0.8	1,828
Increase food assistance benefits by 30% for current recipients.	47.4%	+0.8	1,875
Fine large companies for major unjustified price increases on groceries, gas, housing, and utilities.	47.2%	+0.5	4,098
Offer tax credits to American companies that invest in U.S. manufacturing and create new jobs.	47.1%	+0.5	4,217
Allow any American to buy into Medicare if they choose.	47.0%	+0.3	1,907
Close tax loopholes and deductions that let large corporations pay less than the official tax rate.	46.9%	+0.3	3,756
Require large corporations to disclose profit margins when they raise prices on groceries, gas, housing, and utilities.	46.8%	+0.2	4,173
Expand Medicare to cover all Americans.	46.7%	+0.1	1,871
Raise the federal minimum wage to $10 an hour.	46.7%	+0.0	2,110
Invest $150 billion every year in U.S. manufacturing and infrastructure to create new jobs.	46.6%	-0.0	4,243
Provide unemployment benefits that replace most of a worker's wages for up to one year.	46.5%	-0.1	1,928
Expand Medicaid to cover low-income adults in all states.	46.4%	-0.3	3,745
Make public college tuition-free for all students.	46.2%	-0.4	1,968
Provide $1,000 per month to all adults regardless of income or work status.	46.2%	-0.5	1,894
Cap out-of-pocket health care costs at $2,000 per year for families.	46.2%	-0.5	1,784
Cap out-of-pocket health care costs at $5,000 per year for families.	46.0%	-0.6	1,852
Require companies that move jobs overseas to give workers at least 90 days advance notice.	45.8%	-0.8	4,147
Raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour.	45.8%	-0.8	2,170
Cap medical debt payments at 20% of income per year.	45.6%	-1.0	1,874

Economic policy	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Increase food assistance benefits by 15% for current recipients.	45.3%	-1.3	1,825
Raise the corporate tax rate from 21% to 35%.	45.0%	-1.6	1,831
Require companies that move jobs overseas to pay back any federal tax breaks they received.	44.9%	-1.8	4,190
Raise the federal minimum wage to $12 an hour.	44.6%	-2.0	2,148
Provide unemployment benefits that replace about 60% of a worker's wages for up to six months.	44.4%	-2.2	1,918
Break up large companies that crowd out small businesses and raise prices.	43.9%	-2.8	4,272
Raise the corporate tax rate from 21% to 28%.	43.8%	-2.8	1,886
Allow large business mergers as long as companies can show they will not significantly raise prices for consumers.	43.6%	-3.0	4,104
Provide $500 per month to all adults regardless of income or work status.	43.5%	-3.1	1,871
Cap medical debt payments at 10% of income per year.	43.4%	-3.3	1,750
Set average	**46.6%**		

Values messages

Values message	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Says that we should take care of our own communities and country first.	48.1%	+1.5	8,892
Says that keeping families and communities safe has to be a top priority.	47.5%	+0.9	8,887
Says that America is stronger when we learn from other cultures and ideas.	47.4%	+0.8	8,823
Says we must strengthen enforcement of democratic norms and prosecute officials like Trump who undermine our institutions.	47.2%	+0.7	5,195
Says that strong families are the backbone of a strong community.	47.2%	+0.6	8,927
Says that politicians should tell it like it is and not hide behind fancy words.	47.1%	+0.6	8,891
Says officials who break the rules — including Trump — must be held accountable, so the American people don't pay the price.	47.0%	+0.4	5,219
Says that life is about finding your own path and personal fulfillment.	46.9%	+0.4	8,792
Says that we should never give up our freedoms in the name of security.	46.6%	+0.0	8,967
Says that our traditions and values hold us together.	46.6%	+0.0	8,869
Says that self-discipline, self-reliance, and doing what needs to be done are core values.	46.3%	-0.3	8,872
Says that our institutions need to be updated to keep up with social change and allow for individuality.	46.2%	-0.4	9,009
Says that it's important to take time to explain the nuances and tradeoffs of different policy options.	45.8%	-0.7	8,753
Says Republicans use culture war fights to divide and distract us from the issues that matter to most Americans.	45.8%	-0.8	9,837
Says that people who play by the rules shouldn't be the ones falling behind.	45.6%	-1.0	8,872
Says that people should be able to express their individuality so they can live up to their potential.	45.5%	-1.0	8,644
Says that people shouldn't be defined by traditional family roles.	44.8%	-1.7	8,868
Set average	**46.6%**		

Candidate occupation

Occupation	WC support	vs. avg	Obs.
Receptionist	48.1%	+1.5	6,968
Elementary school teacher	48.1%	+1.5	6,775
Civil engineer	47.4%	+0.8	6,728
Small business owner	47.3%	+0.7	6,990
Mechanic	47.3%	+0.7	6,879
Librarian	47.2%	+0.6	6,834
Manager at a non-profit	46.9%	+0.4	6,903
Software developer	46.8%	+0.3	6,951
Nurse	46.8%	+0.2	6,876
Factory worker	46.7%	+0.2	7,033
Bank teller	46.6%	+0.0	6,823
Investment banker	46.6%	+0.0	6,965
Bartender	46.3%	-0.2	6,353
Social worker	46.1%	-0.5	6,875
Architect	45.9%	-0.6	6,912
Management consultant	45.9%	-0.7	6,881
Corporate executive	45.9%	-0.7	6,839
Retail sales associate	45.6%	-0.9	6,801
Lawyer	45.6%	-0.9	6,772
Journalist	45.5%	-1.1	6,760
Hospital administrator	45.0%	-1.6	6,919
Set average	**46.5%**		