Does the Descriptive Representation of Gender Influence Accountability for Substantive Representation?

Online Appendix

Summary of roll call votes

The 2006 "Common Content" section of the CCES asked respondents for their positions and perceptions of their senators' positions on six roll call votes:

- A ban on late-term, "partial-birth", abortions

- Providing federal funding for embryonic stem cell research

- Proposals to begin withdrawing troops from Iraq

- Immigration reform to create a guest-worker program and a path to citizenship

- An increase in the federal minimum wage

- Extending the 2003 capital gains tax cuts

- The Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA)

The 2008 Harvard University module of the CCES asked respondents for their positions and perceptions of their senators' positions on four roll call votes:

- The S-CHIP program to provide health insurance for children in low-income families

- Allowing U. S. agencies to eavesdrop on overseas terrorist suspects without a court order

- Withdrawing troops from Iraq within 180 days

- Federal assistance for homeowners facing foreclosure

The 2010 Harvard/MIT and Harvard/UCSD modules of the CCES asked respondents for their positions and perceptions of their senators' positions on six roll call votes:

- The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ("the stimulus")

- The Affordable Care Act ("Obamacare")

- The Dodd-Frank Wall Street reforms

- Repealing the military's "Don't Ask Don't Tell" policy

- Confirming Elena Kagan as a Supreme Court Justice

- Confirming Sonia Sotomayor as a Supreme Court Justice[*]

[*]The survey did not ask for respondents' own preferences on the Sotomayor confirmation. I use that roll call vote in the knowledge scales, but not in the congruence scale.

Table A-1: Unweighted descriptive statistics

	2006				2008				2010			
	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Dependent variables												
Number of questions answered	0	7	4.30	2.54	0	4	2.05	1.62	0	6	3.53	2.39
Male senators			*4.21*	*2.58*			*1.98*	*1.63*			*3.43*	*2.40*
Female senators			*4.57*	*2.39*			*2.23*	*1.59*			*3.82*	*2.35*
Percentage of positions correct	0	100	49.32	32.83	0	100	41.38	37.05	0	100	51.00	38.20
Male senators			*47.74*	*33.27*			*39.35*	*37.07*			*49.76*	*38.83*
Female senators			*53.90*	*31.07*			*46.80*	*36.45*			*54.41*	*36.20*
Approval rating	−2	2	0.07	1.46	−2	2	0.00	1.38	−2	2	−0.08	1.41
Male senators			*0.06*	*1.44*			*−0.01*	*1.35*			*−0.07*	*1.40*
Female senators			*0.10*	*1.54*			*0.01*	*1.48*			*−0.10*	*1.45*
Senator												
Female senator	0	1	0.26	0.44	0	1	0.27	0.44	0	1	0.27	0.44
GOP senator	0	1	0.51	0.50	0	1	0.27	0.44	0	1	0.38	0.49
Ideol. extremism	0	0.9	0.23	0.16	0.04	0.9	0.38	0.14	0.03	0.9	0.39	0.14
On ballot	0	1	0.34	0.48	0	1	0.22	0.41	0	1	0.24	0.43
Decades in office	0	4.8	1.18	0.88	0.2	5	1.28	0.93	0.1	5.2	1.29	0.94
Respondent												
Female	0	1	0.52	0.50	0	1	0.51	0.50	0	1	0.53	0.50
Black	0	1	0.10	0.30	0	1	0.06	0.23	0	1	0.12	0.32
Hispanic	0	1	0.09	0.29	0	1	0.06	0.24	0	1	0.06	0.24
Other race	0	1	0.05	0.21	0	1	0.06	0.23	0	1	0.06	0.24
Strength of party ID	0	3	1.88	1.06	0	3	2.04	1.09	0	3	1.95	1.10
Conservatism	−2	2	0.17	0.99	−2	2	0.20	1.11	−2	2	0.28	1.16
Education:												
High school	0	1	0.31	0.46	0	1	0.35	0.48	0	1	0.20	0.40
Some college	0	1	0.30	0.46	0	1	0.24	0.43	0	1	0.38	0.48
College	0	1	0.25	0.44	0	1	0.28	0.45	0	1	0.28	0.45
Post-college	0	1	0.09	0.29	0	1	0.10	0.30	0	1	0.12	0.33
Congruence												
Policy congruence	0	1	0.52	0.30	0	1	0.51	0.33	0	1	0.54	0.35
Same party	0	1	0.34	0.47	0	1	0.36	0.48	0	1	0.36	0.48
Opposing party	0	1	0.29	0.46	0	1	0.32	0.47	0	1	0.29	0.45

Table A-2: Predicted probabilities of job approval responses, by gender of senator and of respondent

2006

	Male respondents		Female respondents	
	Male senator	Female senator	Male senator	Female senator
Strongly disapprove	.19 [.18, .19]	.20 [.19, .21]	.17 [.16, .17]	.17 [.16, .17]
Disapprove	.23 [.21, .25]	.23 [.21, .25]	.21 [.19, .23]	.21 [.20, .23]
Neither	.17 [.16, .19]	.17 [.16, .18]	.17 [.16, .19]	.17 [.16, .19]
Approve	.31 [.30, .32]	.30 [.29, .31]	.33 [.32, .34]	.33 [.32, .34]
Strongly approve	.10 [.08, .12]	.10 [.08, .12]	.12 [.09, .14]	.12 [.09, .14]

2008

	Male respondents		Female respondents	
	Male senator	Female senator	Male senator	Female senator
Strongly disapprove	.19 [.17, .21]	.24 [.22, .27]	.18 [.16, .20]	.17 [.15, .19]
Disapprove	.20 [.15, .25]	.22 [.18, .27]	.19 [.15, .24]	.18 [.14, .24]
Neither	.22 [.19, .26]	.22 [.19, .25]	.23 [.18, .26]	.22 [.18, .27]
Approve	.27 [.23, .30]	.23 [.19, .27]	.28 [.25, .31]	.29 [.25, .32]
Strongly approve	.11 [.05, .19]	.09 [.04, .14]	.12 [.06, .20]	.13 [.06, .21]

2010

	Male respondents		Female respondents	
	Male senator	Female senator	Male senator	Female senator
Strongly disapprove	.17 [.16, .19]	.19 [.17, .21]	.16 [.15, .17]	.16 [.14, .18]
Disapprove	.33 [.27, .40]	.34 [.29, .41]	.32 [.26, .38]	.32 [.25, .39]
Neither	.14 [.13, .16]	.14 [.13, .15]	.14 [.13, .16]	.14 [.12, .16]
Approve	.30 [.24, .34]	.27 [.22, .32]	.32 [.27, .35]	.31 [.26, .35]
Strongly approve	.06 [.03, .10]	.05 [.02, .09]	.07 [.03, .11]	.06 [.03, .12]

Note: Predicted probabilities and 95% confidence intervals [in brackets] simulated from regression models shown in Table 2. Policy congruence is set to .5; all other variables are set to their mean or mode.

Table A-3: Predicted first differences in job approval responses given shift in policy congruence, by gender of senator and of respondent

2006

	Male respondents		Female respondents	
	Male senator	Female senator	Male senator	Female senator
Strongly disapprove	−.26 [−.27, −.25]	−.33 [−.35, −.32]	−.16 [− .16, −.15]	−.24 [−.26, −.23]
Disapprove	−.13 [−.14, −.12]	−.14 [−.15, −.13]	−.10 [− .11, −.10]	−.14 [−.15, −.14]
Neither	.00 [− .01, .01]	.01 [− .00, .03]	−.01 [− .02, −.00]	−.02 [−.03, −.00]
Approve	.22 [.20, .25]	.27 [.24, .30]	.15 [.13, .17]	.22 [.19, .25]
Strongly approve	.16 [.14, .19]	.20 [.16, .23]	.12 [.10, .14]	.19 [.15, .22]

2008

	Male respondents		Female respondents	
	Male senator	Female senator	Male senator	Female senator
Strongly disapprove	−.24 [−.26, −.22]	−.34 [−.38, −.29]	−.11 [− .13, −.10]	−.16 [−.20, −.13]
Disapprove	−.11 [−.13, −.09]	−.10 [−.12, −.08]	−.06 [− .07, −.05]	−.09 [−.11, −.07]
Neither	.00 [− .03, .06]	.04 [− .00, .10]	−.00 [− .02, .02]	−.01 [− .04, .02]
Approve	.19 [.12, .24]	.23 [.18, .27]	.10 [.07, .13]	.14 [.08, .19]
Strongly approve	.16 [.09, .23]	.16 [.08, .24]	.08 [.04, .13]	.12 [.07, .19]

2010

	Male respondents		Female respondents	
	Male senator	Female senator	Male senator	Female senator
Strongly disapprove	−.22 [−.24, −.20]	−.29 [−.32, −.25]	−.13 [− .15, −.12]	−.21 [−.25, −.18]
Disapprove	−.14 [−.16, −.13]	−.14 [−.16, −.11]	−.11 [− .12, −.10]	−.15 [−.17, −.13]
Neither	.03 [− .00, .07]	.04 [.01, .08]	.01 [− .00, .04]	.02 [− .01, .06]
Approve	.25 [.20, .28]	.28 [.24, .32]	.17 [.14, .19]	.25 [.20, .29]
Strongly approve	.09 [.04, .14]	.10 [.05, .16]	.06 [.03, .10]	.10 [.05, .16]

Note: First differences and 95% confidence intervals [in brackets] simulated from regression models shown in Table 2. Policy congruence is shifted from .25 to .75; all other variables held at their mean or mode.