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Abstract: Descriptive representation is believed to provide both an important symbolic value for underrepresented groups such as women and minorities as well as policy benefits. Little is known, however, about how the public views diversity in representation. This paper examines attitudes about the gender and racial balance in the U.S. Congress. We propose and test several hypotheses. One hypothesis assumes that group self interest will motivate attitudes about representation. This leads one to expect that women and minorities will be more likely to believe that Congress should reflect diversity. Another theory assumes that racial and gender stereotypes will shape attitudes about the role of minorities and women in politics. A third explanation assumes that ideology will structure support. We test these hypotheses using original data measuring attitudes about the gender and ethnic representation of the U.S. Congress. These data were collected during the 2008 election through the Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project (CCAP). The analysis has implications for our understanding of public attitudes about government and institutions as well as understanding how concerns about minority representation structure support for electoral reform.

Introduction

Descriptive representation is believed to provide an important symbolic value for underrepresented groups such as women and minorities. Minority citizens can become “empowered” after they have achieved significant descriptive representation and influence in political decision making (Bobo and Gilliam 1990). Visible political leadership by members of a minority group enhances trust in government, efficacy, group pride, and participation (see Banducci, Donovan and Karp 2004; Tate and Harsh 2005). Aside from its symbolic impact, descriptive representation is believed to bring about policy benefits. Women’s policy issues are more likely to reach the campaign agenda when there are more women candidates and more woman friendly policies may be passed in legislatures where women hold a higher proportion of seats (for example, see Kittilson 2008; Childs and Withey 2004). Similarly, black members of Congress are more likely to address African American interests than white members (Canon 1999). Together these findings suggest that descriptive representation brings about positive effects especially for those groups who are underrepresented in the political process.

Little is known, however, about the importance that the public attaches to diversity in representation. The question of whether there is broad support for diversity or whether it is limited to those groups who are underrepresented has important implications not only in terms of political legitimacy but also in terms of reform proposals that place a priority on achieving diversity in representation. This paper examines attitudes about the gender and racial balance in the U.S. Congress. We begin with an overview of the effects of descriptive representation and then evaluate several theories for how much importance citizens may place on descriptive representation.
Descriptive Representation

A number of normative theorists have been skeptical of the merits of descriptive representation relative to other models of representation (e.g., Pitkin 1972; see also Grofman 1982, 97–99). One concern is that there is a perceived trade-off between descriptive representation (in the form of a larger number of minority members in legislatures) and substantive representation (in the form of roll-call votes that advance minority interests). For example, higher concentrations of African Americans in majority-minority districts could strengthen Republican prospects in neighboring districts and thus produce a Congress with more minorities but fewer total members that support policies that many minority representatives promote. There are many studies that demonstrate some elements of a tradeoff between substantive representation of minority interests and descriptive representation (Lublin 1997, Swain 1993), although there may be some reasons to think that the immediate effects of any tradeoff might be limited or overstated (Bullock 1995, 155; Grofman and Handley 1998, 61–62; and Whitby 1997, 132).

Empowerment theory also suggests that descriptive representation has positive effects on minority citizens. Bobo and Gilliam (1990) suggest that minority citizens can become “empowered” after they have achieved significant descriptive representation and influence in political decision making. They reasoned that empowerment via descriptive representation should influence participation because the presence of minority representatives creates macro-level cues that affect how people perceive the costs and benefits of voting (1990, 379). These contextual cues signal likely policy responsiveness “that encourages minorities to feel that participation has intrinsic value” (1990, 387). In other words, the presence of minority elected officials sends a contextual cue to minority citizens that the benefits of voting outweigh the costs of not voting. Greater representation of minorities has been shown to lead to greater trust in government and to higher levels of political interest and rates of
participation in elections on the part of minority citizens (Lublin and Tate 1995; Banducci, Donovan and Karp 2004). African Americans who believe that Congress is comprised of a larger proportion of African American representatives are also more likely to approve of the institution’s performance (Brunell et al. 2008).

Similarly, women as candidates or in positions of power may serve as a powerful symbolic cue that ‘politics is not just a man’s game’. Burns et al. suggest that when women live in an environment where women seek and hold public office they are more likely to know and care about politics (Burns et al., 2001, p.383). Campbell and Wolbrecht (2006) find that the visibility of women politicians in the news inspires political engagement among adolescent girls. Similarly, Atkeson (2003) finds that women are more likely to discuss politics and have higher levels of efficacy when women ran for state-wide office in competitive races. Women are also more likely to be aware of female candidates and are more likely to be interested in the campaign when women compete (Burns et al. 2001).

Women feel better about government when more women are included in positions of power (Mansbridge 1999). When women are better represented on municipal legislative bodies, women are likely to be more trusting of [local] government (Ulbig 2005). They are also likely to feel better about their representatives in Congress when they are women (Lawless 2004).

There is also evidence that citizens are responsive to demographic cues, which can be used to embody both negative and positive group stereotypes. Tate and Harsh (2005) find that when evaluating representatives, race is just as important as party though gender did not appear to have the same influence. Box-Steffensmeier et. al (2003) find that both race and gender are among the factors that explain constituents' satisfaction with their representative's performance. In particular, citizens are more likely to recognize an incumbent’s name and identify a reason for liking the incumbent when race and to a lesser extent gender correspond with that of the representative.
**Attitudes toward Descriptive Representation**

Although the studies above suggest that descriptive representation can influence underrepresented groups, little is known about how Americans view descriptive representation as an end in itself. We can assume, based on the assumption that self-interest motivates behavior that underrepresented groups will place greater value on descriptive representation than others. Moreover the evidence from the studies cited above suggests that representation can have positive affects for the groups involved. However efforts to maximize descriptive representation may be viewed with some skepticism by non minorities. Although the creation of majority-minority succeeded in furthering the representation of African Americans and Latinos in the 1990s, the districts proved to be highly controversial. The literature cited above also suggests that people will prefer representatives like themselves which implies that non minorities and possibly men will be less enthusiastic or perhaps even adverse to the idea of increasing representative diversity.

Aside from group interests, it is also likely that attitudes about race will shape how people think about diversity and representation. However the literature on racial attitudes is a highly debated subject and the body of research in this area has not reached a consensus about whether prejudice or more subtle forms of ‘new’ racism or broader ideological values shape opinion about policy. The new racism or symbolic racism argument comes from the works of Kinder, Sears and their colleagues (Kinder and Sanders 1996; Sears and Kinder 1985; Kinder and Sears 1981). Arguments about new or symbolic racism turn the focus away from blatant or outright prejudice against minority groups on the basis of assumed inferiority and instead focus on more subtle forms of racism. These new, more subtle, forms of racism are manifested as a commitment to values as individualism, equal opportunity, and a belief that racial discrimination no longer exists and unequal outcomes are the result of a lack of
hard work on the part of black Americans. Kinder and Sears (1981, 416) have defined this symbolic racism as a combination of “anti-black affect and the kind of traditional American moral values embodied in the Protestant ethic”.

Critics of the symbolic racism approach suggest moving beyond the racial prejudice framework to take into account attitudes and values that are not specifically related to race. Scholars working from this perspective suggest that prejudice explains little variation in racial policy preferences but that responses to these policies are structured by broader ideological constructs that structure attitudes about the role of government in all policy areas (Sniderman and Carmines 1997; Sniderman and Piazza 1993). Therefore, as with non race based policies, preferences among whites regarding racial policies should reflect ideological and partisan attachments.

Gender stereotypes may also influence attitudes about descriptive representation and the role of women in politics (Dolan and Sanbonmatsu 2009). Women candidates are perceived as more compassionate than men on social issues and more liberal than men (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). Studies have suggested that gender stereotyping of female candidates can account for gender differences in support for female candidates (Banducci and Karp 2000) which women can use to their advantage (Herrnson, Lay and Stokes 2003). Negative stereotypes about women, such as seeing women as less intelligent or more emotional may not only affect how female candidates are evaluated but may also influence what people think about women’s role in politics. Those who have an aversion to women in the work force, for example, may prefer fewer women in politics.

Data and Hypotheses

These studies suggest several hypotheses about how citizens may view descriptive representation. One hypothesis assumes that group self interest will motivate attitudes about
representation. This leads one to expect that women and minorities will be more likely to believe that Congress should reflect diversity. Racial attitudes or gender stereotypes may also shape attitudes about the role of minorities and women in politics. Alternatively, ideological values that separate liberals from conservatives on matters such as equality may play a more prominent role in shaping opinions about diversity.

To test these hypotheses we rely on data from the 2008 Cooperative Comparative Analysis Panel (CCAP) survey. The CCAP is a collaborative effort that brings together over 60 political scientists from 25 institutions to produce a six wave panel study conducted on the internet during the 2008 Presidential campaign. Such a project provided us with a unique opportunity to develop and field unique questions about descriptive representation. The survey sample is drawn from a national sample of nearly 18,000 respondents (14,000 of which completed all six waves) stratified by battleground and non-battleground states. Nine states that make up both battleground and early primaries (FL, IA, MN, NV, WI, NH, NM, OH, PA) were oversampled such that they are equal in population with the non-battleground. Each team of researchers designed a module of questions to a sample of 1000 respondents. The module was approximately 20 minutes long. An initial baseline survey was conducted in December of 2007 followed by four other pre-election waves conducted in January, March, September and October. Our module was administered in the final pre-election wave on October 22 through November 3rd.

Although some have raised concerns about internet surveys in terms of their representativeness (see Malhotra and Krosnick 2007), others have found that they can nonetheless provide useful data that in principle produces equivalent results to that of more traditional survey methods (Sanders et al. 2007). The CCAP uses matched random sampling to alleviate problems with the non-representativeness of internet surveys (Malhotra and Krosnick 2007).1 All results reported in this paper utilize the sampling weights provided by
To measure the importance that people may place on diversity we developed a question about representation that was deliberately phrased as a tradeoff between policy and diversity. It was phrased in the following way: Some people believe that members of the U.S. Congress should reflect the diversity in American society while others believe that achieving diversity is not as important as policy achievements. On the following scale [ranging from 1 to 7 where 1 represents “policy more important” and 7 “diversity more important”], how important is it that the U.S. Congress reflects the racial, ethnic and gender composition of American society? As Figure 1 reveals, responses are distributed unevenly toward the policy end of the continuum. A third of the respondents placed themselves at the end of the continuum on “policy is more important” compared to just five percent placing themselves at the other end “diversity is more important”. About 20 percent choose the mid point of the scale suggesting that they placed equal weight to both diversity and policy.

(Figure 1 here)

We also asked respondents about what they thought about the representation of specific groups, “Thinking about the types of people who serve in the U.S. Congress, what do you feel is the appropriate level of representation for the following groups?” Respondents were instructed to use a sliding scale that ranged from 0 to 100% to evaluate the representation of Latinos, African Americans, and women. They were also offered the option of selecting a separate box if they were not sure. Reflecting a certain degree of ambivalence, close to a third of the respondents reported that there unsure of the appropriate level. Figure 2 shows the distribution of responses on the scale for each of the three groups. To help illustrate the distribution, the results are presented as box plots where the top of the box represents the 75th percentile, the bottom of the box represents the 25th percentile, and the
line in the middle represents the 50th percentile or the median. The whiskers (the lines that extend out the top and bottom of the box) represent the highest and lowest values that are not outliers or extreme values. Outliers (values that are between 1.5 and 3 times the interquartile range) and extreme values (values that are more than 3 times the interquartile range) are represented by circles beyond the whiskers. The results show that the vast majority of respondents generally favor greater representation of all groups. However there is still a considerable variation in responses particularly with respect to the representation of African Americans which tends to pull up the mean response which is 32 percent (as compared to the median at 25 percent). The distribution for Latinos is wide but more evenly distributed with a mean response of 28 percent. In comparison, the distribution for women’s representation is more narrow with seventy-five percent of the sample responding that the appropriate representation is between 40 and 50 percent with the median response at just under 50 percent. These responses are similar to those reported by Dolan and Sanbonmatsu (2009, 414) who analyzed data from a pilot 2006 ANES survey and found that the public express a preference for a gender balance of 60% men to 40% women. Together these results reveal that the public supports more diversity than is currently the reality. At the time the survey was conducted prior to the 2008 election, women held 16 percent of the seats in Congress, African Americans held eight percent, and Latinos held five percent of the seats.

(Figure 2 here)

Multivariate Analysis

To test our hypotheses about group interest, racial resentment, and ideology we first estimate a multivariate model where the dependent variable is our measure of the importance that individuals place on diversity. Because the item is ordinal, we use ordered logit to estimate the model. Group interests are measured by dummy variables that identify women,
African Americans and Hispanics. To test hypotheses about racial resentment we rely on four standard questions that have been used (see Kinder and Sanders 1996) to form a reliable scale (alpha=.86; see appendix for question wording). The scale, which is based on mean responses to the four questions, ranges from tolerance (-2) to resentment (+2). We use another scale made up of six questions (see appendix for question wording) to measure aversion of women (see Valentine 2001) who work to capture negative gender stereotypes (alpha=.63). Ideology has five categories ranging from strongly conservative (-2) to strongly liberal (+2) with moderates and those with no opinion placed in the middle of the scale (0). As controls we include education which has four categories and ranges from high school graduate or less (1) to post graduate (4). We also include age and partisanship, measured by dummy variables for Democrats (including leaning Democrat) and independents with Republicans as the reference category.

The results are presented in Table 1. As expected both women and African Americans are more likely to place importance on diversity but the coefficient for Hispanics and other minorities is not significant. While both ideology and racial resentment are significant, the coefficient for racial resentment is twice as large indicating that attitudes about race exert a strong influence. In comparison, the measure of aversion to women in the workforce has no significant impact. Democrats and independents are also more likely to place importance on diversity than Republicans even when controlling for ideology. Education has a significant impact but is negative indicating that those with higher levels of education place more importance on policy as opposed to diversity holding all other variables constant. The fit of the model is also reasonable (pseudo $R^2$.31) indicating that these variables serve to structure attitudes about representation.

(Table 1 here)
To ease the interpretation of the coefficients Table 2 reports the predicted probabilities of either favoring either one of the extreme positions holding all other variables constant at their means values. In addition, we also report the probabilities for those who consider policy and diversity to be equally important as represented by the median point on the scale. The skewed nature of the data are evident from the table. Among those groups only African Americans have a probability that exceeds .10 of identifying diversity as being the most important factor when it comes to evaluating the tradeoff between policy and diversity. African Americans are also the least likely to believe that policy is the most important factor when it comes to representation. African Americans, Democrats, liberals and those who are least resentful have a similar probability of giving equal weight to both policy and diversity (.33) while those who are highest on the racial resentment scale have a predicted probability of .46 of believing that policy is most important when it comes to representation in Congress. Education has a fairly strong effect particularly in terms of the importance that people place on policy. Those with the highest levels of education have a probability of .39 of rating policy as the most important factor compared with .26 for those with the lowest levels of education.

(Table 2 here)

Table 3 displays the results from models predicting the appropriate level of representation for African Americans, Latinos, and women. Ordinary least squares (OLS) is used to estimate the results so the interpretation is relatively straightforward. We use the same variables identified in the previous analysis. In addition we also include our measure of the importance that individuals place on diversity versus policy in a separate model to determine whether it mediates any effects on group representation.

The results indicate that group self-interest has a substantial impact in most of the models. All other things being equal, African Americans believe that the appropriate level of representation for black representatives is about 10 percentage points higher than whites. The
gap between African Americans and whites is similar for Latino representatives but there is no significant difference when it comes to the representation of women. Hispanics also believe that in greater Latino representation than whites but they are no different from whites when it comes to the representation of African Americans or women. While the coefficients for African Americans and Latinos remained significant when controlling for the importance of diversity, their substantive effects are substantially reduced.

Whereas African Americans and Latinos believe in greater representation for their respective groups than whites, women are no different than men when it comes to women’s representation. However, women place African American representation about 5 percent higher than men but these effects are also reduced when controlling for the importance of diversity. There are no significant differences for non minorities in any of the models indicating that they are not different from whites in their preferences about representation.

Neither partisanship nor ideology appears to make any significant difference. Our measure of importance of diversity is significant in all of the models and is strongly associated with women’s representation. For each increase on the seven point scale, a respondent is likely to increase the percentage of women in Congress by over one percent. So those who place diversity at the top of the scale place women’s representation at eight percentage points higher than those who place policy at the top of the scale. However, while significant, the effects are negligible for African Americans and Latino representation. This suggests that the under representation of women (as compared to other groups) is recognized by those who consider diversity in Congress to be an important aspect of representation. Racial resentment is only approaching statistical significance in the model for women’s representation and is not significant in any of the other models suggesting that it is not a factor shaping attitudes toward any specific group. Finally, education has a significant negative impact on African American and Latino representation. However these effects are
also mediated by the importance that people attach to diversity. Education appears to make no difference in shaping opinions about women’s representation.

(Table 3 here)

Discussion

Our results indicate that racial resentment is a factor that clearly shapes the importance that people give to diversity in the U.S. Congress. In contrast, we find that negative attitudes about women have little impact. Ideology is also a factor that shapes attitudes about descriptive representation but it does not appear to be as important of a factor as racial resentment. While theories of group representation suggest that underrepresented groups will place greater importance on achieving diversity, the effects are limited to African Americans. Neither women nor other minorities can be distinguished from men and whites when it comes to believing that achieving diversity is more important than policy achievements.

Whereas Americans appear to place greater weight on policy than diversity there does appear to be broad support for increasing the representation of African Americans, Latinos, and women. At the moment, women remain the most underrepresented group in the U.S. Congress. Attitudes about women’s representation appear to be broadly held and cannot be distinguished by sex or by minority status. Nor does partisanship or ideology appear to be a factor. The only factor that can distinguish those who believe in greater women’s representation from those who don’t is the weight they give to achieving diversity.

Underrepresented groups and women appear to be more sensitive about increasing minority representation. African Americans, in particular, appear to want greater representation for both African Americans and Latinos. Attitudes about diversity also appear to matter but to a lesser extent than group self-interest.
The findings regarding education suggest that descriptive representation is more likely to be valued by those with less education. Those with higher levels of education appear to place more emphasis on achieving policy achievements rather than diversity. In addition, they are likely not to be as generous as those with lower levels of education when it comes to preferences about the appropriate level of representation for African Americans or Latinos.

We should be cautious about generalizing too far with these data. Nevertheless, the findings do imply that at least a third of the public regard diversity and policy as equally important in a representative democracy. Moreover, there appears to be broad support for increasing the representation of women in Congress. This would suggest that proposals for promoting greater diversity may be met with support particularly if they are framed in terms of helping to increase the representation of women. What might these reforms be? Clearly more female candidates are a necessary precondition to higher levels of women’s representation in parliaments (see Darcy et al., 1994, on this point). Some countries, for example, set aside a certain number of reserved seats that are only open to women (Norris 2004). Other countries employ legislative quotas that require all parties to nominate a certain percentage of women. In recent years more than a hundred countries have adopted legislative quotas for the selection of female candidates to political office (Krook 2006). Special arrangements that advantage one group over another, such as racially gerrymandered districts and gender quotas, may sit uncomfortably with notions of equality and fairness and are likely to be viewed with skepticism. These kinds of arrangements can also prove to be inflexible and can have little ability to respond to changing demographics (Bowler and Donovan 2005).

Other possible reforms include changes to the electoral system. There is also clear evidence that proportional representation (PR) enhances the representation of women in national legislatures (Rule, 1994; see also Lijphart, 1999) while also helping to facilitate the election
of minorities. This could prove to be an effective and less controversial way of meeting the
desire for diversity in representation.
Appendix: Question Wording

Descriptive Representation

Thinking about the types of people who serve in the U.S. Congress, what do you feel is the appropriate level of representation for the following groups? (Scale widget from 0 to 100%, separate box for not sure, auto advance)

On the following scale [ranging from 1 to 7 where 1 represents “policy more important” and 7 “diversity more important”], how important is it that the U.S. Congress reflects the racial, ethnic and gender composition of American society?

Racial Resentment

Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for African Americans to work their way out of the lower class.

Many other minority groups have overcome prejudice and worked their way up. African Americans should do the same without any special favors.

Over the past few years, African Americans have gotten less than they deserve.

It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if African Americans would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.

Alpha=.86

Aversion to women who work

Women and men are equally effective in the workplace.

Women's personal characteristics make life at work difficult

Women lack the skills and abilities needed at work

An employed wife leads to juvenile delinquency

Traditional husband/wife roles are the best

Women with families still have time for other employment.

Alpha=.63
References


Endnotes

1 The CCAP follows the same approach as the 2006 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) which uses sample matching to construct a representative sample of registered voters. With sample matching, a population frame that includes large amounts of auxiliary information is used to select a target sample using known probabilities of selection. For each element of the target sample, the closest matching element from the panel is selected for interviewing. The respondents are matched based on demographic factors, political interest, partisanship and ideology. Using this technique, the CCES produced more precise estimates than more conventional probability designs such as random digit dialed (RDD) phone surveys (Vavreck and Rivers 2008).

2 We do not report the results for aversion to women as it was not significant in any of the models.
Figure 1: Attitudes about Descriptive Representation

Policy more important

Diversity more important
Figure 2: Preferences for Group Representation in Congress (in %)
Table 1: Importance of Descriptive Representation  
(Ordered Logit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.19 **</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1.15 ***</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>0.64 ***</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.62 ***</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal ideology</td>
<td>0.24 **</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial resentment</td>
<td>-0.44 ***</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversion to women in workplace</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[category = 1]</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[category = 2]</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[category = 3]</td>
<td>0.85 *</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[category = 4]</td>
<td>2.27 **</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[category = 5]</td>
<td>3.00 **</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[category = 6]</td>
<td>3.91 **</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke Pseudo $R^2$</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project (2008)

***p<.01; **p<.05
Table 2: Predicted Probabilities about Importance of Descriptive Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policy Most Important</th>
<th>Equally Important</th>
<th>Diversity Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial resentment</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal ideology</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates derived from model in Table 1 holding all other variables constant at their mean values.
Table 3: Attitudes about Appropriate Level of Representation for Various Groups (OLS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African Americans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Latinos</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>39.94 ***</td>
<td>(4.83)</td>
<td>3.85 ***</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>32.40 ***</td>
<td>(4.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-4.56 ***</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>-0.42 ***</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>-3.26 ***</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>(2.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>(2.45)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>(2.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.79 **</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td>0.48 ***</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>(1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9.86 **</td>
<td>(3.58)</td>
<td>0.80 **</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>9.35 ***</td>
<td>(3.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>(3.68)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>11.96 ***</td>
<td>(3.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>(3.89)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>6.30 *</td>
<td>(3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal ideology</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial resentment</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of diversity</td>
<td>0.17 ***</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>0.17 ***</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project (2008)

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.10