**Online Appendix**

**Section 1: 2018 CES Survey Module and Participant Recruitment**

The Saint Louis University 2018 survey module was a part of the 2018 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, later renamed the Cooperative Election Study (CES), conducted by YouGov. YouGov conducted the CES in two waves before and after the election. The first wave was from September 27 to November 5, and the second was from November 7 to December 3, 2018. Approximately 60,000 respondents answered a “Common Content” set of questions, and approximately 1,000 of these respondents answered questions from our survey module. Sample sizes in the analyses are smaller than 1,000 primarily because some survey respondents did not complete both the pre- and post-election surveys.

YouGov recruits Americans to participate in their surveys, and each respondent is informed that their participation is voluntary, confidential, and used for research purposes. Survey respondents receive “points” from YouGov as compensation for their participation. Respondents can exchange these points for gift cards or other prizes. The survey module did not include deception and received exempt approval from Saint Louis University’s Institutional Review Board (Protocol #29440). For more information about the CES or YouGov’s recruitment procedures, see https://cces.gov.harvard.edu/ or https://today.yougov.com/about/.

**Section 2: Replications of Stauffer**

Our study replicates Stauffer’s study of gender descriptive representation. We additionally conduct comparable analyses of the relationship between Black descriptive representation and efficacy. Below is the correspondence between Stauffer’s original figures and tables and those from our replication and extension, which are also provided below.[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table or Figure in Stauffer’s original article | Table or Figure in Stauffer’s original article reproduced in the current appendix | Clark-Rogers  Gender Replication  Table or Figure in the current appendix | Clark-Rogers  Black Extension  Figure or Table in the current appendix |
| Figure 1 | Figure A-1 | Figure A-2 | Figure A-3 |
| Table 1 | Table A-1 | Table A-1 | Table A-1 |
| Figure 2 | Figure A-4: Panel A | Figure A-4: Panel B | Figure A-4: Panel C |
| Table 2 | Table A-2 | Table A-3 | Table A-4 |
| Figure 3 | Figure A-5: Panel A | Figure A-5: Panel B | Figure A-5: Panel C |

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-1: Stauffer Study: Respondent Estimates of Women’s Representation** |
| A graph of women in different ages  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| *Using data from Stauffer (2021), the left panel illustrates the distribution of respondent estimates of the percentage of women in Congress. The right panel plots estimates of the percentage of women in their state legislature on the x-axis compared with the real percentage on the y-axis.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-2: Clark Rogers: Respondent Estimates of Women’s Representation** |
| A graph of women in different directions  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| *Using data from the current study, the left panel illustrates the distribution of respondent estimates of the percentage of women in Congress. The right panel plots estimates of the percentage of women in their state legislature on the x-axis compared with the real percentage on the y-axis.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-3: Clark-Rogers: Respondent Estimates of Black’s Representation** |
| A graph and a diagram  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| *Using data from the current study, the left panel illustrates the distribution of respondent estimates of the percentage of Blacks in Congress. The right panel plots estimates of the percentage of Blacks in their state legislature on the x-axis compared with the real percentage on the y-axis.* |

The first and fourth columns of Table A-1 provide estimates from Stauffer (2021) Table 1. The second and fifth columns provide comparable estimates from the current study focusing on gender, and the third and sixth columns provide comparable estimates from the current study focusing on Blacks.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-1: Regression Models: Perceptions of Women’s and Black’s Inclusion in Congress and External Efficacy** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Stauffer  Women | Clark-Rogers  Women | Clark-Rogers  Blacks | Stauffer  Women | Clark-Rogers  Women | Clark-Rogers  Blacks | | Estimate % Women | 0.003\* | 0.003\* |  | 0.003\* | 0.003\* |  | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) |  | (0.001) | (0.001) |  | | Estimate % Black |  |  | 0.002\* |  |  | 0.003\* | |  |  |  | (0.000) |  |  | (0.001) | | Female | -0.020 | 0.041\* | 0.042\* | -0.038 | -0.097 | 0.040\* | |  | (0.011) | (0.016) | (0.016) | (0.051) | (0.068) | (0.017) | | Black |  |  | 0.052 |  |  | 0.145\* | |  |  |  | (0.029) |  |  | (0.071) | | Estimate % Women x Female |  |  |  | 0.001 | 0.000 |  | |  |  |  |  | (0.001) | (0.001) |  | | Estimate % Black x Black |  |  |  |  |  | -0.002 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.001) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.000 | 0.028\* | 0.029\* | 0.000 | 0.027\* | 0.029\* | |  | (0.004) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.004) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Independent | -0.059\* | -0.012 | -0.024 | -0.059\* | -0.011 | -0.024 | |  | (0.019) | (0.022) | (0.022) | (0.019) | (0.022) | (0.022) | | Republican | -0.016 | 0.008 | -0.001 | -0.016 | 0.011 | -0.002 | |  | (0.017) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.017) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | Strong Partisan | 0.050\* | 0.048\* | 0.042\* | 0.050\* | 0.047\* | 0.044\* | |  | (0.012) | (0.018) | (0.019) | (0.012) | (0.018) | (0.019) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.003 | -0.019\* | -0.020\* | -0.003 | -0.019\* | -0.019\* | |  | (0.004) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.004) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Religiosity | 0.014\* | 0.011\* | 0.011\* | 0.014\* | 0.011\* | 0.011\* | |  | (0.004) | (0.005) | (0.005) | (0.004) | (0.005) | (0.005) | | Education | 0.026\* | -0.023 | -0.019 | 0.026\* | -0.024 | -0.020 | |  | (0.012) | (0.016) | (0.017) | (0.012) | (0.016) | (0.017) | | White | -0.025 | -0.054\* |  | -0.026 | -0.057\* |  | |  | (0.013) | (0.019) |  | (0.014) | (0.019) |  | | Age | -0.007\* | -0.008\* | -0.009\* | -0.007\* | -0.007\* | -0.009\* | |  | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.003) | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.003) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Employed | 0.013 | 0.036\* | 0.039\* | 0.012 | 0.036\* | 0.041\* | |  | (0.013) | (0.017) | (0.018) | (0.013) | (0.017) | (0.018) | | Woman sen. | 0.015 | -0.001 |  | 0.022 | -0.021 |  | |  | (0.013) | (0.016) |  | (0.018) | (0.024) |  | | Woman rep. | 0.019 | -0.006 |  | 0.010 | -0.022 |  | |  | (0.014) | (0.019) |  | (0.021) | (0.029) |  | | Women in state leg. | 0.001 | 0.001 |  | 0.001 | -0.002 |  | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) |  | (0.001) | (0.002) |  | | Woman sen. x Female |  |  |  | -0.013 | 0.037 |  | |  |  |  |  | (0.024) | (0.032) |  | | Woman rep. x Female |  |  |  | 0.017 | 0.036 |  | |  |  |  |  | (0.029) | (0.038) |  | | Women in state leg. x Female |  |  |  | 0.000 | 0.004 |  | |  |  |  |  | (0.002) | (0.002) |  | | Black sen. |  |  | 0.021 |  |  | 0.029 | |  |  |  | (0.021) |  |  | (0.023) | | Black rep. |  |  | -0.012 |  |  | -0.018 | |  |  |  | (0.034) |  |  | (0.042) | | Black in State Leg |  |  | -0.001 |  |  | -0.001 | |  |  |  | (0.001) |  |  | (0.001) | | Black sen. x Black |  |  |  |  |  | -0.057 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.071) | | Black rep. x Black |  |  |  |  |  | 0.015 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.074) | | Black in State Leg x Black |  |  |  |  |  | -0.003 | |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.004) | | Constant | 0.372\* | 0.318\* | 0.372\* | 0.384\* | 0.380\* | 0.364\* | |  | (0.054) | (0.084) | (0.076) | (0.061) | (0.091) | (0.077) | | N | 1798 | 767 | 767 | 1798 | 767 | 767 | | Log-Likelihood | 58.3 | 127.6 | 118.1 | 59.0 | 131.5 | 119.5 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

In Figure A-4, Panel A below replicates Stauffer (2021) Figure 1. Panel B is a replication using our survey. Panel C is similar to Panel B but focuses on perceptions of Black descriptive representation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Figure A-4: Respondent Estimates and Predicted Levels of Efficacy** | | |
| **Panel A: Stauffer’s Study Women** | **Panel B: Clark-Rogers Women** | **Panel C: Clark-Rogers Blacks** |
| A graph of a person with a line  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A graph of a person with a black line  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A graph of a line  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| Predicted values are calculated by holding all other variables at the mean and modal values. Shaded regions represent 95% confidence intervals. | | |

Table A-2 replicates Stauffer’s (2021) Table 2. Table A-3 is a replication using our survey. Table A-4 is similar but focuses on Black descriptive representation.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-2: Stauffer Study, Ordered Probit Models:**  **Perceptions of Women’s Inclusion in State Legislatures and Evaluations of State Responsiveness** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Women in State Leg | 0.001 | -0.000 | -0.001 | -0.002 | |  | (0.007) | (0.009) | (0.007) | (0.009) | | Estimate % Women |  |  | 0.008\* | 0.009\* | |  |  |  | (0.003) | (0.004) | | Female | 0.071 | 0.013 | 0.066 | 0.043 | |  | (0.078) | (0.311) | (0.078) | (0.321) | | Women in State Leg x Female |  | 0.002 |  | 0.002 | |  |  | (0.012) |  | (0.012) | | Estimate % Women x Female |  |  |  | -0.002 | |  |  |  |  | (0.005) | | Ideology (lib to cons.) | 0.326\* | 0.325\* | 0.331\* | 0.332\* | |  | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.062) | | State gov. liberalism. | 3.733\* | 3.725\* | 3.661\* | 3.656\* | |  | (0.558) | (0.560) | (0.559) | (0.561) | | Ideology (lib to cons.) x State gov. liberalism. | -0.874\* | -0.872\* | -0.881\* | -0.881\* | |  | (0.130) | (0.130) | (0.130) | (0.130) | | Congruence | 0.377\* | 0.378\* | 0.361\* | 0.362\* | |  | (0.104) | (0.104) | (0.104) | (0.104) | | Republican | 0.094 | 0.094 | 0.065 | 0.063 | |  | (0.123) | (0.123) | (0.123) | (0.124) | | Independent | -0.205 | -0.205 | -0.228 | -0.229 | |  | (0.125) | (0.125) | (0.126) | (0.126) | | Strong Partisan | 0.046 | 0.046 | 0.035 | 0.036 | |  | (0.084) | (0.084) | (0.085) | (0.085) | | Political Knowledge (State) | -0.014 | -0.014 | -0.004 | -0.003 | |  | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | | Age | -0.033\* | -0.033\* | -0.032\* | -0.032\* | |  | (0.013) | (0.013) | (0.013) | (0.013) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | -0.161 | -0.162 | -0.137 | -0.137 | |  | (0.087) | (0.087) | (0.087) | (0.088) | | Education | -0.020 | -0.020 | -0.007 | -0.008 | |  | (0.083) | (0.083) | (0.083) | (0.083) | | Employed | 0.011 | 0.011 | 0.021 | 0.021 | |  | (0.083) | (0.083) | (0.083) | (0.083) | | Religiosity | 0.052\* | 0.052\* | 0.046 | 0.045 | |  | (0.025) | (0.025) | (0.025) | (0.025) | | cut1 | -0.105 | -0.139 | 0.049 | 0.048 | |  | (0.430) | (0.465) | (0.434) | (0.477) | | cut2 | 0.944\* | 0.910 | 1.104\* | 1.103\* | |  | (0.430) | (0.465) | (0.435) | (0.478) | | cut3 | 2.724\* | 2.690\* | 2.894\* | 2.894\* | |  | (0.439) | (0.473) | (0.444) | (0.486) | | N | 873 | 873 | 873 | 873 | | Log-Likelihood | -954.2 | -954.2 | -950.0 | -949.9 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-3: Clark-Rogers, Ordered Probit Models:**  **Perceptions of Women’s Inclusion in State Legislatures and Evaluations of State Responsiveness** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Women in state leg. | 0.000 | 0.003 | -0.000 | 0.001 | |  | (0.006) | (0.009) | (0.006) | (0.009) | | Estimate % women |  |  | 0.011\* | 0.014\* | |  |  |  | (0.002) | (0.004) | | Female | 0.110 | 0.225 | 0.082 | 0.289 | |  | (0.084) | (0.316) | (0.084) | (0.346) | | Women in state leg. x Female |  | -0.005 |  | -0.002 | |  |  | (0.012) |  | (0.012) | | Estimate % women x Female |  |  |  | -0.005 | |  |  |  |  | (0.005) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.400\* | 0.400\* | 0.381\* | 0.379\* | |  | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.036\* | 0.036\* | 0.036\* | 0.035\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | -0.008\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.520\* | 0.521\* | 0.500\* | 0.500\* | |  | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | | Republican | -0.010 | -0.012 | 0.038 | 0.037 | |  | (0.133) | (0.133) | (0.134) | (0.134) | | Independent | 0.157 | 0.157 | 0.209 | 0.207 | |  | (0.115) | (0.115) | (0.116) | (0.116) | | Strong Partisan | 0.018 | 0.017 | 0.044 | 0.043 | |  | (0.095) | (0.095) | (0.095) | (0.095) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.051 | -0.051 | -0.035 | -0.036 | |  | (0.038) | (0.038) | (0.039) | (0.039) | | Age | -0.048\* | -0.048\* | -0.047\* | -0.047\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | -0.043 | -0.040 | -0.021 | -0.015 | |  | (0.098) | (0.098) | (0.098) | (0.098) | | Education | -0.223\* | -0.224\* | -0.199\* | -0.197\* | |  | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | | Employed | 0.129 | 0.128 | 0.127 | 0.119 | |  | (0.090) | (0.090) | (0.090) | (0.091) | | Religiosity | 0.029 | 0.029 | 0.026 | 0.027 | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | -0.405 | -0.342 | -0.115 | -0.000 | |  | (0.478) | (0.506) | (0.484) | (0.516) | | cut2 | 0.311 | 0.373 | 0.609 | 0.724 | |  | (0.478) | (0.505) | (0.484) | (0.516) | | cut3 | 1.257\* | 1.320\* | 1.567\* | 1.683\* | |  | (0.479) | (0.507) | (0.485) | (0.518) | | cut4 | 2.513\* | 2.576\* | 2.843\* | 2.960\* | |  | (0.484) | (0.511) | (0.491) | (0.524) | | N | 771 | 771 | 771 | 771 | | Log-Likelihood | -1063.5 | -1063.4 | -1054.4 | -1053.8 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-4: Clark-Rogers, Ordered Probit Models:**  **Perceptions of Blacks’ Inclusion in State Legislatures and Evaluations of State Responsiveness** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Black in State Leg | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.004 | -0.002 | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Estimate % black |  |  | 0.007\* | 0.007\* | |  |  |  | (0.002) | (0.003) | | Female | 0.109 | 0.109 | 0.090 | 0.090 | |  | (0.084) | (0.084) | (0.084) | (0.084) | | Black in State Leg x Black |  | -0.018 |  | -0.015 | |  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) | | Estimate % black x Black |  |  |  | 0.003 | |  |  |  |  | (0.007) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.401\* | 0.399\* | 0.389\* | 0.387\* | |  | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.036\* | 0.036\* | 0.036\* | 0.036\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.521\* | 0.520\* | 0.507\* | 0.503\* | |  | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | | Republican | -0.024 | -0.019 | 0.005 | 0.015 | |  | (0.132) | (0.132) | (0.133) | (0.133) | | Independent | 0.153 | 0.156 | 0.179 | 0.181 | |  | (0.115) | (0.115) | (0.115) | (0.115) | | Strong Partisan | 0.019 | 0.018 | 0.035 | 0.031 | |  | (0.095) | (0.095) | (0.095) | (0.096) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.053 | -0.052 | -0.034 | -0.035 | |  | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | | Age | -0.048\* | -0.049\* | -0.049\* | -0.050\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Black | -0.008 | 0.245 | 0.003 | 0.140 | |  | (0.141) | (0.299) | (0.141) | (0.336) | | Education | -0.224\* | -0.226\* | -0.184\* | -0.186\* | |  | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.086) | (0.086) | | Employed | 0.129 | 0.133 | 0.122 | 0.125 | |  | (0.090) | (0.090) | (0.090) | (0.090) | | Religiosity | 0.030 | 0.031 | 0.028 | 0.029 | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | -0.408 | -0.408 | -0.290 | -0.311 | |  | (0.458) | (0.458) | (0.459) | (0.461) | | cut2 | 0.307 | 0.308 | 0.430 | 0.410 | |  | (0.457) | (0.457) | (0.459) | (0.461) | | cut3 | 1.253\* | 1.255\* | 1.382\* | 1.362\* | |  | (0.458) | (0.458) | (0.460) | (0.462) | | cut4 | 2.509\* | 2.512\* | 2.649\* | 2.630\* | |  | (0.463) | (0.463) | (0.466) | (0.468) | | N | 771 | 771 | 771 | 771 | | Log-Likelihood | -1063.5 | -1063.1 | -1058.6 | -1058.2 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

In Figure A-5, panel A is Stauffer’s (2021) Figure 3. Panel B is a replication using our survey. Panel C is similar to Panel B but focuses on perceptions of Black descriptive representation.

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-5: Respondent Estimates and Predicted Evaluations of State Responsiveness** |
| **Panel A: Stauffer Study, Women**  A graph of numbers and a number of women  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| **Panel B: Clark-Rogers, Women**  A screenshot of a graph  Description automatically generated |
| **Panel C: Clark-Rogers, Blacks** |
| A screenshot of a computer screen  Description automatically generated |
| *Predicted probabilities are calculated by holding all other variables at their mean or modal values. Shaded regions represent 95% confidence intervals.* |

**Section 3: Differences between the Clark-Rogers and Stauffer’s Surveys**

In the main text, we highlight question-wording differences between the current study and Stauffer’s study. Table A-5 provides question wordings and response options for each question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table A-5: Dependent Variable Question Wordings | |
| Questions | **Response Options** |
| Clark-Rogers Question 1:  Thinking about the following statements, to what extent do you agree or disagree…The U.S. Congress represents the interests of people like me. | Strongly agree  Somewhat agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat disagree  Strongly disagree |
| Clark-Rogers Question 2:  Thinking about the following statements, to what extent do you agree or disagree…If I called or emailed my representatives in the U.S. Congress, it would make a difference in shaping policy. | Strongly agree  Somewhat agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat disagree  Strongly disagree |
| Clark-Rogers Question 3:  Thinking about the following statements, to what extent do you agree or disagree…If I called or emailed my state legislators, it would make a difference in shaping policy. | Strongly agree  Somewhat agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat disagree  Strongly disagree |
| Stauffer Study Question 4:  How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements… Government officials care what people like me think. | Strongly agree  Somewhat agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat disagree  Strongly disagree |
| Stauffer Study Question 5:  How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements…People like me have a say in what the government does. | Strongly agree  Somewhat agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat disagree  Strongly disagree |
| Stauffer Study Question 6:  How responsive do you think that your state legislature is to the concerns of people like you? | Very responsive  Moderately responsive  Not very response  Not at all responsive |
| Clark-Rogers Congress Trust Question:  How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?...[The U.S. Congress] | Always  Most of the time  About half the time  Some of the time  Never |
| Clark-Rogers State Legislature Trust Question:  How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?...[State Legislature Name] | Always  Most of the time  About half the time  Some of the time  Never |

Readers should also be mindful of question-ordering differences between Stauffer’s and our survey, as these may introduce priming effects (Rasinski and Krishnamurty 2012). When studying Congress, Stauffer asked respondents to estimate women’s presence in Congress. Following this, respondents then immediately answered efficacy questions 4 and 5. As put by Stauffer, “…it is possible that respondents were primed to think about gender representation in a way that they otherwise would not when answering the efficacy question” (Stauffer 2021, Online Appendix, 21).[[2]](#footnote-2)

Meanwhile, our survey respondents answered efficacy questions in the pre-election module of the CES and gave their estimates of the percentage of women and Black legislators in the post-election module. Our reasoning for this survey design was that the CES common content asks respondents about sexism and racial resentment, and we did not want to bias respondents’ estimates of descriptive representation. While this can help avoid priming, an acknowledged drawback of this approach is that our question is likely more confusing: “Considering those who served for most of 2018 before the election, what percentage of… Members of the U.S. Congress were women.” Meanwhile, Stauffer’s questions were more straightforward: “If you had to make your best guess, what percentage of people currently serving in Congress are women?”

Question ordering within each survey may be responsible for differences in our measures of Americans’ beliefs about descriptive representation. The only descriptive representation question asked across both Stauffer and our surveys in the same year concerned the percentage of women in the U.S. Congress in 2018. Stauffer’s respondents estimated that Congress was 20.5 percent women, but our respondents believed Congress was 31.5 percent women (actual percentage 20.6). Our respondents’ higher estimates *after* the election may have been influenced by news coverage that a record number of women were elected to Congress in the 2018 election (e.g., Salam 2018). Readers should be mindful of these differences.

Table A-6 provides summary statistics of measures from Stauffer’s and our studies of Congress.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A-6: Summary Statistics for Congressional Analyses | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Clark-Rogers**  **2018 CES Modules** | | | | | **Stauffer**  **2016 & 2018 CES Modules** | | | | |
| Variable | **Mean** | **Median** | **Min** | **Max** | **SD** | **Mean** | **Median** | **Min** | **Max** | **SD** |
| External Efficacy | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0 | 1 | 0.23 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0 | 1 | 0.25 |
| Trust in Congress | -0.74 | -1 | -2 | 2 | 0.98 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimate % Women | 31.48 | 27 | 2 | 100 | 17.07 | 22.39 | 20 | 0 | 100 | 13.37 |
| Female | 0.57 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 | 0.55 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 |
| Ideology | 4.12 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1.87 | 4.02 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1.85 |
| Republican | 0.26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.48 |
| Independent | 0.28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.45 | 0.16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.37 |
| Strong Partisan | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 | 0.39 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 |
| Federal Knowledge | 3.59 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1.73 | 3.40 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1.80 |
| Religiosity | 2.79 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1.68 | 2.80 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1.69 |
| College Degree | 0.37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.48 | 0.37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.48 |
| White | 0.74 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.44 | 0.74 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.44 |
| Age | 49.21 | 49 | 19 | 93 | 17.66 | 47.78 | 48 | 18 | 91 | 17.45 |
| Employed | 0.49 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 |
| Woman Senator | 0.40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 | 0.34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 |
| Woman Rep | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.40 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.39 |
| Woman State Leg | 25.2 | 25 | 11 | 40 | 6.45 | 25.15 | 25 | 0 | 42 | 6.15 |
| Racial Resentment (Tesler) | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.88 | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0 | 0.88 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sexism | 0.47 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.88 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black | 0.09 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimate % Black | 24.96 | 22 | 0 | 100 | 17.92 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black US Senator | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |
| US Senator Black | 0.06 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black State Leg | 11.46 | 9.39 | 0 | 29.31 | 6.73 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-7 provides summary statistics of measures from Stauffer’s and our studies of state legislatures.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A-7: Summary Statistics for State Legislative Analyses | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Clark-Rogers**  **2018 CES Module** | | | | | **Stauffer**  **2017 CES Module** | | | | |
| Variable | **Mean** | **Median** | **Min** | **Max** | **SD** | **Mean** | **Median** | **Min** | **Max** | **SD** |
| Responsiveness | -0.08 | 0 | -2 | 2 | 1.13 | 2.42 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0.84 |
| Trust in State Legislature | -0.28 | 0 | -2 | 2 | 1.04 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimate % Women | 31.01 | 28 | 0 | 100 | 16.86 | 23.91 | 20 | 0 | 100 | 15.36 |
| Female | 0.57 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 | 0.58 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 |
| Ideology | 4.12 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1.87 | 3.91 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1.94 |
| Republican | 0.26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.44 | 0.31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.46 |
| Independent | 0.28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.45 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.38 |
| Strong Partisan | 0.40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 |
| State Gov Liberalism | 40.85 | 42.27 | 17.78 | 70.38 | 18.46 | 0.42 | 0.45 | 0.18 | 0.70 | 0.19 |
| Congruence | 0.32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.49 |
| Religiosity | 2.79 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1.68 | 2.74 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1.69 |
| College Degree | 0.37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.48 | 0.32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 |
| White | 0.74 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.44 | 0.67 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.47 |
| Age | 49.21 | 49 | 19 | 93 | 17.66 | 48.63 | 50 | 19 | 93 | 17.58 |
| Employed | 0.49 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 | 0.49 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.50 |
| Political Knowledge State | 1.94 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1.15 | 1.79 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1.10 |
| Women in State Leg | 25.20 | 25 | 11 | 40 | 6.45 | 24.41 | 22.5 | 11.1 | 40 | 6.07 |
| Racial Resentment (Tesler) | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.88 | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racial Resentment  (Kinder & Sanders) | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0 | 0.88 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sexism | 0.47 | 0.50 | 0 | 0.88 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimate % Black | 23.49 | 20 | 0 | 100 | 18.21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black in State Leg | 11.46 | 9.39 | 0 | 29.31 | 6.73 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black | 0.09 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |

**Section 4: Conditional Impact of Sexism and Racial Resentment**

Stauffer and our analyses focus on understanding how Americans’ beliefs about descriptive representation in Congress and state legislatures relate to how efficacious and trusting they are of these institutions. However, it is well documented that Americans have biases towards gender and racial groups, and sexism and racial resentment influence political attitudes (Barnes and Beaulieu 2019; Huddy and Feldman 2009; Paxton and Hughes 2007). These biases can affect political attitudes toward political figures and policies.

For example, focusing on gender and sexism, those who hold more sexist views are shown to be more supportive of Donald Trump in the 2016 vote (Knuckey 2019; Valentino, Wayne, and Oceno 2018), more supportive of restrictive immigration policy (Filindra and Nassar 2024), and exhibit more pro-life abortion attitudes (Cizmar and Kalkan 2023). Similarly, an established body of work shows that racially resentful voters were less supportive of Barack Obama (Tesler and Sears 2010; Weisberg 2015), the Black Lives Matter Movement (Riley and Peterson 2020), and affirmative action (Mangum and Block Jr. 2022) while also being more supportive of capital punishment (Unnever and Cullen 2007).[[3]](#footnote-3) Prior work additionally shows that racially resentful Americans are more likely to be misinformed about the size of social groups (Abrajano and Lajevardi 2021).

A key contribution of this body of research is that it highlights the importance of Americans’ perceptions of beneficiaries. For example, DeSante (2013) employs a survey experiment where individuals are asked to evaluate welfare applications. Some applications had traditional, racially Black names (e.g., Latoya and Keisha), whereas others had traditional, racially white names (e.g., Laurie and Emily) (see Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004). DeSante shows that white applicants received more welfare benefits than black applicants, particularly when the survey respondent exhibited higher levels of racial resentment.[[4]](#footnote-4) Such findings provide evidence that both respondents’ perceptions, in this case, welfare beneficiaries, and racial resentment matter for understanding Americans’ political behavior.

Building on this body of work, it then stands to reason that sexist attitudes towards women, as well as racially resentful attitudes towards Blacks, may affect Americans’ attitudes towards Congress and their state legislature if they *perceive* these institutions have more women or Blacks. To investigate whether this is the case, we evaluate whether the relationship between Americans’ perceptions of descriptive representation and attitudes towards legislative institutions is conditional on their levels of sexism or racial resentment. In Section 5 below, we further investigate the extent to which sexism and racial resentment relate to Americans’ beliefs about descriptive representation.

To measure sexism, we create a zero-to-one measure that indicates the extent to which an American agreed with the following statements: “When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against” and “Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men” (Glick and Fiske 2018). To measure racial resentment, we create measures that follow both Tesler (2016) and Kinder and Sanders (1996). Following Tesler, we create a zero-to-one measure that indicates the extent to which a voter agreed with the following statements: “Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class” and “Irish, Italians, Jewish, and many other minorities overcome prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.” Following Kinder and Sanders (1996), we additionally include “Over the past few years blacks have gotten less than they deserve” and “It’s really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be as well of as whites” within our zero-to-one measure of racial resentment.[[5]](#footnote-5)

To investigate if those with prejudiced beliefs are less likely to have positive views of legislative institutions if they believe those institutions have more gender or racial descriptive representation, we interact these sexism and racial resentment measures with Americans’ beliefs about racial and descriptive representation. We add these interaction terms to Stauffer’s original statistical models concerning gender descriptive representation and our extensions concerning racial descriptive representation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Figure A-6: Change in Sexist & Racially Resentful Americans’ Congressional Efficacy** | |
| A graph with lines and numbers  Description automatically generated | A graph of a line  Description automatically generated |
| *Using estimates from the second columns of Tables A-8 and A-12, the above panels plot the predicted change in an Americans’ efficacy towards Congress associated with that American believing that there were 17 or 18 percent more women or Blacks in Congress (left and right panels). Changes estimated across different levels of hostile sexism or racial resentment (x-axes).* | |

Focusing on gender descriptive representation, we do not find that an American’s sexism conditions the relationship between their perception of the percentage of women in Congress or their state legislature and their attitudes towards those institutions (Tables A-8, A-9, A-10, and A-11). To illustrate this (lack of) relationship, the left panel of Figure A-6 plots the predicted change in the Congressional efficacy measure associated with a standard deviation increase (approximately 17 percent) in an American’s beliefs about the percentage of women in Congress. Moving from the left to the right of this panel will show the predicted change in efficacy as an American’s measured hostile sexism increases. The near-zero slope of this line suggests that the impact of increased gender diversity beliefs is relatively the same for those with low or high levels of hostile sexism. Figures A-7, A-8, and A-9 illustrate similar null findings concerning gender descriptive representation and trust in Congress, trust in state legislatures, and responsiveness of state legislatures.

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-7: Change in Sexist Americans’ Trust in Congress** |
| A diagram of a graph  Description automatically generated |
| *Using ordered probit estimates from column 2 of Table A-9, the above panels plot the predicted change in probability that an American gave a certain response (panel title) to the question: “How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?” associated with that American believing Congress had 17 percent more women. Changes estimated across different levels of sexism (x-axis).* |
| **Figure A-8: Change in Sexist Americans’ Trust in State Legislatures** |
| *A diagram of a graph  Description automatically generated with medium confidence* |
| *Using ordered probit estimates from column 2 of Table A-11, the above panels plot the predicted change in probability that an American gave a certain response (panel title) to the question: “How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?” associated with that American believing their state legislature had 17 percent more women. Changes estimated across different levels of sexism (x-axis).* |
| **Figure A-9: Change in Sexist Americans’ Perceived State Legislative Responsiveness** |
| *A diagram of a graph  Description automatically generated with medium confidence* |
| *Using ordered probit estimates from column 2 of Table A-10, the above panels plot the predicted change in probability that an American agreed with the statement “If I called or emailed my state legislators, it would make a difference in shaping policy” associated with that American believing their state legislature had 17 percent more women. Changes estimated across different levels of racial resentment (x-axis).* |

We also do not find that Americans’ racial resentment conditions the relationship between their perception of the percentage of Blacks in Congress and their attitudes towards Congress (Tables A-12 and A-13). To illustrate these null relationships, the right panel of Figure A-6 is similar to the left panel, but the right panel presents the predicted change in the Congressional efficacy measure associated with a standard deviation increase (approximately 18 percent) in an American’s beliefs about the percentage of Blacks Congress. The slope of the line is negative, but the difference in differences between Americans with low and high levels of racial resentment does not meet conventional levels of statistical significance (Table A-12).

We find evidence that racially resentful Americans believe their state legislature is less responsive if that American also believes that the legislature has more Black legislators (Table A-14). To illustrate these conditional relationships, Figure A-10 plots the changes in the predicted probability of a respondent agreeing or disagreeing with the statement, “If I called or emailed my state legislators, it would make a difference in shaping policy” associated with a standard deviation increase (approximately 18 percent) in an American’s beliefs about the percentage of Blacks or women in the state legislature. Moving from the left to the right of each panel indicates this change in predicted probability for Americans with different levels of racial resentment (x-axis).

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-10: Change in Racially Resentful Americans’ Perceived State Legislative Responsiveness** |
| A diagram of a graph  Description automatically generated |
| *Using ordered probit estimates from column 2 of Table A-14, above panels plot the predicted change in probability that an American agreed with the statement “If I called or emailed my state legislators, it would make a difference in shaping policy” associated with that American believing their state legislature was 18 percent more Black. Changes estimated across different levels of racial resentment (x-axis).* |

The positively sloped lines in the left two panels suggest that as Americans become more racially resentful and believe there are more Blacks in the legislature, they are *more likely* to *disagree* that their legislators are responsive. Similarly, the negatively sloped lines in the right two panels suggest that as Americans become more racially resentful and believe there are more Blacks in the legislature, they are *less likely* to *agree* that their legislators are responsive. For example, consider an American who scored a zero on the racial resentment measure. If this American believed their state legislature was 41 percent instead of 23 percent Black (a standard deviation increase above the mean), the predicted probability they would strongly disagree with the statement “If I called or emailed my state legislators, it would make a difference in shaping policy” would fall by 0.065 (Figure A-10, far left panel, left side; t-statistic of difference 4.99). Meanwhile, if we considered an American who scored a one on the racial resentment measure, the predicted probability they would strongly disagree would rise by approximately 0.023 (Figure A-10, far left panel, right side; t-statistic of difference 1.20). The difference between these differences is approximately 0.088 (t-statistic of difference 3.25). The comparable difference in differences for predicting an American strongly agrees with the above statement is -0.070 (Figure A-10, far right panel; t-statistic of difference 2.95).

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure A-11: Change in Racially Resentful Americans’ Trust in their State Legislature** |
| A graph with a line  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
| *Using ordered probit estimates from column 2 of Table A-15, the above panels plot the predicted change in the probability that an American gave a certain response (panel title) to the question: “How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?” associated with that American believing their state legislature was 18 percent more Black. Changes estimated across different levels of racial resentment (x-axis).* |

Findings are similar when studying Americans’ trust in their state legislature (Table A-15). To again illustrate substantive results, Figure A-11 plots the changes in the predicted probability of a respondent’s answer to “How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?...[State Legislature Name]” associated with a standard deviation increase (approximately 18 percent) in an American’s beliefs about the percentage of Blacks or women in the state legislature.

Focusing on the two left panels of Figure A-11, the positively sloped lines suggest that as an American becomes more racially resentful and believes there are more Blacks in the legislature, they are more likely to “never” trust or only trust their state legislature “some of the time.” Similarly, the negatively sloped line in the second panel from the right suggests that as an American becomes more racially resentful and believes there are more Blacks in the legislature, they are *less likely* to indicate they trust their state legislature “most of the time.” For example, again, consider an American who scored a zero on the racial resentment measure. If this American believed their state legislature was 41 percent instead of 23 percent Black, the predicted probability the American would trust their legislature most of the time would increase by 0.073. Meanwhile, if we considered an American who scored a one on the racial resentment measure, the predicted probability they would trust their legislature most of the time would decrease by only 0.031 (t-statistic of difference 1.44). The difference between these differences is approximately 0.102 (t-statistic of difference 2.59).

While we find that more racially resentful Americans have more *negative* attitudes towards their state legislature if they *believe* that more Blacks serve in the legislature, statistical analyses additionally suggest that racially resentful Americans have more positive attitudes towards their state legislature if their state legislature *actually* has more Black state legislators. It is not immediately apparent to the authors why these counteracting conditional impacts of racial resentment are present, and we encourage future research to investigate further the relationship between sexism, racial resentment, and Americans’ attitudes toward political institutions.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-8: Regression Models: Perceptions of Women’s inclusion in Congress and External efficacy** |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | | Estimate % Women | 0.003\* | 0.003\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.001) | | Hostile Sexism | -0.006 | -0.011 | |  | (0.037) | (0.066) | | Estimate % Women x Hostile Sexism |  | 0.000 | |  |  | (0.002) | | Female | 0.042\* | 0.042\* | |  | (0.016) | (0.016) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.029\* | 0.029\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Independent | -0.012 | -0.012 | |  | (0.022) | (0.022) | | Republican | 0.002 | 0.002 | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | | Strong Partisan | 0.050\* | 0.049\* | |  | (0.019) | (0.019) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.019\* | -0.019\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Religiosity | 0.011\* | 0.011\* | |  | (0.005) | (0.005) | | Education | -0.028 | -0.028 | |  | (0.017) | (0.017) | | White | -0.053\* | -0.053\* | |  | (0.019) | (0.019) | | Age | -0.007\* | -0.007\* | |  | (0.003) | (0.003) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Employed | 0.037\* | 0.037\* | |  | (0.018) | (0.018) | | Woman sen. | -0.000 | -0.000 | |  | (0.016) | (0.016) | | Woman rep. | -0.006 | -0.006 | |  | (0.019) | (0.019) | | Women in state leg. | 0.001 | 0.001 | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Constant | 0.295\* | 0.298\* | |  | (0.085) | (0.089) | | N | 760 | 760 | | Log-Likelihood | 128.8 | 128.8 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-9: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Women’s Inclusion in Congress, Sexism, and Trust in Congress** |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | | Estimate % Women | 0.005\* | 0.004 | |  | (0.003) | (0.005) | | Hostile Sexism | 0.395\* | 0.331 | |  | (0.196) | (0.354) | | Estimate % Women x Hostile Sexism |  | 0.002 | |  |  | (0.010) | | Female | 0.169 | 0.170\* | |  | (0.086) | (0.086) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.031 | 0.031 | |  | (0.033) | (0.033) | | Independent | -0.010 | -0.010 | |  | (0.115) | (0.115) | | Republican | 0.322\* | 0.322\* | |  | (0.128) | (0.128) | | Strong Partisan | 0.001 | 0.000 | |  | (0.098) | (0.098) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.060\* | -0.060\* | |  | (0.030) | (0.030) | | Religiosity | 0.080\* | 0.081\* | |  | (0.025) | (0.025) | | Education | -0.027 | -0.028 | |  | (0.087) | (0.088) | | White | -0.142 | -0.142 | |  | (0.100) | (0.100) | | Age | -0.048\* | -0.048\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Employed | 0.135 | 0.136 | |  | (0.093) | (0.093) | | Woman sen. | -0.043 | -0.041 | |  | (0.083) | (0.084) | | Woman rep. | 0.174 | 0.175 | |  | (0.101) | (0.101) | | Women in state leg. | 0.004 | 0.004 | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | | cut1 | -1.309\* | -1.337\* | |  | (0.449) | (0.468) | | cut2 | -0.066 | -0.094 | |  | (0.448) | (0.467) | | cut3 | 0.813 | 0.784 | |  | (0.449) | (0.468) | | cut4 | 2.084\* | 2.056\* | |  | (0.469) | (0.487) | | N | 761 | 761 | | Log-Likelihood | -942.9 | -942.8 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-10: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Women in State Legislatures and Responsiveness of State Legislatures** |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | | Estimate % women | 0.010\* | 0.009 | |  | (0.003) | (0.005) | | Women in state leg. | -0.000 | 0.031\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.013) | | Hostile Sexism | -0.166 | 1.407\* | |  | (0.190) | (0.662) | | Female | 0.068 | 0.069 | |  | (0.085) | (0.085) | | Estimate % women x Hostile Sexism |  | 0.003 | |  |  | (0.010) | | Women in state leg. x Hostile Sexism |  | -0.065\* | |  |  | (0.023) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.384\* | 0.373\* | |  | (0.062) | (0.062) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.035\* | 0.034\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.008\* | -0.008\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.520\* | 0.487\* | |  | (0.118) | (0.118) | | Republican | 0.039 | 0.058 | |  | (0.136) | (0.136) | | Independent | 0.224 | 0.212 | |  | (0.117) | (0.117) | | Strong Partisan | 0.036 | 0.025 | |  | (0.096) | (0.096) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.032 | -0.027 | |  | (0.039) | (0.039) | | Age | -0.045\* | -0.046\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | -0.011 | -0.033 | |  | (0.098) | (0.099) | | Education | -0.218\* | -0.221\* | |  | (0.087) | (0.087) | | Employed | 0.129 | 0.136 | |  | (0.091) | (0.091) | | Religiosity | 0.022 | 0.026 | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | -0.162 | 0.554 | |  | (0.493) | (0.565) | | cut2 | 0.560 | 1.282\* | |  | (0.494) | (0.566) | | cut3 | 1.523\* | 2.250\* | |  | (0.495) | (0.568) | | cut4 | 2.809\* | 3.542\* | |  | (0.500) | (0.574) | | N | 764 | 764 | | Log-Likelihood | -1043.7 | -1039.5 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses; \* *p* < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-11: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Women in State Legislatures and Trust in State Legislatures** |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | | Estimate % women | 0.006\* | 0.004 | |  | (0.003) | (0.005) | | Women in state leg. | 0.009 | 0.019 | |  | (0.007) | (0.013) | | Hostile Sexism | -0.119 | 0.276 | |  | (0.193) | (0.660) | | Female | 0.082 | 0.082 | |  | (0.085) | (0.085) | | Estimate % women x Hostile Sexism |  | 0.003 | |  |  | (0.010) | | Women in state leg. x Hostile Sexism |  | -0.019 | |  |  | (0.023) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.363\* | 0.361\* | |  | (0.062) | (0.063) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.037\* | 0.036\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.382\* | 0.370\* | |  | (0.120) | (0.121) | | Republican | -0.002 | 0.003 | |  | (0.137) | (0.138) | | Independent | -0.008 | -0.014 | |  | (0.119) | (0.119) | | Strong Partisan | 0.003 | -0.002 | |  | (0.098) | (0.098) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.032 | -0.031 | |  | (0.040) | (0.040) | | Age | -0.021 | -0.021 | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000 | 0.000 | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | 0.069 | 0.063 | |  | (0.100) | (0.100) | | Education | -0.066 | -0.069 | |  | (0.087) | (0.087) | | Employed | 0.115 | 0.119 | |  | (0.092) | (0.092) | | Religiosity | 0.082\* | 0.083\* | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | 0.290 | 0.477 | |  | (0.505) | (0.572) | | cut2 | 1.433\* | 1.620\* | |  | (0.506) | (0.574) | | cut3 | 2.303\* | 2.490\* | |  | (0.510) | (0.577) | | cut4 | 4.075\* | 4.262\* | |  | (0.530) | (0.594) | | N | 762 | 762 | | Log-Likelihood | -981.2 | -980.8 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses; \* *p* < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-12: Regression Models: Perceptions of Blacks’ inclusion in Congress and External Efficacy** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Estimate % Black | 0.002\* | 0.004\* | 0.002\* | 0.003\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.001) | (0.000) | (0.001) | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) | -0.040 | 0.015 |  |  | |  | (0.037) | (0.054) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  | 0.039 | 0.071 | |  |  |  | (0.039) | (0.057) | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) x Estimate % Black |  | -0.002 |  |  | |  |  | (0.002) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) x Est. % Black |  |  |  | -0.001 | |  |  |  |  | (0.002) | | Female | 0.044\* | 0.044\* | 0.043\* | 0.043\* | |  | (0.016) | (0.016) | (0.016) | (0.016) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.033\* | 0.031\* | 0.026\* | 0.025\* | |  | (0.007) | (0.007) | (0.007) | (0.007) | | Independent | -0.025 | -0.024 | -0.025 | -0.024 | |  | (0.022) | (0.022) | (0.022) | (0.022) | | Republican | 0.001 | 0.003 | -0.005 | -0.004 | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | Strong Partisan | 0.037\* | 0.039\* | 0.044\* | 0.044\* | |  | (0.019) | (0.019) | (0.019) | (0.019) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.020\* | -0.020\* | -0.019\* | -0.019\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Religiosity | 0.010\* | 0.011\* | 0.011\* | 0.011\* | |  | (0.005) | (0.005) | (0.005) | (0.005) | | Education | -0.023 | -0.022 | -0.018 | -0.018 | |  | (0.017) | (0.017) | (0.017) | (0.017) | | Black | 0.043 | 0.038 | 0.059\* | 0.056 | |  | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | | Age | -0.008\* | -0.008\* | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | |  | (0.003) | (0.003) | (0.003) | (0.003) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Employed | 0.039\* | 0.037\* | 0.037\* | 0.036\* | |  | (0.018) | (0.018) | (0.018) | (0.018) | | Black sen. | 0.019 | 0.019 | 0.022 | 0.021 | |  | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.021) | | Black rep. | -0.012 | -0.013 | -0.014 | -0.014 | |  | (0.034) | (0.034) | (0.034) | (0.034) | | Black in State Leg | -0.001 | -0.001 | -0.002 | -0.002 | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Constant | 0.369\* | 0.344\* | 0.371\* | 0.359\* | |  | (0.076) | (0.078) | (0.076) | (0.078) | | N | 764 | 764 | 763 | 763 | | Log-Likelihood | 118.1 | 119.1 | 117.4 | 117.7 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-13: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Black’s Inclusion in Congress and Trust in Congress** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Estimate % Black | 0.005 | 0.013\* | 0.005 | 0.008 | |  | (0.002) | (0.005) | (0.002) | (0.005) | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) | 0.247 | 0.604\* |  |  | |  | (0.193) | (0.283) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  | 0.415\* | 0.565 | |  |  |  | (0.205) | (0.299) | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) x Estimate % Black |  | -0.016 |  |  | |  |  | (0.009) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) x Est. % Black |  |  |  | -0.006 | |  |  |  |  | (0.009) | | Female | 0.143 | 0.144 | 0.148 | 0.149 | |  | (0.086) | (0.086) | (0.086) | (0.086) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.047 | 0.036 | 0.033 | 0.028 | |  | (0.034) | (0.034) | (0.034) | (0.035) | | Independent | -0.038 | -0.033 | -0.040 | -0.038 | |  | (0.114) | (0.114) | (0.114) | (0.114) | | Republican | 0.300\* | 0.311\* | 0.284\* | 0.289\* | |  | (0.126) | (0.126) | (0.126) | (0.126) | | Strong Partisan | -0.006 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0.008 | |  | (0.098) | (0.098) | (0.098) | (0.098) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.066\* | -0.064\* | -0.062\* | -0.061\* | |  | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.031) | | Religiosity | 0.082\* | 0.084\* | 0.085\* | 0.086\* | |  | (0.025) | (0.025) | (0.025) | (0.025) | | Education | -0.005 | -0.000 | 0.003 | 0.005 | |  | (0.088) | (0.088) | (0.088) | (0.088) | | Black | 0.233 | 0.203 | 0.259 | 0.247 | |  | (0.153) | (0.154) | (0.153) | (0.154) | | Age | -0.052\* | -0.051\* | -0.052\* | -0.052\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Employed | 0.131 | 0.120 | 0.127 | 0.123 | |  | (0.092) | (0.092) | (0.092) | (0.092) | | Black sen. | 0.049 | 0.044 | 0.052 | 0.049 | |  | (0.112) | (0.112) | (0.112) | (0.112) | | Black rep. | 0.028 | 0.022 | 0.023 | 0.021 | |  | (0.176) | (0.176) | (0.176) | (0.176) | | Black in State Leg | -0.009 | -0.009 | -0.009 | -0.009 | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | cut1 | -1.602\* | -1.443\* | -1.578\* | -1.520\* | |  | (0.397) | (0.408) | (0.397) | (0.406) | | cut2 | -0.359 | -0.199 | -0.334 | -0.276 | |  | (0.394) | (0.405) | (0.394) | (0.403) | | cut3 | 0.515 | 0.680 | 0.543 | 0.602 | |  | (0.395) | (0.407) | (0.395) | (0.405) | | cut4 | 1.739\* | 1.914\* | 1.767\* | 1.829\* | |  | (0.416) | (0.428) | (0.416) | (0.425) | | N | 765 | 765 | 764 | 764 | | Log-Likelihood | -953.3 | -951.8 | -951.3 | -951.0 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-14: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Blacks in State Legislatures and Responsiveness of State Legislatures** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Black in State Leg | -0.005 | -0.028\* | -0.005 | -0.031\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.012) | (0.006) | (0.012) | | Estimate % black | 0.008\* | 0.023\* | 0.007\* | 0.022\* | |  | (0.002) | (0.005) | (0.002) | (0.005) | | Female | 0.087 | 0.077 | 0.086 | 0.077 | |  | (0.084) | (0.085) | (0.084) | (0.085) | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) | -0.006 | 0.114 |  |  | |  | (0.188) | (0.324) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  | 0.157 | 0.206 | |  |  |  | (0.199) | (0.335) | | Black in State Leg x Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  | 0.045\* |  |  | |  |  | (0.020) |  |  | | Estimate % black x Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  | -0.029\* |  |  | |  |  | (0.009) |  |  | | Black in State Leg x Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  |  | 0.050\* | |  |  |  |  | (0.021) | | Estimate % black x Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  |  | -0.029\* | |  |  |  |  | (0.009) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.393\* | 0.370\* | 0.382\* | 0.362\* | |  | (0.062) | (0.062) | (0.062) | (0.062) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.036\* | 0.035\* | 0.037\* | 0.036\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.009\* | -0.008\* | -0.009\* | -0.009\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.511\* | 0.510\* | 0.508\* | 0.503\* | |  | (0.117) | (0.118) | (0.117) | (0.118) | | Republican | -0.004 | -0.011 | -0.015 | -0.014 | |  | (0.133) | (0.134) | (0.134) | (0.134) | | Independent | 0.164 | 0.173 | 0.165 | 0.175 | |  | (0.116) | (0.116) | (0.116) | (0.116) | | Strong Partisan | 0.023 | 0.044 | 0.036 | 0.053 | |  | (0.097) | (0.097) | (0.097) | (0.097) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.036 | -0.041 | -0.034 | -0.040 | |  | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | | Age | -0.050\* | -0.053\* | -0.051\* | -0.055\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.001\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Black | 0.008 | -0.011 | 0.039 | 0.029 | |  | (0.147) | (0.149) | (0.146) | (0.149) | | Education | -0.176\* | -0.169 | -0.167 | -0.161 | |  | (0.087) | (0.087) | (0.087) | (0.087) | | Employed | 0.116 | 0.103 | 0.111 | 0.106 | |  | (0.091) | (0.091) | (0.091) | (0.091) | | Religiosity | 0.028 | 0.036 | 0.030 | 0.036 | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | -0.319 | -0.439 | -0.297 | -0.471 | |  | (0.460) | (0.498) | (0.461) | (0.497) | | cut2 | 0.407 | 0.292 | 0.430 | 0.262 | |  | (0.460) | (0.498) | (0.461) | (0.497) | | cut3 | 1.364\* | 1.260\* | 1.385\* | 1.227\* | |  | (0.461) | (0.498) | (0.462) | (0.497) | | cut4 | 2.627\* | 2.536\* | 2.648\* | 2.500\* | |  | (0.467) | (0.503) | (0.467) | (0.502) | | N | 768 | 768 | 767 | 767 | | Log-Likelihood | -1053.4 | -1046.5 | -1052.0 | -1045.6 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses \* *p* < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-15: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Blacks in State Legislatures**  **and Trust of State Legislatures** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Black in State Leg | -0.018\* | -0.045\* | -0.018\* | -0.052\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.012) | (0.006) | (0.013) | | Estimate % black | 0.004 | 0.016\* | 0.004 | 0.015\* | |  | (0.002) | (0.005) | (0.002) | (0.005) | | Female | 0.092 | 0.078 | 0.090 | 0.077 | |  | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) | -0.073 | -0.201 |  |  | |  | (0.191) | (0.327) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  | 0.001 | -0.272 | |  |  |  | (0.202) | (0.339) | | Black in State Leg x Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  | 0.053\* |  |  | |  |  | (0.020) |  |  | | Estimate % black x Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  | -0.022\* |  |  | |  |  | (0.009) |  |  | | Black in State Leg x Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  |  | 0.066\* | |  |  |  |  | (0.021) | | Estimate % black x Racial Resentment (Kinder & Sanders) |  |  |  | -0.022\* | |  |  |  |  | (0.009) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.374\* | 0.352\* | 0.369\* | 0.349\* | |  | (0.062) | (0.062) | (0.062) | (0.062) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.036\* | 0.035\* | 0.037\* | 0.035\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.010\* | -0.009\* | -0.010\* | -0.009\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.390\* | 0.394\* | 0.388\* | 0.390\* | |  | (0.118) | (0.119) | (0.118) | (0.119) | | Republican | -0.051 | -0.063 | -0.055 | -0.063 | |  | (0.135) | (0.135) | (0.135) | (0.136) | | Independent | -0.054 | -0.045 | -0.055 | -0.043 | |  | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.118) | | Strong Partisan | -0.015 | -0.002 | -0.008 | 0.003 | |  | (0.098) | (0.098) | (0.098) | (0.098) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.046 | -0.053 | -0.046 | -0.053 | |  | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | | Age | -0.023 | -0.026 | -0.023 | -0.028 | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Black | -0.070 | -0.066 | -0.055 | -0.032 | |  | (0.147) | (0.149) | (0.146) | (0.149) | | Education | -0.016 | -0.009 | -0.010 | -0.006 | |  | (0.088) | (0.088) | (0.088) | (0.088) | | Employed | 0.087 | 0.080 | 0.085 | 0.087 | |  | (0.091) | (0.092) | (0.091) | (0.092) | | Religiosity | 0.080\* | 0.087\* | 0.080\* | 0.085\* | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.025) | | cut1 | -0.332 | -0.606 | -0.325 | -0.701 | |  | (0.464) | (0.501) | (0.465) | (0.500) | | cut2 | 0.817 | 0.552 | 0.825 | 0.458 | |  | (0.464) | (0.500) | (0.464) | (0.499) | | cut3 | 1.687\* | 1.431\* | 1.692\* | 1.336\* | |  | (0.466) | (0.501) | (0.466) | (0.500) | | cut4 | 3.433\* | 3.189\* | 3.438\* | 3.096\* | |  | (0.484) | (0.517) | (0.485) | (0.516) | | N | 766 | 766 | 765 | 765 | | Log-Likelihood | -984.8 | -979.2 | -983.7 | -977.4 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses; \* *p* < 0.05 |

**Section 5: Knowledge of Descriptive Representation**

Stauffer highlights the importance of individuals’ perceptions of descriptive representation. As discussed in the main text, Americans overestimate levels of gender and Black descriptive representation. To come to these conclusions, we use our survey to evaluate what predicts whether an individual overestimates descriptive representation (Table A-16), how large overestimations are (Table A-17), the size of errors (Table A-18), and whether respondents’ estimates of descriptive representation are within five percentage points of reality (Table A-19).

The variables used in these analyses are akin to those in the main text. Following prior findings on political knowledge, we also account for a respondent’s income, and following prior work that finds Americans who live closer to the capital are more likely to be knowledgeable about state politics (Hopkins 2018), our studies of knowledge about the state legislature account for a respondent’s distance from the state capital. Following findings that those with biased views towards groups are less informed about social groups (Abrajano and Lajevardi 2021), we also account for a respondent’s sexism or racial resentment using the measures described in Section 4. We employ sample weights specific to the module’s respondents and refer readers to YouGov’s documentation concerning the 2018 CES for information about sampling and weighting procedures.

We consistently find that Americans who are knowledgeable about other aspects of federal or state politics are less likely to overestimate the percentage of women or Blacks in Congress and state legislatures (Table A-16). These respondents’ estimations of the percentages of women and Blacks serving in Congress are smaller than those of other respondents, all else equal (Table A-17). Focusing on state legislatures, we also find that older voters are more likely to overestimate diversity in their state legislature (Table A-17). Respondents who live further away from the state capital believe more women serve in their state legislature than respondents who live closer to the state capital (Table A-17).

We do not find strong evidence that women are more likely to be more knowledgeable about gender descriptive representation in Congress or state legislatures. However, we do find that Americans who exhibit higher levels of hostile sexism are more likely to overestimate the percentage of women who serve in Congress and their state legislature (Tables A-16 and A-17). Americans who exhibit higher levels of hostile sexism also have larger errors in their estimations of the percentages of women who serve in their state legislature (Table A-18). However, we do not find that hostile sexism relates to whether Americans are more likely to accurately identify the percentage of women in Congress or their state legislature within five percentage points (Table A-19).

Racially resentful Americans are more likely to overestimate the percentage of Blacks in Congress (Table A-16) and have larger overestimates (Table A-17). However, when studying Americans’ knowledge of descriptive representation in state legislatures, we only find evidence that racially resentful voters are less likely to accurately identify the percentage of Blacks in their state legislature within five percentage points (Table A-19). Estimates concerning the relationship between racial resentment and Americans’ overestimations, or the size of their errors are in the expected direction but do not meet conventional levels of statistical significance.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-16: Whether a Respondent Overestimated Levels of Descriptive Representation** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Women  Congress | Women  State Legislature | Black  Congress | Black  State Legislature | | Female | -0.043 | 0.024 | -0.112 | 0.012 | |  | (0.115) | (0.119) | (0.125) | (0.119) | | Strong Partisan | 0.048 | -0.081 | 0.199 | 0.109 | |  | (0.116) | (0.116) | (0.124) | (0.124) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.234\* |  | -0.228\* |  | |  | (0.045) |  | (0.047) |  | | Political knowledge (State) |  | -0.254\* |  | -0.276\* | |  |  | (0.055) |  | (0.058) | | Hostile Sexism | 0.638\* | 0.682\* |  |  | |  | (0.214) | (0.216) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  |  | 0.832\* | 0.413 | |  |  |  | (0.224) | (0.212) | | Age | 0.007 | 0.017 | 0.015 | 0.047\* | |  | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.023) | (0.021) | | Age x Age | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000 | -0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | -0.163 | -0.319\* |  |  | |  | (0.142) | (0.147) |  |  | | Black |  |  | -0.042 | -0.069 | |  |  |  | (0.203) | (0.197) | | Education | -0.201 | -0.340\* | -0.165 | -0.257\* | |  | (0.124) | (0.120) | (0.130) | (0.125) | | Income | -0.006 | 0.002 | -0.006 | -0.018 | |  | (0.018) | (0.018) | (0.019) | (0.019) | | Woman rep. | -0.151 |  |  |  | |  | (0.149) |  |  |  | | Black rep. |  |  | 0.576\* |  | |  |  |  | (0.252) |  | | Woman sen. | 0.060 |  |  |  | |  | (0.115) |  |  |  | | Black sen. |  |  | -0.032 |  | |  |  |  | (0.167) |  | | Distance to Capital (Logged) |  | 0.065 |  | -0.060 | |  |  | (0.052) |  | (0.053) | | Constant | 1.317\* | 0.122 | 0.837 | 0.517 | |  | (0.543) | (0.608) | (0.571) | (0.538) | | N | 728 | 727 | 730 | 729 | | Log-Likelihood | -349.0 | -416.2 | -267.7 | -351.5 | |
| *This table reports the results of a probit regression in which the outcome of interest is whether a respondent overestimates the percentage of women or Blacks in their legislature. Standard errors in parentheses, \*p < 0.05* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-17: Predicting Difference between respondents’ beliefs about and actual descriptive representation** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Women  Congress | Women  State Legislature | Black  Congress | Black  State Legislature | | Female | 1.194 | 1.053 | -0.573 | 0.398 | |  | (1.355) | (1.658) | (1.756) | (1.977) | | Strong Partisan | -0.127 | -1.039 | 0.061 | -1.950 | |  | (1.407) | (1.625) | (1.635) | (1.893) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -3.347\* |  | -4.695\* |  | |  | (0.519) |  | (0.681) |  | | Political knowledge (State) |  | -2.597\* |  | -3.892\* | |  |  | (0.763) |  | (0.933) | | Hostile Sexism | 5.671\* | 7.541\* |  |  | |  | (2.189) | (2.594) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  |  | 6.466\* | 1.847 | |  |  |  | (3.079) | (3.234) | | Age | 0.598\* | 0.518 | 0.928\* | 0.687\* | |  | (0.276) | (0.284) | (0.290) | (0.321) | | Age x Age | -0.005\* | -0.005\* | -0.008\* | -0.007\* | |  | (0.003) | (0.003) | (0.002) | (0.003) | | White | -5.536\* | -6.176\* |  |  | |  | (2.003) | (2.289) |  |  | | Black |  |  | 3.436 | 1.100 | |  |  |  | (3.293) | (3.656) | | Education | -2.043 | -3.842\* | -2.444 | -5.227\* | |  | (1.617) | (1.610) | (1.870) | (2.071) | | Income | -0.301 | -0.349 | -0.428 | -0.398 | |  | (0.231) | (0.277) | (0.259) | (0.346) | | Woman rep. | -0.194 |  |  |  | |  | (1.981) |  |  |  | | Black rep. |  |  | 1.712 |  | |  |  |  | (3.333) |  | | Woman sen. | 2.086 |  |  |  | |  | (1.388) |  |  |  | | Black sen. |  |  | 3.323 |  | |  |  |  | (3.433) |  | | Distance to Capital (Logged) |  | 1.480\* |  | 0.217 | |  |  | (0.683) |  | (0.794) | | Constant | 10.948 | -1.190 | 10.800 | 10.965 | |  | (6.668) | (8.171) | (6.927) | (10.220) | | Observations | 728 | 727 | 730 | 729 | |
| *This table reports the results of a linear regression in which the outcome of interest is the difference between a respondent’s beliefs about descriptive representation and actual levels of descriptive representation, where positive values are overestimates. Standard errors in parentheses, \*p < 0.05* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-18: Predicting the size of error between respondents’ beliefs about and actual descriptive representation** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Women  Congress | Women  State Legislature | Black  Congress | Black  State Legislature | | Female | 1.457 | 2.416 | -0.076 | 0.562 | |  | (1.190) | (1.269) | (1.682) | (1.768) | | Strong Partisan | -0.102 | -1.533 | -0.428 | -2.679 | |  | (1.234) | (1.280) | (1.561) | (1.674) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -2.708\* |  | -4.355\* |  | |  | (0.481) |  | (0.666) |  | | Political knowledge (State) |  | -1.020 |  | -3.018\* | |  |  | (0.607) |  | (0.842) | | Hostile Sexism | 3.039 | 3.770\* |  |  | |  | (1.846) | (1.909) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  |  | 4.725 | 2.576 | |  |  |  | (2.950) | (2.862) | | Age | 0.640\* | 0.413 | 0.927\* | 0.391 | |  | (0.250) | (0.213) | (0.278) | (0.289) | | Age x Age | -0.006\* | -0.004\* | -0.009\* | -0.004 | |  | (0.002) | (0.002) | (0.002) | (0.002) | | White | -5.037\* | -4.762\* |  |  | |  | (1.826) | (1.866) |  |  | | Black |  |  | 3.956 | 3.412 | |  |  |  | (3.150) | (3.280) | | Education | -1.251 | -1.591 | -2.255 | -3.894\* | |  | (1.415) | (1.191) | (1.783) | (1.850) | | Income | -0.295 | -0.244 | -0.413 | -0.192 | |  | (0.205) | (0.233) | (0.253) | (0.314) | | Woman rep. | 0.457 |  |  |  | |  | (1.710) |  |  |  | | Black rep. |  |  | 0.975 |  | |  |  |  | (3.287) |  | | Woman sen. | 2.352 |  |  |  | |  | (1.202) |  |  |  | | Black sen. |  |  | 3.427 |  | |  |  |  | (3.312) |  | | Distance to Capital (Logged) |  | 0.652 |  | 0.466 | |  |  | (0.498) |  | (0.708) | | Constant | 11.332 | 8.516 | 12.050 | 15.425 | |  | (6.008) | (5.856) | (6.574) | (9.419) | | Observations | 728 | 727 | 730 | 729 | |
| *This table reports the results of a linear regression in which the outcome of interest is the absolute value of the difference between a respondent’s beliefs about descriptive representation and actual levels of descriptive representation. Standard errors in parentheses, \*p < 0.05.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-19: Respondents Correctly Estimating Descriptive Representation** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Women  Congress | Women  State Legislature | Black  Congress | Black  State Legislature | | Female | -0.165 | -0.148 |  | 0.038 | |  | (0.119) | (0.118) |  | (0.116) | | Strong Partisan | 0.003 | 0.050 | 0.369\* | 0.200 | |  | (0.119) | (0.118) | (0.121) | (0.116) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | 0.184\* |  | -0.162\* |  | |  | (0.042) |  | (0.046) |  | | Political knowledge (State) |  | 0.184\* |  | 0.187\* | |  |  | (0.063) |  | (0.063) | | Hostile Sexism | -0.154 | -0.293 |  |  | |  | (0.213) | (0.225) |  |  | | Racial Resentment (Tesler) |  |  | -0.016 | -0.670\* | |  |  |  | (0.206) | (0.193) | | Age | -0.058\* | -0.002 | -0.005 | 0.012 | |  | (0.023) | (0.022) | (0.022) | (0.021) | | Age x Age | 0.001\* | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.000 | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | 0.180 | 0.192 |  |  | |  | (0.155) | (0.156) |  |  | | Black |  |  | -0.093 | -0.421\* | |  |  |  | (0.235) | (0.200) | | Education | 0.143 | 0.031 | 0.156 | 0.211 | |  | (0.122) | (0.127) | (0.119) | (0.123) | | Income | 0.004 | 0.002 | -0.047\* | 0.012 | |  | (0.018) | (0.019) | (0.019) | (0.019) | | Woman rep. | 0.071 |  |  |  | |  | (0.149) |  |  |  | | Black rep. |  |  | -0.068 |  | |  |  |  | (0.245) |  | | Woman sen. | -0.322\* |  |  |  | |  | (0.118) |  |  |  | | Black sen. |  |  | 0.144 |  | |  |  |  | (0.168) |  | | Distance to Capital (Logged) |  | -0.019 |  | 0.002 | |  |  | (0.052) |  | (0.050) | | Constant | 0.183 | -0.972 | 0.787 | -1.285\* | |  | (0.595) | (0.597) | (0.591) | (0.550) | | N | 728 | 727 | 730 | 729 | | Log-Likelihood | -377.4 | -393.0 | -452.8 | -361.5 | |
| *This table reports the results of a probit regression in which the outcome of interest is whether a respondent’s estimate of the percentage of women or Blacks in their legislature was within 5% of the actual percentage. Standard errors in parentheses, \*p < 0.05* |

**Section 6: Political Trust**

Stauffer argues that perceptions of descriptive representation should relate to Americans’ trust in political institutions. However, research is mixed on whether gender descriptive representation leads to increased trust (Clayton, O’Brien, and Piscopo 2019; Dolan 2006; Lawless 2004).

In one of the few existing studies that focus on perceptions of Black descriptive representation, Tate (2002) finds that Blacks who perceive more Blacks serving in Congress are more likely to trust Congress. However, just as with political efficacy, there is reason to doubt that the relationship between Black descriptive representation and political trust is attributable to the second mechanism. For instance, Black candidates in elections are viewed as less competent than their white counterparts (Sigelman et al. 1995), Black candidates are seen by whites as favoring Black interests (Stephens-Dougan 2020), and Black candidates accused of sexual impropriety are punished more than their white peers (Berinsky et al. 2011). Together, these findings suggest some may be less willing to trust legislatures they perceive as having more Black representatives.

To empirically evaluate the relationship between descriptive representation and trust, we take advantage of two political trust questions asked on our 2018 CES Module. Specifically, we asked respondents: “How much of the time do you think you can trust the following levels of government to do what is right?” Respondents separately rated their trust in “The U.S. Congress” and their state legislatures, with responses of “Always, “Most of the time,” “About half the time,” “Some of the time,” and “Never.” Using these survey responses, we employ the same statistical approach used by Stauffer and in our studies of efficacy to examine the relationship between Americans’ perceptions of descriptive representation in Congress and state legislatures and their trust in these political institutions. Substituting our trust for efficacy measures, analyses in Table A-20 follow Stauffer’s Table 1, and Tables A-21 and A-22 follow Stauffer’s Table 2.

We find that Americans’ views of gender descriptive representation relate to their trust in government. Findings concerning racial descriptive representation are in the expected direction, but do not meet conventional levels of statistical significance. Focusing on Congress, when using estimates from the first column of Table A-20, we find that if an American believes that Congress is 35 percent women instead of 25 percent women, it increases the predicted probability that American trusts Congress “most of the time” by 0.009 and decreases the probability that American “never” trusts Congress by 0.018. When using estimates from the third column of Table A-20, we find that if an American believes Congress is 35 percent black instead of 25 percent black, it increases the predicted probability that American trusts Congress “most of the time” by 0.007 (t-statistic of difference 1.81) and decreases the probability that American “never” trusts Congress by 0.013 (t-statistic of difference 1.91).

Like the studies presented in Stauffer (2021) and the main text, our analyses of state legislatures take advantage of the fact that different numbers of women and Blacks serve in these institutions. Our findings regarding the importance of gender descriptive representation in the state legislature are similar to those in Congress. When using estimates from the third column of Table A-21, we find that if an American believes that their state legislature is 35 percent women instead of 25 percent women, it increases the predicted probability that person trusts their state legislature “most of the time” by 0.017 and decreases the probability that person “never” trusts their state legislature by 0.011. However, when studying Black descriptive representation, the comparable increase and decreases respectively are 0.009 (t-statistic of difference 1.48) and 0.006 (t-statistic of difference 1.54) (Table A-22).

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-20: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Women’s & Black’s Inclusion in Congress and Trust in Congress** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Women Congress | Women Congress | Blacks Congress | Blacks Congress | | Estimate % Women | 0.006\* | 0.011\* |  |  | |  | (0.003) | (0.004) |  |  | | Estimate % Black |  |  | 0.005 | 0.007\* | |  |  |  | (0.002) | (0.003) | | Female | 0.145 | 0.457 | 0.141 | 0.112 | |  | (0.085) | (0.358) | (0.086) | (0.086) | | Black |  |  | 0.185 | 1.043\* | |  |  |  | (0.147) | (0.364) | | Estimate % Women x Female |  | -0.008 |  |  | |  |  | (0.005) |  |  | | Estimate % Black x Black |  |  |  | -0.008 | |  |  |  |  | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.063\* | 0.062\* | 0.067\* | 0.065\* | |  | (0.029) | (0.029) | (0.029) | (0.030) | | Independent | -0.001 | 0.003 | -0.024 | -0.031 | |  | (0.115) | (0.115) | (0.114) | (0.114) | | Republican | 0.345\* | 0.349\* | 0.328\* | 0.322\* | |  | (0.125) | (0.126) | (0.125) | (0.125) | | Strong Partisan | -0.008 | -0.015 | -0.026 | -0.016 | |  | (0.097) | (0.097) | (0.096) | (0.097) | | Political Knowledge (Fed) | -0.067\* | -0.069\* | -0.070\* | -0.069\* | |  | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | | Religiosity | 0.083\* | 0.088\* | 0.081\* | 0.083\* | |  | (0.024) | (0.025) | (0.025) | (0.025) | | Education | -0.033 | -0.033 | -0.017 | -0.028 | |  | (0.086) | (0.087) | (0.087) | (0.087) | | White | -0.131 | -0.121 |  |  | |  | (0.100) | (0.100) |  |  | | Age | -0.047\* | -0.046\* | -0.050\* | -0.051\* | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | 0.000\* | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Employed | 0.126 | 0.115 | 0.131 | 0.162 | |  | (0.092) | (0.092) | (0.092) | (0.092) | | Woman sen. | -0.034 | -0.025 |  |  | |  | (0.083) | (0.126) |  |  | | Woman rep. | 0.169 | 0.111 |  |  | |  | (0.101) | (0.152) |  |  | | Women in state leg. | 0.003 | 0.005 |  |  | |  | (0.006) | (0.010) |  |  | | Woman sen. x Female |  | -0.010 |  |  | |  |  | (0.168) |  |  | | Woman rep. x Female |  | 0.112 |  |  | |  |  | (0.203) |  |  | | Women in state leg. x Female |  | -0.004 |  |  | |  |  | (0.013) |  |  | | Black sen. |  |  | 0.047 | 0.171 | |  |  |  | (0.112) | (0.119) | | Black rep. |  |  | 0.036 | 0.124 | |  |  |  | (0.176) | (0.218) | | Black in State Leg |  |  | -0.008 | -0.007 | |  |  |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Black sen. x Black |  |  |  | -1.184\* | |  |  |  |  | (0.384) | | Black rep. x Black |  |  |  | -0.422 | |  |  |  |  | (0.381) | | Black in State Leg x Black |  |  |  | -0.024 | |  |  |  |  | (0.020) | | cut1 | -1.372\* | -1.172\* | -1.596\* | -1.583\* | |  | (0.440) | (0.480) | (0.396) | (0.399) | | cut2 | -0.126 | 0.076 | -0.356 | -0.331 | |  | (0.439) | (0.479) | (0.394) | (0.397) | | cut3 | 0.748 | 0.951\* | 0.516 | 0.547 | |  | (0.440) | (0.480) | (0.395) | (0.398) | | cut4 | 1.979\* | 2.188\* | 1.741\* | 1.785\* | |  | (0.459) | (0.497) | (0.415) | (0.419) | | N | 768 | 768 | 768 | 768 | | Log-Likelihood | -954.5 | -953.2 | -957.4 | -950.8 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses. \* p < 0.05 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A-21: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Women’s Representation and Trust in State Legislatures** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Women in state leg. | 0.010 | 0.012 | 0.009 | 0.009 | |  | (0.007) | (0.010) | (0.007) | (0.010) | | Estimate % women |  |  | 0.007\* | 0.011\* | |  |  |  | (0.003) | (0.004) | | Female | 0.103 | 0.164 | 0.086 | 0.317 | |  | (0.085) | (0.320) | (0.085) | (0.347) | | Women in state leg. x Female |  | -0.002 |  | -0.000 | |  |  | (0.012) |  | (0.012) | | Estimate % women x Female |  |  |  | -0.007 | |  |  |  |  | (0.005) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.378\* | 0.378\* | 0.366\* | 0.363\* | |  | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.061) | (0.061) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.038\* | 0.038\* | 0.037\* | 0.037\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.384\* | 0.384\* | 0.370\* | 0.369\* | |  | (0.119) | (0.119) | (0.119) | (0.119) | | Republican | -0.049 | -0.050 | -0.021 | -0.020 | |  | (0.135) | (0.135) | (0.135) | (0.136) | | Independent | -0.053 | -0.053 | -0.024 | -0.029 | |  | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.118) | (0.118) | | Strong Partisan | -0.007 | -0.007 | 0.008 | 0.006 | |  | (0.096) | (0.096) | (0.097) | (0.097) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.048 | -0.048 | -0.037 | -0.038 | |  | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | | Age | -0.021 | -0.021 | -0.020 | -0.019 | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | White | 0.042 | 0.043 | 0.055 | 0.062 | |  | (0.099) | (0.100) | (0.099) | (0.100) | | Education | -0.068 | -0.068 | -0.052 | -0.050 | |  | (0.086) | (0.086) | (0.086) | (0.086) | | Employed | 0.102 | 0.101 | 0.102 | 0.091 | |  | (0.091) | (0.091) | (0.091) | (0.091) | | Religiosity | 0.085\* | 0.085\* | 0.082\* | 0.085\* | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | 0.155 | 0.189 | 0.341 | 0.468 | |  | (0.490) | (0.519) | (0.494) | (0.527) | | cut2 | 1.298\* | 1.332\* | 1.487\* | 1.614\* | |  | (0.491) | (0.520) | (0.495) | (0.528) | | cut3 | 2.164\* | 2.198\* | 2.358\* | 2.487\* | |  | (0.494) | (0.523) | (0.499) | (0.532) | | cut4 | 3.903\* | 3.937\* | 4.107\* | 4.241\* | |  | (0.513) | (0.541) | (0.519) | (0.552) | | N | 769 | 769 | 769 | 769 | | Log-Likelihood | -993.8 | -993.8 | -990.5 | -989.4 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses; \* *p* < 0.05 |
| **Table A-22: Ordered Probit Models: Perceptions of Blacks in State Legislatures and Trust in State Legislatures** |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | Black in State Leg | -0.015\* | -0.011 | -0.017\* | -0.013\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Estimate % black |  |  | 0.004 | 0.003 | |  |  |  | (0.002) | (0.003) | | Female | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.090 | 0.091 | |  | (0.084) | (0.084) | (0.085) | (0.085) | | Black in State Leg x Black |  | -0.034 |  | -0.033 | |  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) | | Estimate % black x Black |  |  |  | 0.001 | |  |  |  |  | (0.007) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) | 0.371\* | 0.369\* | 0.364\* | 0.363\* | |  | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | (0.060) | | State gov. liberalism | 0.037\* | 0.037\* | 0.037\* | 0.037\* | |  | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | (0.006) | | Ideology (lib. to cons.) x State gov. liberalism | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | -0.010\* | |  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | | Congruence | 0.396\* | 0.393\* | 0.389\* | 0.385\* | |  | (0.118) | (0.118) | (0.118) | (0.118) | | Republican | -0.063 | -0.052 | -0.049 | -0.037 | |  | (0.134) | (0.134) | (0.134) | (0.135) | | Independent | -0.053 | -0.047 | -0.041 | -0.036 | |  | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | (0.117) | | Strong Partisan | -0.001 | -0.002 | 0.007 | 0.004 | |  | (0.096) | (0.096) | (0.096) | (0.097) | | Political knowledge (State) | -0.055 | -0.053 | -0.046 | -0.045 | |  | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.040) | (0.040) | | Age | -0.023 | -0.024 | -0.023 | -0.025 | |  | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | (0.015) | | Age x Age | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |  | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | | Black | -0.065 | 0.421 | -0.060 | 0.375 | |  | (0.141) | (0.302) | (0.141) | (0.337) | | Education | -0.037 | -0.039 | -0.016 | -0.020 | |  | (0.086) | (0.086) | (0.087) | (0.087) | | Employed | 0.098 | 0.108 | 0.096 | 0.105 | |  | (0.091) | (0.091) | (0.091) | (0.091) | | Religiosity | 0.082\* | 0.083\* | 0.081\* | 0.082\* | |  | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | | cut1 | -0.368 | -0.366 | -0.309 | -0.319 | |  | (0.462) | (0.462) | (0.464) | (0.465) | | cut2 | 0.772 | 0.776 | 0.833 | 0.825 | |  | (0.461) | (0.461) | (0.463) | (0.465) | | cut3 | 1.639\* | 1.646\* | 1.702\* | 1.696\* | |  | (0.463) | (0.463) | (0.465) | (0.467) | | cut4 | 3.380\* | 3.393\* | 3.447\* | 3.447\* | |  | (0.482) | (0.482) | (0.484) | (0.486) | | N | 769 | 769 | 769 | 769 | | Log-Likelihood | -991.5 | -989.8 | -990.4 | -988.8 | |
| Standard errors in parentheses \* *p* < 0.05 |
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