

Appendixes to be placed on-line:

Appendix A: Variations in Who Responded

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>Standard error</u>
Democrat	-.002	.05	.12
Female	-.02	.00	.15
Year born	-.01	.000	.001
Education	.03	.11	.08
Left chamber	-.09***	-.68	.18***
Senate	.02	-.02	.13
Professionalism	-.14***	-4.44	.58***
Southern states	-.09***	-.88	.13***
Year entered	-.01	-.01	.01
Term limits	-.02	.20	.13
Constant		12.97	19.42
N	1831 to 1511	1394	

Pseudo R 2 = .06

Log likelihood = -875.57

LR chi2 = 107.24 *** (Df=10)

* <= .10; ** <= .05; *** <= .01 (using a two-tailed test).

Appendix B: Analysis of items used to create contact scale

The range for each of the four items used to create the contact scale was 0-4. The means and standard deviations were as follows: Keeping in-touch during the session 2.21 and .94; doing casework during the session 1.95 and 1.00; keeping in touch after the session 2.36 and 1.09; and doing casework after the session 2.11 and 1.08. The table below indicates the correlations between the items (average inter-item covariance was .54).

	<u>in-touch in session</u>	<u>casework in session</u>	<u>in-touch out of session</u>
casework in session	.53		
in-touch out of session	.40	.43	
casework out of session	.37	.59	.67

all the correlations are significant at the .000 level.

Appendix C: Negative Binomial used to examine effect of listening and district preferences on GLB co-sponsorships

<u>Variable</u>	<u>negative binomial</u>
Number of bills	.24 (.04)***
State views	.02 (.03)
District vote	5.66 (.88)***
Percentminority	-.01 (.01)*
Percent rural	-.01 (.00)
Democrats	.94 (.24)***
Women	.76 (.14)***
Age	-.01 (.01)
Discrete ambition	.50 (.21)**
Term length	.34 (.14)**
Independents	1.18 (.50)**
User	-1.30 (1.18)
Monitor	1.19 (.57)**
Independents * vote	-3.55(1.04)***
User * vote	.83 (2.18)
Monitor * vote	-3.55 (1.31)***
Marginal district	-.39 (.25)
Constant	-6.14 (1.18)*** ²
log pseudo likelihood	-258.91
Wald Chi2	5.13.06***
McFadden R2	.27
N	571

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

For the logit the dependent variable is code 1 if legislator cosponsored any GLB legislation and 0 if not. For negative binomial the dependent variable is the number of pro-GLB bills co-sponsored by legislators (range 0-5). Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Table D: Listening to constituents and policy congruence

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Listeners</u>	<u>User^a</u>	<u>Monitor</u>	<u>Independents</u>
Number of bills	.33 (.11)***	.20 (.17)	.16 (.08)**	.43 (.16)***
State views	-.04 (.05)	-.20 (.10)**	.06 (.05)	.04 (.04)
District vote	14.42 (3.79)***	32.73 (15.04)**	1.85 (1.91)	3.31 (2.02)
Percent minority	-.01 (.01)	.04 (.05)	-.01 (.01)	.00 (.02)
Percent rural	-.00 (.01)	-.03 (.02)	-.01 (.01)	-.01 (.01)
Democrats	1.65(1.03)		.54 (.52)	1.11 (.71)
Women	.34 (.73)		1.17 (.66)*	.46 (.75)
Age	-.06 (.05)		-.00 (.02)	-.02 (.03)
Discrete ambition	2.01 (.74)***	2.81 (2.39)	.29 (.51)	.93 (.45)**
Term length	.71 (.37)*	2.91 (1.20)	.14 (.29)	.70 (.36)**
Marginal district	-.00(.78)		-.83 (.47)*	-1.84 (.91)**
Constant	-6.37 (2.69)***	-18.80 (10.92)**	-5.20 (2.10)**	-7.43
R2	.49	.62	.24	.40
N	162	58	193	157

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

Dependent variable is whether the member co-sponsored any GLB legislation (coded 1 otherwise 0). Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

a Because of the small number of cases I removed several variables. These were variables that initial analysis indicated were not significantly related to bill co-sponsorship for users.

Appendix E: Variables' descriptive statistics

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Description</u>
Using Constituent information	1 -4	3.26	.70	How often legislators use information from constituents
Using interest group information	1 -4	2.39	.85	How often legislators use information from interest groups
Using other legislator information	1 -4	2.62	.87	How often legislators use information from other legislators
Co-sponsorships	1-5	.25	.72	Number of pro-GLB pieces of legislation co-sponsored by legislator
District vote	.02-.80	.31	.14	District opposition to same-sex marriage measured from ballot item vote
Age	29-90	58	11	Age of legislator
Democrats	0-1	.46	.50	Democrat (1), Republicans (0), Others .5
Term length	2-4	2.77	.97	Length of term
GLB bills	12-0	3.10	3.30	Pieces of pro-GLB legislation introduced
Discrete ambition	0-1	.31	.46	Legislator plans to retire in 5 years
Vulnerability	1 -0	.30	.46	Gap between legislator's vote and opponents' vote more than 20 (1)
Women	0-1	.19	.39	Legislator was a woman (1)
State support marriage	23-50	33.2	6.9	Lax and Phillips (2007) measure of support of same-sex marriage
District magnitude	0-1	.13	.34	1= multimember district
District size	7.6 to 975.5	76.97	101.94	number of constituents in 1000s
Seniority	0-47	8.13	7.20	number of years served
Trustee	1-6	3.73	2.53	scale 6 = trustee; 1 = delegate
State orientation	1-7	3.78	1.45	7 = state orientation; 1= district orientation
Monitoring	0-16	8.64	3.28	4 items on time spent on activities combined
Contacts per capita	.02 to 241.94	5.82	13.38	number of contacts per week per 1000 constituents
Professionalism	.05 to .62	.15	.10	Squire's 2007 index based on resources
Party competition	20-50	40.37	7.48	% seats held by minority party in chamber
Chamber	0-1	.29	.45	Senators = 1; lower house = 0
Listeners	0-1			Those who monitor and use information =1
Users	0-1			Those who only use information =1
Monitors	0-1			Those who only monitor =1
Independents	0-1			Those who neither monitor nor use information =1

