Lien et al., "Concepts and Correlates of Political Participation" WPSA_GMCL 09 Tables

Table 1. Representational Role by Personal Sociodemographic Background

	Trustee	Delegate	Politico	DK/NS	Total N
All	59%	32%	3%	2%	1293
Race*					
AIAN*	**67**	**13**	**7**	**13**	**15**
F	29	29	14	29	7
M	100	0	0	0	8
Asian	**74**	**21**	**3**	**2**	**92**
F	76	21	3	0	29
M	73	21	3	3	63
Black	**60**	**35**	**3**	**2**	**695**
F	58	36	3	3	301
M	62	34	3	2	394
Latino	**61**	**35**	**3**	**2**	**491**
F	63	32	4	1	155
M	60	36	2	2	336
Gender					
Female	60	34	3	3	492
Male	62	33	3	2	801
Education					
No College	61	35	3	1	171
Some College	63	33	3	1	248
College degree+	62	33	3	2	788

Source: Gender and Multicultural Leadership Survey, 2006-07. *p≤ .05, #p≤.10

Table 2. Representational Role by Personal Political Orientation

	Trustee	Delegate	Politico	DK/NS	Total N
Partisanship					
Democrat	61%	34%	3%	2%	1006
Independent	61	36	3	1	132
Republican	69	28	2	1	102
None/other	51	34	3	11	35
Ideology					
V. Liberal	67%	31%	2%	1%	126
SW Liberal	62	33	2	3	295
Middle	62	35	2	2	452
SW Conservative	58	35	5	2	308
V. Conservative	59	36	3	3	76
Motivation to run for the first office					
Community-based	60	36	3	2	643
Non-community	64	32	3	2	647
Ambition for a higher office (mean)	4.4	4.3	4.7	3.0	4.4

Table 3. Representational Role by Socialization and Social Network

	Trustee	Delegate	Politico	DK/NS	Total Mean
Avg. Prior Civic Involvement*	5.0	5.4	5.2	4.4	5.2
Neighborhood/ Community Org.	7.3	7.5	6.8	6.6	7.3
PTA/O*	5.9	6.5	6.3	4.4	6.1
Civil Rights Org.	5.0	5.6	5.5	5.3	5.3
Faith-based Org.[#]	5.1	5.2	5.5	3.4	5.2
Women's Org.*	3.3	3.9	3.0	3.5	3.5
Political Party	5.6	5.9	5.7	5.3	5.7
Election Campaign	5.6	5.9	6.3	5.2	5.7
Business Group	4.9	5.0	5.0	3.7	4.9
Labor Union[#]	2.8	3.3	2.3	2.3	3.0
Years in Public Office	12.4	13.0	14.0	13.2	12.6
Years of Residence	31.5	31.8	33.8	30.3	31.6

Table 4. Representational Role by Political Institutional Context

	Trustee	Delegate	Politico	DK/NS	Total N
Level of Office					
State Legislative	63%	32%	3%	2%	138
County	60	35	4	1	206
Municipal	58	36	3	3	603
School Board	67	30	2	1	346
Type of Election*					
Single Member District	58	37	3	2	407
At large	68	28	2	2	452
Multimember District	57	36	3	3	232
Type of Competition*					
Incumbent	63	32	3	2	821
Challenger	56	39	.5	4	189
Open Seat	59	36	3	2	267

Table 5. Representational Role by Perceived Constituency Characteristics and Level of Contact

	Trustee	Delegate	Politico	DK/NS	Total N
Constituent Partisanship*					
Mostly Democrat	60%	36%	3%	2%	879
Mostly Republican	69	25	1	4	143
Evenly Divided	60	33	4	3	252
Constituent Ideology					
Mostly V. Liberal	60%	36%	3%	1%	72
Mostly SW Liberal	62	35	2	1	284
Mostly Middle of the Road	60	34	3	2	478
Mostly SW Conservative	64	32	2	2	344
Mostly V. Conservative	64	29	3	3	92
Const. Racial Make-up					
Mostly N-H White	68%	26%	4%	2%	253
Mostly Black	59	36	3	2	412
Mostly Latino	61	35	3	2	318
Mostly Asian	75	25	0	0	16
Mostly AIAN	73	18	0	9	11
Evenly Mixed	59	36	2	3	280
Const. Class Make-up					
Mostly Poor	60%	37%	2%	2%	186
Mostly Working Class	59	38	2	2	461
Mostly Middle Class	66	29	4	1	289
Mostly Upper Middle Class	68	29	1	3	77
Mostly Upper	69	23	0	8	13
Mostly Mixed	60	32	4	4	259
Constituency Contact					(mean)
Avg. # per week	29.5	28.5	39.2	8.2	29.1

Table 6. Logistic Regression Predictions of Trustee Role Orientation among Nonwhite Elected Officials

	All		Blacks		Latinos	
Sociodemographic Background	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Race (ref.=AIAN)						
Asian	.548	.508				
Black	.370	.459				
Latino	.269	.460				
Female	-.089	.126	-.080	.165	-.072	.224
Education (3=college grad. or more)	.192**	.056	.178*	.074	.149	.100
Personal Political Orientation						
Partisanship (6=Strong Republican)	.087[#]	.047	.104	.093	.154*	.066
Ideology (5= Very Liberal)	.154**	.049	.071	.064	.275**	.088
Motivation (community-based)	-.192[#]	.120	-.258	.164	-.236	.200
Socialization and Social Network						
Prior Civic Involvement	-.037	.029	-.046	.039	-.023	.050
Years in Public Office	-.009	.007	-.008	.009	-.010	.012
Political Institutional Context						
State Legislature	.270	.231	.057	.306	.100	.428
School Board	.223	.146	-.072	.214	.500*	.228
At-large Election	.334*	.159	.427[#]	.223	.337	.260
SMD Election	.012	.159	-.038	.203	.161	.287
Campaign as Challenger	-.014	.196	.105	.268	-.531[#]	.324
Campaign as Incumbent	.219	.146	.171	.196	.086	.249
Perceived Constituency Structure						
Partisan Make-up (mainly Republican)	.245	.213	.217	.339	.294	.305
Racial Make-up (varied by model)[a]	.197	.166	.083	.167	.181	.215
Class Make-up (mostly middle class)	.279[#]	.149	.140	.202	.466[#]	.252
Class Make-up (mostly poor)	.145	.176	.076	.232	-.076	.308
(Constant)	-1.009	.532	-.198	.454	-1.190	.512
N	1290		684		488	
% predicted correct	62.2		58.5		66.4	
-2 Log Likelihood	1668		908		605	
Nagelkerke R-sq	.079		.048		.144	

Source: GMCL Survey 2006-07. Note: [#] $p \leq .10$, * $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .005$
b=unstandardized logistic regression coefficients, s.e.= standard errors
[a]The measure of majority constituency racial make-up used in the model for All is "mostly white," that for the model among Blacks is "mostly Black," that for the model among Latinos is "mostly Latino".

Table 7. Logistic Regression Predictions of Delegate Role Orientation Among Nonwhite Elected Officials

Sociodemographic Background	All		Blacks		Latinos	
	b	s.e.	b	s.e.	b	s.e.
Race (ref.=AIAN)						
Asian	-.315	.553				
Black	-.043	.496				
Latino	.169	.497				
Female	.090	.132	.071	.172	.099	.233
Education (3=college grad. or more)	.097#	.060	.148#	.080	.066	.103
Personal Political Orientation						
Partisanship (Democrat)	.433*	.182	.767*	.312	.323	.270
Ideology (Conservative)	.225#	.137	.199	.194	.011	.221
Motivation (community-based)	.208#	.125	.275	.173	.219	.206
Socialization and Social Network						
Prior Civic Involvement	.061*	.030	.093*	.041	.036	.051
Years in Public Office	.009	.007	.007	.010	.013	.013
Political Institutional Context						
State Legislature	-.254	.241	.058	.315	-.357	.443
School Board	-.212	.152	.202	.222	-.731**	.241
At-large Election	-.297#	.167	-.348	.236	-.297	.270
SMD Election	.072	.165	.072	.213	.024	.294
Running as Challenger	.100	.202	-.116	.280	.515	.330
Running as Incumbent	-.147	.152	-.125	.205	-.035	.261
Perceived Constituency Structure						
Partisan Make-up (mostly Republican)	-.257	.217	-.545	.383	.147	.311
Racial Make-up (varied by model)[a]	.277#	.151	.022	.178	-.254	.237
Class Make-up (mostly working class)	.374*	.136	.025	.187	.991**	.241
Class Make-up (mostly poor)	.288	.186	.077	.245	.877*	.339
(Constant)	-1.947	.580	-2.458	.522	-1.645	.520
N	1290		684		488	
% predicted correct	68.0		67.5		69.7	
-2 Log Likelihood	1568		847		576	
Nagelkerke R-sq	.059		.055		.113	

Source and Note: (See Table 6)

[a]The measure of majority constituency racial make-up used in the model for All is "evenly mixed," that for the model among Blacks is "mostly Black," that for the model among Latinos is "mostly Latino".