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Abstract

Within the last fifty years, social scientists have begun to define forms of representation, in reference to how a legislator is elected. While descriptive representation stipulates that the representative must share physical characteristics with their constituents, substantive representation merely advocates the realization and active concentration on constituent interests. However, scholars propose that within the African American community, descriptive representation translates into substantive representation. Using previous literature concerning Black representation in the U.S. Congress and two multivariate models, this paper proposes that African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress varies due to a sense of shared experiences and “linked fate,” with legislators, while incorporating the interaction between descriptive and substantive representation.

Introduction

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 not only opened up opportunities for African Americans to have equal access to the voting polls, allowing this population to elect their “candidate of choice,” but also to contend for office (Epstein, O’Halloran 1999: 370). Many scholars, noting that African Americans now have a choice between Black candidates and White candidates, question whether Black Americans will favor descriptive representation—when “representatives, in their own backgrounds mirror experiences and [physical] descriptions belonging to the group [African Americans]” (Mansbridge 1999:628). According to Jane Mansbridge (1999: 651), “psychological benefits [are derived] from descriptive, surrogate representation,” especially when a
particular portion of the electorate has been excluded from the political process, which is the case for African Americans. Hence, we expect that physical characteristics and shared experiences will promote accurate representation and commitment to constituent interests (Mansbridge 1999: 629). This finding, in turn, facilitates a basis for Michael Dawson’s black utility heuristic—attributing one’s individual interests to that of the larger group—within the process of representation (Mansbridge 1999: 629, Dawson 1994). Conversely, other researchers, for example Carol Swain, argue that “more black faces in political office will not necessarily lead to more representation of the tangible interests of blacks” (1993: 5). Consequently, this discussion has agitated state legislatures in their attempt to redistrict. These legislators debate the benefits of creating districts concentrated with minority populations versus complete disregard for the issue of race when attempting to maximize African American representation in the U.S. Congress. This paper discusses the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation, and whether, in fact, African Americans equate the two due to the concept of “linked fate.” This paper also hypothesizes that the reason African Americans tend to prefer descriptive representation is because “linked fate” has provided the basis for equating the election of Black representatives to the U.S. Congress with maximizing African American substantive representation of group interests:

…as long as African Americans continue to believe that their lives are to a large degree determined by what happens to the group as a whole, I would expect African Americans’ perceptions of racial group interests to be an important component of the way individual blacks go about evaluating policies, parties, and candidates (Dawson 1994: 57).
Analysis of previous literature concerning Black representation in the U.S. Congress and also the National Black Election Study (1996) will provide an evaluation of the relationship between perceptions of the U.S. Congress and African American support for descriptive representation, substantive representation, and “linked fate.”

**Literature Review**

This review assesses previous literature and studies that evaluate the origins of descriptive representation within American democracy, the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation, and the influence that sharing a sense of “linked fate” has on the election of Black representatives.

**African Americans and the History of U.S. Political Participation**

According to many scholars, the idea of descriptive representation is embedded within the origins of American democracy. Mansbridge (1999: 629) establishes that “the deliberative function of democracy requires descriptive representation,” citing the U.S. Constitutional requirement that (Article II, Section II) the president of our nation be a natural born citizen—essentially, “being one of us is assumed to promote loyalty to our interests” (Mansbridge 1999: 629). Even in the U.S. Congress, citizens elect their representatives with the “presumption that elected officials could be trusted to represent the will of the people because officials would be drawn from the ranks of the people,” this creating a body proportionally equal to the mass population, visually and ideologically (Tate 2003: 3). It is important to note that when our founding fathers

---

1 According to Katherine Tate (1999), substantive representation occurs when legislators realize a particular population’s political concerns and actively seeks to address them.
established the framework for American representation, the then Black slave populace, then viewed as property, was not included. In fact, the principle of virtual representation was used by White Americans “to dismiss arguments in favor of granting suffrage to African Americans” for centuries (Tate 2003: 8). Thus, when the African American population gained the right to vote without the hindrance provided by poll taxes, segregation, and discrimination, special interest was taken to ensure that they were allowed to participate actively in the government from which they had been disenfranchised for so long, and whether “is it enough for Blacks to identify with the team [political party in power]…or must some players on the field also be Black” (Tate 2003: 19).

Race and Representation

When discussing types of representation, scholars have developed definitions of two forms: descriptive and substantive representation. According to Jolly (2002: 3), descriptive representation is typified when “a representative, legislative chamber reflect[s] the overall constituency in terms of [physical] characteristics.” This is compared with substantive representation, which occurs when representatives take a functional role in ensuring that their constituency’s concerns are dealt with.

Within the last fifty years, scholars and legislators have taken consideration for the most effective method of ensuring that African American concerns and interests are fully addressed, debating the necessity for Black citizens to participate in government,

---

2 Katherine Tate makes mention of virtual representation in Black Faces in the Mirror when discussing the theory that the English Parliament used during colonialism to deny the North American colonies direct participation in government. Essentially, the American colonists, though not expressly participating in the British government, were represented by the Monarch (2003: 8).
and whether creating majority-minority districts is the solution to guarantee substantive representation. Mansbridge (1999: 634) states that “the deliberative function of representative democracy aims at understanding which policies are good for the polity...[and] the representative’s constituents.” At times, legislators “are engaged primarily in introspective representation,” fulfilling what Tate calls the delegate and trustee\(^3\) styles of political representation (Mansbridge 1999: 646, Tate 2003:12). In both approaches, it is more conducive for the representatives to have a strong understanding of their constituency creating some sort of bond with those that they represent. Other times, this translates into “symbolic representation,\(^4\)” in which legislators, following cultural cues (food, holidays, etc.), attempt to identify with different groups, and display a “common interest.” However, identifying with one’s constituents through physical characteristics also serves as a basis for establishing such a relationship. According to Claudine Gay (2002: 726), the average Black, Democratic constituent with a Black representative is twice as likely to establish some sort of contact with their legislator, as opposed to African Americans with White representatives, serving as a basis for increased concern with the political process due to increased identification with legislators. Thus, Gay’s finding is in accordance with proponents of descriptive representation and maximization of Black representatives in Congress.

Essentially, some scholars conclude that descriptive representation contributes to an increased sense of trust in one’s representative, but even though Blacks may sense that

---

\(^3\) Tate also distinguishes between the different styles of representation used by U.S. legislators. While a delegate follows the will of the people, disregarding personal interpretation, the trustee solely uses their own judgment when performing duties.  

\(^4\) Both Mansbridge and Tate elaborate on the theory of “symbolic representation” within their respective works; however, for the purposes of this paper, this concept will not be elaborated upon.
they are better represented by African Americans, others contend that these sentiments do not guarantee substantive representation.

Swain (1993) claims that the African American push for substantive representation weakens substantive representation in Congress because even though minority faces are apparent in the legislative body, Black representatives lack the familiarity with the political process to address African American interests. Epstein and O’Halloran (1999: 369) concur, posing the scenario in which “concentrating [minority] populations too heavily [would] marginalize policy concerns in surrounding districts.” Hence, even though creating majority – minority districts may lead to the election of African American representatives “these surrounding districts may then elect representatives who are unlikely to vote for policy proposals favored by the minority community,” this due to the lack of African American poll influence in the neighboring districts (Epstein and O’Halloran 1999: 385). In another article, Epstein and O’Halloran (1999: 187) conclude that “minority candidates have a substantial chance of winning elections in districts with…less than 50% minority population,” and that after this point of concentration it is better to abort the establishment of majority-minority districts, this permitting the Democratic, African American sway in other districts, leading to more substantive representation. Indeed, these scholars normatively deduce that as opposed to representation by those that share similar physical characteristics, substantive representation should be at the forefront of the African American agenda because this focus actively produces results.

Conversely, other analysts posit that African American representatives are only elected by majority Black districts. Lublin (1999: 183) concludes “that African
Americans have an 86% chance of winning in districts that are [at least] 55% black.” Furthermore Grofman and Handley (1989: 269) deduce that “the simple fact is that most black members of Congress are elected from cities with black populations above 300,000;” therefore, concentration of African Americans proves beneficial to the election of Black representatives to the U.S. Congress. Indeed, state redistricting “can institutionalize some of the strategic actions needed to facilitate minority representation” (Bowler, et al.1998: 1113).

**Impact on African American Perceptions of the U.S. Congress**

These scholars also propose that African Americans equate descriptive representation with substantive representation because African American representatives actually represent the interests of the Black population more than White representatives. Lublin concludes that “black Democrats are more responsive to black interests than white Democrats,” and this is further corroborated by the example of the African American Senator Carol Mosley-Braun, “the only Black member of the U.S. Congress… [spoke against an amendment] renewing the design patent of United Daughters of the Confederacy” (Mansbridge 1999: 646). By virtue of her race Senator Mosley-Braun felt compelled to defend the Black American, despite the composition of her district.

With the formation of the Congressional Black Caucus the fact that interests of the African American race trumps district boundaries was cemented. Tate (2003: 155) concludes that the fact that “Black members in Congress have been the most consistent spokespersons for and champions of Black interests” attests for the reasoning behind why
descriptive representation is equated with substantive representation within the Black community.

The final issue that scholars evaluate when considering the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation involves considering why Black legislators feel more of an obligation to the race, as opposed to limiting their scope to their respective districts. Michael Dawson (1994: 77), within his *black utility heuristic*, discusses the idea that “historical experiences [slavery, discrimination, segregation] of African Americans have resulted in a situation in which group interests have served as a useful proxy for self-interest,” and that this belief in what happens to the group affects every individual member, or “linked fate,” still exists today. Tate (2003: 127) briefly discusses this bond within the Black population in relation to Congressional representation, citing the Congressional Black Caucus mission, and that “because we [Black legislators] understand that the destiny of each of us [African Americans] is inextricably bound to the 32 million other black brothers and sisters.” Therefore, sharing a sense of “linked fate” with one’s representatives produces an increased concern and protection of African American interests in the U.S. Congress.

Therefore, based upon the previously mentioned research, my model posits:

\[
\text{Satisfaction with U.S. Congress} = a + b \text{ (descriptive representation)} + c \text{ (substantive representation)} + d \text{ (linked fate)},
\]

this equation stating that African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress will increase as descriptive representation increases, substantive representation also increases, while the feeling of “linked fate” with the remainder of the race also increases. I make use of “satisfaction with the U.S. Congress” as my dependent variable because it
encompasses the nature of the feeling towards Congress that respondent would have. I also propose a second model, in which there is a direct interaction between descriptive and substantive representation, thus:

\[
\text{Satisfaction with U.S. Congress} = a + b (\text{descriptive representation} \times \text{substantive representation}) + c (\text{linked fate}),
\]

where African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress also increases as the interaction between descriptive representation and substantive representation increases, while “linked fate” increases. In evaluating these models, the 1996 National Black Election Study will be used to analyze the validity and plausibility of my hypothesis to the general African American population.

**Data and Methods**

In order to test this hypothesis, I analyzed already existing data from the 1996 National Black Election Study (NBES). This is a random, telephone survey comprised of twelve hundred and sixteen (1,216) African Americans chosen out of the United States, Black electorate.

**Satisfaction with the U.S. Congress as the Dependent Variable**

As previously mentioned, my dependent variable is the feeling of satisfaction within the African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress, where the context of “satisfaction” lies in the constituents’ ability to trust in the legislature’s “efficacy in furthering substantive goals,” and eventually the “perceived legitimacy of the institution, its legislative process, and policy outputs” (Cameron, Epstein, and O’Halloran 1996: 794,
Gay 2002: 720). This is best exemplified by the NBES survey question (b1k) which I have renamed \textit{feelcong}, asking respondents to gauge their feeling towards the U.S. Congress in a thermometer format. Here, the value zero (0) is interpreted as having a cold or unfavorable feeling toward the U.S. Congress, fifty (50) is having neither warm, nor cold feeling, and one hundred (100) is having a warm or favorable feeling. I then collapsed this variable, dividing the 100 point scale into increments of ten (10) units because in evaluating the results, there is no significant difference in values within range of 10 units. Additionally, collapsing this variable allows more efficient comparison of the increase in positive feelings of satisfaction across the entire scale.

**Descriptive and Substantive Representation as Independent Variables and an Interaction**

The level satisfaction with the U.S. Congress (feelcong) is contingent first on descriptive representation and substantive representation, individually, and then on an interaction between descriptive representation and substantive representation and also “linked fate.” First, I was able to determine two questions within the NBES that measure the respondents’ sentiment that representation by officials with who they share physical characteristics leads to substantive representation of African American concerns and interests. The survey question e2b, renamed \textit{derep2}, makes the statement that “Blacks should vote for Black candidates,” this gauging the importance that the respondents have placed on descriptive representation. A second survey question, e1c, renamed \textit{blackrep}, makes the statement that “Blacks elected to office really don’t have power to change things for Blacks.” This question measures to what extent respondents feel that their African American representatives to the U.S. Congress can realize their political needs
and produce results for this minority population: their external efficacy. In accordance with previous literature concluding that African Americans equate descriptive representation with substantive representation I also generated an interaction between derep2 and blackrep, named inter1, which will show the association between the two variables and ultimately its affect on satisfaction with the U.S. Congress (feelcong). Derep2, blackrep, and Inter1 all range from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (4), in which agreement with both statements increase as integer values also increase.

“Linked Fate” as an Independent Variable

Furthermore, the concept of “linked fate” is established through the survey question, qw1, renamed linkfate2, stating that “What happens to Blacks in the United States has a lot to do with me,” measuring the respondents’ agreement with the idea that African Americans have a common connection, encouraging group identity and working towards uplifting the whole group (Dawson, 1994). Linkfate2 also ranges from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (4), where agreement with the existence of “linked fate” increases as numerical value also increases.

Proposed Models

Hence, revised versions of my models, including my variables are:

Model 1:  feelcong = a + b (derep2) + c (blackrep) + d (linkfate2)

Model 2:  feelcong = a + b (inter1=derep2*blackrep) + c (linkfate2),

reiterating that positive feelings towards the U.S. Congress will first increase as descriptive and substantive representation increase separately, and then as the interaction
between descriptive and substantive representation increases, and that positive feelings will also increase as a sense of linked fate increases.

**Control Variables**

In accordance with previous research I also control for certain demographic factors within the African American population, including political ideology (ideology), educational attainment (educ), gender (gender), family income level (income), and age of the respondent (age). These factors have been recorded as having an influence on the respondents’ approval of the U.S. Congress (Gay 2002).

It is important to note that upon summarizing and renaming the afore mentioned variables I found that respondents who answered these survey questions with the “don’t know” option or declined to respond were minor in terms of the percentage that chose those responses. Therefore, I concluded that dropping these respondents from my analysis would not skew my results in any fashion, but rather enable me to increase the persuasiveness of my results. To determine the validity of my models, testing the relationship first between feelcong, derep2, blackrep, and linkfate, then between feelcong, inter1, and linkfate2, my analysis includes running a multivariate, linear regression involving my dependent variable, independent variables, interaction, and control variables. Furthermore, I was able to perform a histogram of my errors, evaluating the distribution of error within my regression, and then assess the strength of my hypothesized models thorough significance tests and consideration of summary effects (P-Value, Magnitude).

---

5 Variable names in the context of my analysis are included in parentheses.
6 Additional statistical information about each variable is included in Appendix A.
7 A Correlation Summary is included in Appendix B.
Analysis and Results

In order to investigate the relationship between African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress and descriptive representation, substantive representation, and “linked fate” I developed two models:

Model 1: \[ \text{feelcong} = a + b \quad (\text{derep2}) + c \quad (\text{blackrep}) + d \quad (\text{linkfate2}) + \text{controls} \]

Model 2: \[ \text{feelcong} = a + b \quad (\text{inter1}) + c \quad (\text{linkfate2}) + \text{controls}. \]

These models essentially hypothesize that as descriptive and substantive representation increases (in Model 2 this is characterized by an interaction), while “linked fate” also increases, satisfaction with Congress will consequently increase. After completing multivariate regressions using both models (control variables being included in each regression), I now present my results.

Observations: Model 1

After running a multivariate regression using model 1 I prepared the following equation:

\[ \text{feelcong} = 4.75212 + 0.11025 \quad (\text{derep2}) + 0.15543 \quad (\text{blackrep}) - 0.13628 \quad (\text{linkfate2}). \]

In accordance with Tate (2003) and Gay (2002), my findings establish that descriptive representation (derep2) lacks sufficient significance (P-Value = 0.310) to make formal conclusions about the direct impact that an increase or decrease in the U.S. Congress of Black representatives would have on African American satisfaction with the legislative body. However, analysis of the other two independent variables provides a more

---

8 A regression summary, including each variable, their respective coefficient, standard deviation value, and significance level for both models are included in Appendix C.
accurate depiction of the factors affecting African American feelings toward the U.S. Congress.

The multivariate regression results report valid significance levels for blackrep (substantive representation), providing a P-Value of 0.030. Additionally, as hypothesized, there is a positive relationship between substantive representation by African American representatives and African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress, meaning that as substantive representation from Black legislators increases Black American indication of favorable feelings towards the representative body also increases, the magnitude of this change being 0.38811 units on a four unit scale. These results propose that substantive representation does, in fact, influence the African American community and their satisfaction with Congress increases when this attention to group interests is given by Black representatives. Furthermore, the more that African Americans perceive that their African American representatives have the ability to address their concerns the more they recognize the U.S. Congress as an institution that positively affects their everyday lives. Substantive representation is a key feature in gauging African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress and accordingly, Congressional policies.

Additionally, the multivariate analysis also conveys valid significance levels linkfate2 (“linked fate”), providing a P-Value of 0.087. However, whereas my model proposed a positive relationship between the increased sentiment of “linked fate” and African American satisfaction levels with the U.S. Congress, the regression presents a negative slope (-0.13628), this meaning that as identification with the concept of “linked fate” increases by 1 unit, satisfaction with Congress decreases by 0.13628 units. These

---

9 Magnitude is calculated by multiplying the variable’s mean value by the coefficient provided in the regression analysis.
results propose that portions of the African American community, when opting to use group interests as a proxy for individual concerns, experience a decline in the agreement with the U.S. Congress and their doings. This can be attributed to the fact that as recently as the 107th Congress (2001-2002) only thirty – eight (38) out of the five hundred twenty six (526)10 U.S. Congressional seats were held by African American constituents. As a result, it is more difficult to establish a common sense of “linked fate” with representative body in which one’s own race is underrepresented. Therefore, my model suggests that as descriptive representation increase, African American satisfaction with the U.S. Congress will also increase due to an increase in the ability to identify with their representatives.

Hence, while my descriptive representation variable proved to be insignificant, substantive representation provided a significant, positive relationship with satisfaction levels with the U.S. Congress, while “linked fate” contradicted my hypothesis with a significant, negative relationship.

Observations: Model 2

In conducting my second multivariate analysis with my second model, my regression resulted in the following equation:

\[
\text{feelcong} = 5.02939 + 0.7251 \text{ (inter1)} - 0.13960 \text{ (linkfate2)}.
\]

Even though my first model resulted in the illegitimization of the descriptive representation variable (dereg2), an interaction between descriptive representation and substantive representation—following research which concluded that within the African American population, descriptive representation translates into substantive

---

10 425 representative seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, 100 seats in the U.S. Senate, and one seat for the District of Columbia.
representation—proved to be extremely significant, resulting in a P-Value of 0.018. This regression essentially confirmed my hypothesis that as descriptive representation intermingles with substantive representation, establishing a situation where African Americans are physically embodied in the Congressional composition and their interests are actively addressed, and satisfaction with the U.S. Congress was maximized (Gay 2002, Tate 2003). When evaluating the magnitude, we observe that when the mean value is incorporated into the function there is a yield 3.04802 units on a sixteen (16) unit scale, or 0.75 units on a four unit scale—nearly double the magnitude produced by blackrep alone. Hence, these results provide evidence for the effectiveness of both descriptive and substantive representation when linked with one another.

In considering the results provided by running a regression analysis with linkfate2, we find that this variable maintains its level of significance and a coefficient of -0.13960, upholding the negative relationship with African American satisfaction levels with the U.S. Congress.12

My models provided significant results in terms of substantive representation, linked fate, and an interaction between descriptive and substantive representation and their effect on Black America’s satisfaction with the our national legislature. While evidence was found in support of my hypotheses concerning the strength of the connection between physical representation and Black representative’s realization of political interests in the group, my data provided results depicting a negative relationship between “linked fate” and African American approval ratings on the U.S. Congress.

11 Once again, please refer to Appendix C for a regression summary.
12 Linkfate2 results in Model 1 are essentially identical in Model 2.
Controls

In both of my multivariate analyses and models, the significance of my controls yielded the similar results. Interestingly enough, ideology, education, gender, and income were all insignificant. This again supports Dawson’s concept “linked fate,” and that despite socioeconomic status and other descriptors, African Americans generally respond in a similar manner.

Discussion

Research Summary

This paper began with the purpose of exploring the validity of a relationship between the level of satisfaction that African Americans have with the U.S. Congress and first descriptive representation, substantive representation, and “linked fate” as independent variables. Furthermore, this paper also sought to establish a connection between African American views of descriptive representation and whether or not their political needs were being met, and that when both of the factors were intertwined, a greater significance was created when comparing the effect on satisfaction with the national legislative body. Through running my two models, my research supported my hypothesis concerning the importance of substantive representation to African Americans and also the strength of the interaction between physically being represented in Congress and active concentration on Black American concerns. On the other hand, both of my models produced a significant, negative relationship between “linked fate” and levels of satisfaction with the U.S. Congress, posing the prospect that if descriptive representation
is to increase, a sense of “linked fate” between legislators and constituents will also increase. Furthermore, my findings also concurred with previous research that proposed that descriptive representation, alone, did not present itself as a significant factor in African American feelings toward Congress.

**Shortcomings and Errors**

Even though I was able to find certain survey questions within the NBES to craft in order to fit my research analysis, I found that other questions would have better tackled the issues of descriptive representation, substantive representation, “linked fate,” and their influence on African American perceptions of Congress. For example, it would have been ideal to directly ask a specific question targeting African American preference for Black versus White representatives in the U.S. Congress and their perceptions of how sharing common social experiences influence the quality of representation. Additionally, I was unable to account for regional differences in levels of satisfaction and views of the difference forms of representation and “linked fate,” which is another factor that could influence these results; however the NBES did not provide a survey question inquiring into the respondent’s region of residence.

After performing a histogram of my errors\(^\text{13}\), I also found that there were outliers within my multivariate regression, which unfortunately my models are unable to account for. However, if the research design is modified in a fashion that directly asks respondents to compare their views representation in terms of sharing race with their representatives, while accounting for regional differences and similar demographic controls, the resulting model would present much more of a holistic argument for the

\(^{13}\) A histogram of errors for both models is provided in Appendix D.
relationship between satisfaction with the U.S. Congress, descriptive and substantive representation, and also “linked fate.”

**Conclusion**

In conducting this research comparing the relationship between African American perceptions of the U.S. Congress and descriptive representation, substantive representation, an interaction of the two forms of representation, and “linked fate” four significant findings were made:

1. In accordance with previous studies conducted, descriptive representation, alone, was not significant enough as an independent variable to influence African American feeling toward Congress.

2. Substantive representation, especially when performed by African Americans has a significant positive influence on Black perceptions of the U.S. Congress because their political interests are being addressed.

3. An interaction between descriptive representation and substantive representation provides the maximum significant, positive effect on favorable attitudes towards Congress because African Americans are being physically represented, actively participating in the political process, and furthermore this participation yields results for the whole group.

4. “Linked fate” yields a significant negative relationship with Black satisfaction with the national legislative body because, in effect, establishing a sense of common experiences and union with representatives proves difficult when the large majority of legislators are not African American. Thus, this model suggests
that as descriptive representation in Congress increases, “linked fate” between Congress and the African American constituency will lead to more favorable views of the U.S. Congress.

Theoretically, this research presents a cogent argument for African Americans equating descriptive representation with substantive representation and “linked fate”. Thus, while some scholars argue that state legislators and the African American community should focus on electing those that will enact policy to address minority concerns, it is important to note that “perhaps black legislators as a group, regardless of their outreach to the white community, put more effort into making themselves available to black constituents” (Gay 2002: 729). Furthermore, Lublin (1999) and Grofman/Handley (1989) posit that, generally, African American representatives are elected from majority-minority districts: thus, in order to maximize favorable attitudes toward Congress, both descriptive and substantive representation—no longer independent of one another—must be taken into account, where conceivably, creating a sense of commonality between Congress and African American constituents could better awareness and appreciation of both parties.
## Appendix A

Summary of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelcong</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>5.70509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derep2</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1.72755</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blackrep</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>2.49701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linkfate2</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>3.01688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter1</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>4.20359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideology</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1.93671</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>2.19852</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>0.37236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1.66772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>2.42089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Correlation Summary

#### Model 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>feelcong</th>
<th>derep2</th>
<th>blackrep</th>
<th>linkfate2</th>
<th>ideology</th>
<th>educ</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>income</th>
<th>age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelcong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derep2</td>
<td>0.0314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackrep</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linkfate2</td>
<td>-0.0663</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.0712</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.0666</td>
<td>-0.1653</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>-0.0387</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>0.1584</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.0262</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>0.0471</td>
<td>0.0558</td>
<td>-0.718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
<td>0.0506</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>-0.0711</td>
<td>0.3143</td>
<td>0.1092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.1301</td>
<td>0.0409</td>
<td>-0.1251</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
<td>0.0454</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Model 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>feelcong</th>
<th>inter1</th>
<th>linkfate2</th>
<th>ideology</th>
<th>educ</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>income</th>
<th>age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelcong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter1</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linkfate2</td>
<td>-0.0663</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.0712</td>
<td>0.0802</td>
<td>-0.1653</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>-0.0387</td>
<td>0.0495</td>
<td>0.1584</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.0262</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0471</td>
<td>0.0558</td>
<td>-0.0718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>0.0244</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>-0.0711</td>
<td>0.3143</td>
<td>0.1092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.1301</td>
<td>0.1031</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
<td>-0.0454</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

Regression Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1: Main Effects</th>
<th>Model 2: Representation Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derep2</td>
<td>0.11025 (0.10861)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blackrep</td>
<td>0.15543** (0.07152)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linkfate2</td>
<td>-0.13628* (0.07946)</td>
<td>-0.13960* (0.07940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.7251*** (0.03067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideology</td>
<td>0.17045 (0.11218)</td>
<td>0.16964 (0.07940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>-0.01570 (0.13944)</td>
<td>-0.01378 (0.13919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.9641 (0.16912)</td>
<td>0.10162 (0.16890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>-0.13101 (0.13587)</td>
<td>-0.13065 (0.13654)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.41300*** (0.11507)</td>
<td>0.41437*** (0.11466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>4.75212***</td>
<td>5.02939***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Indicates significance at the 0.01 level, **at the 0.05 level, and *at the 0.10 level
Coefficient (Standard Deviation)
Appendix D

Histogram of Errors

Model 1:

Satisfaction with the U.S. Congress = \( 4.75212 + 0.11025 \text{(derep2)} + 0.15543 \text{(blackrep)} - 0.13628 \text{(linkfate2)} \)

Model 2:

Satisfaction with the U.S. Congress = \( 5.02939 + 0.07251 \text{(inter1)} - 0.13959 \text{(linkfate2)} \)
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