Appendix A: Examples of Constituent Statements and Explicit and Indirect Responses

The following interactions (taken from my observations of public meetings) constitute examples of explicit and indirect responses. For purposes of brevity, the constituent's comments and the member's response are summarized briefly rather than provided word-for-word, especially since some of the constituents' statements and legislators' responses are quite verbose.

Explicit Responses:

- Example 1: A constituent rebukes the Council for not adequately addressing the problems of global warming. Later during the meeting, a council member expresses his appreciation for the various elements of Mr. X's "forward-looking views" and adds that he hopes Mr. X will "come back and listen to [the city's] sustainability plan."
- Example 2: During his comments on a pending local ordinance that details an arrangement between the city, a housing commission under scrutiny, and the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Office, a community lawyer suggests to council members that they request from the housing commission a written chronology of events that led to its troubled status. Later on, a council member responds, asserting that she agrees with the lawyer, and urges the Council to include in the resolution a formal request to the housing commission to submit a report detailing the chronology of events leading up to its current situation.

Indirect Responses:

- Example 3: A constituent expresses opposition to the construction of a new train station near the parklands, arguing that given the city's "financial issues," the local government should instead divert the funds set aside for the train station to "essential services." Later during the meeting, the mayor asks the city administrator to clarify whether or not essential services would be compromised if the government decided to proceed with the construction of the train station.
- Example 4: A constituent urges city council members to support a symbolic resolution that would declare the city's opposition to Michigan's version of Stand Your Ground (SYG) laws. In her opinion, SYG laws overturn the century-old common law tradition that demands a duty to retreat from violent confrontation in public spaces. Later during the meeting, a council member affirms her support for the resolution, stating that SYG laws "fly in the face of common law." However, she makes no reference to the constituent's arguments.

Appendix B: Levels of Responsiveness (by Action or Compliance)

Table B1: The Effect of Race on Responsiveness Level (All Legislators)

	Constituent Race		
Level of Responsiveness[1]	White	Black	Total
0	1,785 89.61%	354 90.77%	2,139 89.80%
1	5 0.25%	6 1.54%	11 0.46%
2	189 9.49%	25 6.41%	214 8.98%
3	13 0.65%	5 1.28%	18 0.76%
Total	1,992 100%	390 100%	2,382 100%

Table B2: The Effect of Race on Responsiveness Level (Black Legislators)

	Constituent Race		
Level of Responsiveness	White	Black	Total
0	301 92.90%	87 87.00%	388 91.51%
1	0 0.00%	2 2.00%	2 0.47%
2	20 6.17%	9 9.00%	29 6.84%
3	3 0.93%	2 2.00%	5 1.18%
Total	324 100%	100 100%	424 100%

1. Levels represent the following categories: 0 – no response; 1 – simple acknowledgement; 2 –CM's acknowledgement indicates listening; 3 – CM decides to take action or declares an intention to do so.

Table B3: The Effect of Race on Responsiveness Level (White Legislators)

	Constituent Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	White	Black	Total
0	1,484 88.97%	267 92.07%	1,751 89.43%
1	5 0.30%	4 1.38%	9 0.46%
2	169 10.13%	16 5.52%	185 9.45%
3	10 0.60%	3 1.03%	13 0.66%
Total	1,668 100%	290 100%	1,958 100%

Discussion of Appendix B: The results as shown in Appendix B suggest that interestingly Black constituents receive slightly more of the highest level responses (category 3) than do Whites. However, the information provided in the tables does not make distinctions among responses to different types of message content.

Appendix C: Level of Responsiveness by Speech on Race

Table C1: Black Legislators' Responsiveness Level by Speech on Race (White Constituents)

	Speak on Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	0	1	Total
0	279 94.29%	22 78.57%	301 92.90%
1	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
2	14 4.73%	6 21.43%	20 6.17%
3	3 1.01%	0 0.00%	3 0.93%
Total	296 100.00%	28 100.00%	324 100%

Table C2: Black Legislators' Responsiveness Level by Speech on Race (Black Constituents)

	Speak on Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	0	1	Total
0	50 81.97%	37 94.87%	87 87.00%
1	2 3.28%	0 0.00%	2 2.00%
2	7 11.48%	2 5.13%	9 9.00%
3	2 3.28%	0 0.00%	2 2.00%
Total	61 100.00%	39 100.00%	100 100%

Table C3: White Legislators' Responsiveness Level by Speech on Race (White Constituents)

	Speak on Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	0	1	Total
0	1,387 88.80%	97 91.51%	1,484 88.97%
1	4 0.26%	1 0.94%	5 0.30%
2	161 10.31%	8 7.55%	169 10.13%
3	10 0.64%	0 0.00%	10 0.06%
Total	1,562 100.00%	106 100.00%	1,668 100%

Table C4: White Legislators' Responsiveness Level by Speech on Race (Black Constituents)

	Speak on Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	0	1	Total
0	136 86.08%	131 99.24%	267 92.07%
1	4 2.53%	0 0.00%	4 1.38%
2	15 9.49%	1 0.76%	16 5.52%
3	3 1.90%	0 0.00%	3 1.03%
Total	158 100.00%	132 100.00%	290 100%

Discussion of Appendix C: On the other hand, the results in Appendix C show that legislators are highly unlikely to issue the highest level of responses to speech about race-related concerns compared to speech about issues orthogonal to race.

Appendix D: Level of Responsiveness to Speech on Legislation

Table D1: Black Legislators' Responsiveness Level by Constituent Race

	Constituent Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	White	Black	Total
0	216 92.70%	62 92.54%	278 92.67%
1	0 0.00%	1 1.49%	1 0.33%
2	15 6.44%	4 5.97%	19 6.33%
3	2 0.86%	0 0.00%	2 0.67%
Total	233 100%	67 100%	300 100%

Table D2: White Legislators' Responsiveness Level by Constituent Race

	Constituent Race		
Levels of Responsiveness	White	Black	Total
0	901 85.16%	168 96.00%	1,069 86.70%
1	3 0.28%	1 0.57%	4 0.32%
2	149 14.08%	6 3.43%	155 12.57%
3	5 0.47%	0 0.00%	5 0.41%
Total	1,058 100%	175 100%	1,233 100%

Discussion of Appendix D: The results in Appendix D demonstrate that White legislators issue slightly more level 3 responses to White constituents than to their Black counterparts when these constituents convey messages regarding legislative matters being considered that evening. While the descriptive data conveyed in Appendices B through D does not dispute the main findings of this article, it can only be suggestive given that without a feasible statistical model, we cannot know if the differences are statistically significant.[2]

2. Reporting the chi-square statistics is not appropriate here since the observations are not independent.

Appendix E: Levels of Responsiveness by Clarification

Table E1: The Effects of Race on Level of Clarification

	(1) Shared Race	(2) Speak on Race (White CM's)	(3) Speak on Legislation (White CM's)
Black Constituent	-0.558 (0.440)	0.193 (0.506)	0.850 (0.613)
Black Legislators	-0.298 (0.367)	-----	-----
Male Constituent	0.200 (0.277)	0.080 (0.282)	0.044 (0.302)
Male Legislator	0.154 (0.249)	0.113 (0.318)	0.229 (0.304)
Speak on Legislation	0.809*** (0.272)	1.133*** (0.317)	1.363*** (0.378)
Speak on Race	-0.632 (0.454)	-0.656 (0.617)	-1.121** (0.520)
Speak on Class	-0.202 (0.428)	-----	-----
Speak on Dominant Topic	0.705*** (0.252)	0.617** (0.270)	0.669** (0.285)
Same Opinion as Another Const.	-1.096*** (0.237)	-1.210*** (0.258)	-1.165*** (0.284)
Mayor	1.004*** (0.333)	1.079** (0.432)	1.094** (0.443)
City B	-0.053 (0.396)	-0.163 (0.447)	-----
City C	-0.551 (0.403)	-0.609 (0.471)	-----
Black Constituent × Black Legislator	0.762 (0.536)	-----	-----
Black Constituent × Speak on Race	-----	-2.397* (1.319)	-----
Black Constituent × Speak on Legislation	-----	-----	-2.068*** (0.807)

Continued on next page

Table E1 Continued

	(1) Shared Race	(2) Speak on Race (White CM's)	(3) Speak on Legislation (White CM's)
Cutpoint 1	3.194*** (0.302)	3.309*** (0.358)	3.708*** (0.559)
Cutpoint 2	4.477*** (0.319)	4.590*** (0.378)	4.991*** (0.586)
Log Likelihood	-799.637	-662.497	-661.775
Wald χ^2	57.600	49.590	68.910
Prob. > χ^2	0.000	0.000	0.000
N	2382	1958	1958

Notes: The dependent variable is ordered responsiveness to individual constituent messages (no response, response with no clarification, and response with clarification). Entries are coefficients and their standard errors from a crossed-random effects ordered logit model. Given the limitations of the data, I excluded the Speak on Class variables from Models 2 and 3 and the city fixed effects from Model 3. These variables were consistently found to have insignificant effects in previous models. The main reference categories are White constituent, White legislator and City A. Cutpoint 1 is the estimated cutpoint used to differentiate no response from the other two levels of responses when the values of the independent variables are set at zero. Cutpoint 2 is the estimated cutpoint used to discern responsiveness with clarification from responsiveness with no clarification or no responsiveness when values of the independent variables are zero. Constituents having a value of cutpoint 2 or greater would be classified as receiving the highest level of response when the independent variables are evaluated at 0. Constituents having a value between cutpoint 1 and cutpoint 2 would be classified as receiving a response without any clarification. *p<0.10 **p<0.05 ***p<0.01

Table E2: White Legislators Responses to White Constituents by Speech on Race

	No Response	Response with No Clarification	Response with Clarification
Speak on Non-Racial Issues	0.840	0.100	0.060
Speak on Race	0.901	0.065	0.034
Difference in Probabilities	0.061 (0.053)	-0.035 (0.031)	-0.026 (0.023)
p-value	0.254	0.263	0.251

Variables held at the following theoretical values: male constituent=1; male council member =1; speak on legislation=1; dominant topic=0; same opinion=0; mayor=0; city B=1

Table E3: White Legislators Responses to Black Constituents by Speech on Race

	No Response	Response with No Clarification	Response with Clarification
Speak on Non-Racial Issues	0.818	0.111	0.071
Speak on Race	0.985	0.010	0.004
Difference in Probabilities	0.167 (0.069)	-0.101 (0.037)	-0.066 (0.033)
p-value	0.015**	0.006***	0.045**

Variables held at the following theoretical values: male constituent=1; male council member =1; speak on legislation=1; dominant topic=0; same opinion=0; mayor=0; city B=1

Table E4: White Legislators Responses to Speech on Legislation (By Constituent Race)

	No Response	Response with No Clarification	Response with Clarification
White Constituents	0.832	0.104	0.064
Black Constituents	0.933	0.045	0.022
Difference in Probabilities	0.101 (0.039)	-0.059 (0.023)	-0.042 (0.017)
p-value	0.009***	0.012**	0.012**

Variables held at the following theoretical values: male constituent=1; male council member =1; speak on legislation=1; dominant topic=0; speak on race=0; same opinion=0; mayor=0

Discussion of Appendix E: Although, there is a lack of evidence to suggest that race exerts an independent effect on responsiveness (conceptualized as a 3-level ordered variable), race affects this type of responsiveness in other ways. Since the coefficients of ordered logit models are difficult to interpret, I report the results in predicted probabilities associated with each outcome of the dependent variable. When Black constituents speak about race, White legislators are not only less likely to issue responses, but they are also less likely to issue responses with clarification than when Black constituents speak about matters not related to race. Furthermore, when constituents speak about legislative matters, White legislators are not only more likely to respond to White constituents than to Black constituents but they are also more likely to clarify their responses to White constituents. The results of these statistical models are only suggestive due to the limited number of times legislators respond to constituents, especially under specific conditions. To ensure the robustness of these results, additional data should be collected.