


12-2015

Not All Politicians Are the Same: The Effect of Gender and Political Party on Candidate Evaluation

Minu V. Nagashunmugam
College of William and Mary

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/honorsthesis>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nagashunmugam, Minu V., "Not All Politicians Are the Same: The Effect of Gender and Political Party on Candidate Evaluation" (2015). *Undergraduate Honors Theses*. Paper 989.
<https://scholarworks.wm.edu/honorsthesis/989>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.


Not All Politicians Are The Same: The Effects of Gender and Political Party on Candidate
Evaluation

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Government from
The College of William and Mary

by

Minu V Nagashunmugam


Accepted for Honors



Cheryl L Dickter



Meghan Sinton-Miller



Jaime Settle

Williamsburg, VA
December 9, 2015

Abstract

This study seeks to examine how gender stereotypes and political party stereotypes influence voters' evaluation of candidates and vote choice through evaluating voters' reactions to stereotypic expectancy violations by fictional candidates. Previous research has suggested that multiple factors contribute to vote choice, such as political party affiliation and subjective attitudes about gender roles and stereotypes. Participants ($n = 200$), recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk, were asked to evaluate fictional Republican and Democratic male and female presidential candidates, and to fill out surveys defining their attitudes and beliefs on gender roles and stereotypes. No interactions were found between a candidate's gender and political party and the participants' political party affiliation. Attitudes about gender roles for men and women played a part in evaluating candidates' competency and ability to govern. Future research should study the mechanisms behind traditional gender attitudes' effect on vote choice and incorporate other demographic and social factors, such as biases regarding race and sexuality, into election data collection in order to examine their effect on vote choice.

Not All Politicians Are The Same: The Effects of Gender and Political Party on Candidate Evaluation

In 1916, Jeannette Pickering Rankin of Montana was elected to the House of Representatives. Today, her achievement may not seem particularly unique, but at the time, Rankin was the first woman elected to the United States Congress. After being elected, Rankin famously stated, “I may be the first woman member of Congress, but I won’t be the last.” Since Rankin’s election, 313 women have served nationally as representatives, delegates or senators. According to Rutgers University Center for American Women in Politics, women hold 104 seats in the 114th United States Congress, which accounts for 19.4% of all seats. This is in contrast to the fact that women comprise 50.8% of the population of the United States.

Researchers have set forth multiple theories as to why there is a gross misrepresentation of women in political office. In the field of political science, the utilization of gender and gender stereotypes in voter decision-making is well studied and posits that the traits and beliefs associated with gender stereotypes affect voters’ decisions. The discipline of social psychology offers an intriguing and unique insight into gender representation in politics. In contrast, than focusing on voting outcomes, and hypothesizing as to what situational and environmental factors influence voters, social psychology allows for the examination of gender and partisan stereotypes that affect vote choice.

The purpose of the current research is to investigate the role that gender plays in voting behavior from a social psychological lens. Many recent studies have examined the factors that affect voting choice through examination of survey data collected from previous political elections. Rather, this project examined voters’ perceptions of candidates as a function of the gender and political party of politicians. Campaign biographies of fictional Democratic and

Republican candidates for president were created and the degree to which they defied their respective party line on issues ranked as important to American voters was manipulated. This study allowed for the experimental examination of whether female politicians are more likely to be negatively evaluated than male politicians when they defy party lines. This was expected because women candidates are perceived as violating traditional stereotypes of women as mothers and wives in addition to party stereotypes by opposing views stated by the party platform. It was also hypothesized that Republican female politicians are more likely to be negatively evaluated than their Democratic counterparts, because they were violating associations of the Republican Party with masculinity. Lastly, I hypothesized that participants who held traditional gender biases would evaluate female candidates more negatively because they were in direct violation of traditional gender roles.

Stereotypes and Expectancy Violation

The concept of stereotyping, a set of defined beliefs or ideas about a group of people, is well studied in social psychology, and is the result of social categorization of people. Categorization occurs quickly, and is often based on physical features such as race, sex and age (Bartholow & Dickter, 2008; Skitka & Maslach, 1990; Richeson & Shelton, 2006). Stereotyping is considered to be a part of the adaptive processes of the human brain such that it conserves cognitive resources by using schematic processing. Stereotyping allows for people to develop a stable social environment by simplifying a complex environment, but it can lead to stereotype activation, which can negatively affect the stereotyped target. The categorization of people on the basis of their social group, and subsequent utilization of stereotypes, can reinforce negative or harmful ideas about groups of people. Importantly, stereotype activation can lead individuals to discriminate against members of derogated groups when the stereotypes contain negative

information. Stereotypes and discrimination can have negative effects on the stereotyped group, including, but not limited to, adverse health effects and status caused by behavioral changes, substance abuse, increased rates of aggression, lack of self-control, difficulty making rational decisions, a tendency to overeat, and difficulty making financial decisions (Williams & Mohammed, 2013; Gibbons et al. 2012; Inzlicht & Kang, 2010; Carr & Steele, 2010).

When group members act in a way that is contrary to learned societal stereotypes about their group, defined as stereotypic expectancy violations, the brain processes these violations differently than behaviors that confirm expectancies and this subsequently affects perception and judgments (Bettencourt, Dill, Greathouse, Charlton & Mulholland, 1998). Expectancy violation theory, as posited by Burgoon (1986) and Jussim, Coleman and Lerch (1987), suggests that people evaluate others more extremely when their behaviors violate stereotyped expectations for their salient in-groups. Category-based expectancy violations, which are violations of stereotypes rooted in categorization of targets, are not the only factor influencing how targets are evaluated. Individual characteristics, such as prior category-based expectations of a group the target has been categorized into, mediate cognitive inferences about the target's traits. Bettencourt et al. (1998) found that the evaluation of targets is affected both by stereotypic expectancies and individual characteristics. In-group and out-group targets that violated category-based expectations were evaluated similarly to in-group and out-group targets that did not violate category-based expectations. When reviewing positive and negative stereotypic violations, the authors found positive job resumes that violated stereotyped expectations were evaluated more positively, and participants' group membership did not affect the outcomes. Taken together, the study supported social psychological theories that expectancy violations produce extreme evaluations, which can range either positively or negatively, depending on the valence of the

violation (e.g. positive or negative). The authors also found that stereotype expectancies, such as an individual's own perceptions and ideas, could mediate evaluations.

Another study by Bartholow, Fabiani, Gratton and Bettencourt (2001) further supported these conclusions. They conducted a study which recorded electrophysiological activity while participants read stories about fictitious characters that were consistent, violated, or irrelevant to stereotypic expectancy violations. They found that expectancy relevant expectations elicited differing brain activity based on participants' conditions. In particular, negative expectancy violation behaviors enhanced negative affect in the brain. Participants exposed to negative expectancy-violating behaviors elicited negative effects in the brain as early as 100 to 300 milliseconds after being exposed to the stimulus. In contrast, positive expectancy-violating behaviors affected the brain more than 300 milliseconds later than negative expectancy-violations. Though the valence of evaluation is dependent on whether the violation is positive or negative, the rate at which the brain registers the violation differs. The previous studies' conclusion held true when focusing on gender roles, and gender expectancy violations.

The Psychology of Gender Stereotyping

Gender stereotypes are a well-researched mechanism in social psychology. Ashmore and Del Boca (1979) define gender stereotypes as a structured set of beliefs about the personal attributes of women and of men. Women are typically described as warm, gentle, feminine and sensitive, whereas men are described as assertive, coarse, tough, aggressive and rational (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). Fiske, Cuddy, Glick and Xu (2002) argue that female stereotypes originate from the perceived traits of warmth and competence. Their theory suggests that these traits are moderated by perceived status and competition from other categorical groups an individual

might fit in. Gender stereotypes are a product of paternalistic stereotypes and suggest that females are warm, but not competent.

Prejudice is defined as the affective component of stereotyping and consists of the feelings that people have about other groups of people; it subsequently influences categories in which groups of people may be placed (Vescio & Weaver, 2013). Regarding prejudice based on gender, sexism can manifest itself in either hostile or benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Hostile sexism is defined as sexism displayed through antagonistic attitudes towards women who violate traditional gender roles. It manifests itself most obviously when women violate specific norms for behavior, such as entering the workforce. Benevolent sexism is the opposite. Rather than exhibiting antagonism or violence against those perceived as defying traditional gender roles, benevolent sexism masks as a positive engagement, but still reinforces sexist notions. Benevolent sexism is directly rooted in paternalistic power relations, and may often be directed towards those in traditional female roles, such as homemakers. Masser and Abrams (2004) examined hostile sexism, which is associated with negative evaluations of a female candidate for a masculine typed occupational role. Researchers found that hostile sexism was significantly associated with more negative evaluations of a female candidate. Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner and Zhu (1997) argue that benevolent sexism and hostile sexism are reserved for different subtypes of women. Benevolent sexism is applied to the idealization and positive evaluation of women in traditional gender roles. In contrast, hostile sexism is reserved for women who violate traditional gender roles, such as women who enter the workforce or identify as feminists.

Another relevant aspect of gender stereotypes research is examinations of female leaders in both the business and political environment. Male gender stereotypes are most commonly associated with the characteristics of successful executives, though females have entered

executive and managerial roles. Rather than exhibiting hostile sexism, benevolent sexism is more frequently displayed towards women. Women ranked lower than men on three different leadership scales, which included being courageous, resilient, inspiration and energetic (Martell, Parker, Emrich & Crawford, 1998). A 1976 study by Bartol and Butterfield found that the gender of leaders has effects on evaluations of managerial behaviors, such as initiating structure, consideration, production emphasis, and tolerance for freedom. The results were consistent with gender stereotypes; female managers received higher scores on consideration (taking into account other workers' schedules and needs), whereas male managers were evaluated well on structuring behavior. The study also noted that identical behavior was evaluated differently depending on gender, suggesting the use of sex stereotypes for managers. Atwater, Brett, Waldman, DiMare and Hayden (2004) argue that certain subroles in managerial positions are viewed as more feminine, while some are viewed as more masculine. In particular, men and women differed on how likely they were to see subroles as either masculine or feminine - male respondents were more likely to see most subroles as more masculine than female respondents were to see them as feminine. This research has also been applied to women in leadership or managerial positions in other fields, such as politics. Okimoto and Brescoll (2010) hypothesized that voting preferences for female candidates may be hindered by the belief that she seeks power - this belief violates the typical gender roles for women, leading to negative consequences. In contrast, voting preferences for male candidates were not affected by power-seeking intentions. The researchers hypothesize that those voters perceiving women to violate typical gender stereotypes are more likely to punish them for doing so.

Gender and Politics

Gender inequities in politics begin at a young age. Surveys have shown that women face barriers to entering politics before they can even vote. Daughters were statistically less likely to be encouraged by their parents to run for office - 33% of men were encouraged to run by their fathers for office, whereas 23% of women were encouraged. The statistics vary only marginally when encouraged by mothers - 34% of men were encouraged to run for office while 23% of women were encouraged. In contrast, 18% of women stated their parents would prefer a non-political career in contrast to 14% of men. Forty percent of men were encouraged by their parents to run for office, whereas 29% of women were encouraged (Lawless & Fox, 2004). All of these statistics demonstrate the barriers women face to entering politics, specifically from family members, and the implications of gender roles.

These gender inequities and barriers translate onto the national scale as well. A 1998 study by Fox and Smith showed candidate sex is indeed a factor in vote choice when studying state-specific populations, such as California or Wyoming. A 2003 Gallup poll revealed that 87% of voters would choose a qualified female candidate for president. In a 2012 Gallup poll, 96% of voters would vote for a female candidate as president. While these statistics demonstrate an overwhelming majority of voters are prepared for a female president, there are still institutional difficulties to entering politics, barring familial pressure. A 2008 poll by CBS News revealed that 39% of voters felt that a female candidate faced more obstacles in presidential politics than an African American candidate. Forty-two percent of voters felt that 2008 Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton was judged more harshly than her opponent Barack Obama.

Gender, Gender Stereotypes and Politics

Taken together, this research suggests that women may face societal, regional and institutional disadvantages to entering politics. Previous research has shown that candidate

gender is indeed a factor in vote choice when studying regional populations and that female candidates experience voter bias and prejudice against them (Fox & Smith, 1998). The authors found that bias against female candidates was a factor in vote choice, particularly in specific regions or cultures. Pre-existing stereotypes regarding competence, intelligence and other stereotypes valued among politicians may be inconsistent with stereotypes of women. Therefore, evaluations of women candidates may not be limited merely to just perceptions of a candidate's gender, but also the associated stereotypes about candidate traits, beliefs, and issue competency (Conover & Feldman, 1989; Paul, Paul & Smith, 2004). Male and female genders connote a specific set of traits, benefits and deficiencies based on learned gender stereotypes; these may be compared to a voter's stereotypes defining a good politician. Disparities and similarities between these two stereotypic profiles are some of the contributing factors to voter evaluation (Sanbonmatsu & Dolan, 2009; Dolan, 2010).

The degree to which assessment of these traits affects voting behavior depends on a variety of factors, and is inconclusive. There is no consistency as to when and how voters will apply gender stereotypes to vote choice. When making electoral decisions, voters' preference and willingness to vote for a female candidate is dependent on the type of race female candidates are contesting in. National Election Studies data from 1988, 1990 and 1992, and pooled 1988-1992 Senate Election Study revealed that some voters, specifically well-educated female voters, exhibited a preference for female candidates in House races rather than Senate races. In addition, women candidates had a slight advantage in races facing a challenger and incumbent, but only with the support of well-educated female voters. Female candidates also had a greater advantage in open-seat contests, in which female voters (regardless of educational levels) were more likely to support female candidates. Candidate gender, whether male or female, was not a significant

marker for male voters (Smith & Fox, 2001). In opposition, Dolan (2014) argued that voters utilize gender stereotypes only when evaluating a female candidate, which translates into public opinion towards women's representation in elected office.

These findings offer mixed evaluations on how voters utilize gender stereotypes in candidate evaluation. The utilization of experimental methods to examine candidate evaluation could address inconsistencies and further elaborate on how gender and political party interact. Specifically, the utilization of an experimental method will help isolate gender as a variable, and eliminate the effects of sociopolitical environment, such as incumbency, or political climate.

Recent studies have also shown that female politicians have different trait associations compared to women who are not politicians. Schneider and Bos (2014) found that female politicians are caught in between 'losing' by lacking male traits, but not having the redeeming traits that women do, such as compassion, kindness and sensitivity. Female politicians are isolated from the two stereotyping groups of 'women' and 'politicians' and are therefore a subtype. Indeed, no stereotypical traits of women emerged as descriptive of female politicians. Female politicians had twice as many negative female leader traits (a subtype of female stereotypes) attributed to them. Women were also rated more highly on traits attributed to males, which were competitive, daring, adventurous and aggressive. Female politicians were perceived as having traits similar to the subgroup of female professionals, which included independent and organized, but showed no other significant similarities. Female politicians also are not associated with the positive male stereotypical qualities (Schneider & Bos, 2014).

Researchers found that there was a preference for masculine personality traits for higher offices while typical feminine personality traits and areas of "female" political strengths were neither a liability for higher office nor a special asset for lower office (Fox, 1998). This finding

means that voters may be less likely to support a female candidate because of her perceived deficiency in handling the military, war, and economic issues. Previous research showed that voters are less likely to be swayed to vote for a female candidate based on her perceived competency in arts, education and health issues, which suggests that female candidates do not gain an advantage from possessing stereotypically feminine personality traits (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). Voters also utilize information about gender-related traits to evaluate leadership qualities and skills (Alexander & Andersen, 1993). Dolan and Lynch (2014) found that gender stereotypes exhibited almost no impact on the policy abilities and traits of female candidates in specific candidate evaluations (modeled as a function of respondent gender stereotypes about policies and traits, as well as primary political variables). These findings imply that there is indeed a bias against candidates who lack masculine traits, and female candidates may have to convince voters they possess male characteristics to gain favorable evaluations, particularly in regards to which type of office the candidate is seeking. However, there is still no clear answer to how and when gender stereotypes are utilized by voters.

Gender stereotypes also intersect with other factors in candidate evaluation, such as voters' personal endorsement of stereotypes, political views, and current political climate. Huddy and Terkildsen (1993), Koch (1999), and Smith, Paul, and Paul (2007) all argue that gender bias against female candidates affects perceptions of these individuals. Dolan (2010) found that voters utilized masculine and feminine stereotypes in their ratings of political candidates only if they held traditional stereotypes that men were superior in handling stereotypically male issues, such as the military, war and the economy. Respondents who did not hold traditional stereotypes about male policy competence, on the other hand, evaluated female candidates over male candidates more favorably on these issues. Lawless (2004) found that voters' positive attitudes or

negative attitudes about gender stereotypes play a role in how they perceive candidates; voters who value social issues and warmth will choose a female candidate, while voters concerned about foreign policy issues would support a man. Falk and Kenski (2006) argue that issue saliency affects the public's perceptions of whether a man or a woman would make a better president when considering the nation's most important issues. They found that issue salience does affect presidential gender preferences, even when utilized in tandem with demographic and party identification variables. In a study examining the American political climate post-9/11, researchers asked respondents about their political attitudes, preferred characteristics in high-level office holders, and attitudes about women and men's roles, traits and issue experiences. The author found that an atmosphere of war led to a favoritism of male candidates because gender stereotypes dictated they would be 'better' at issues of national security and military (Lawless, 2004). Given the rise of instability in the Middle East, and the growing economic and political strength of China, foreign policy and military issues have and will continue to dominate the political landscape.

The Interaction of Gender Stereotypes and Partisan Stereotypes

Previous research has demonstrated that political party is one of the most utilized heuristics in vote choice. Evidence of the importance of political party shows itself in voters' utilization of previously acquired information, such as one's own issue positions, ideological cues, and party cues rather than seeking out information about candidates' policy positions (Conover & Feldman, 1989). Utilizing survey data and content news coverage from the 2006 U.S. Senate elections, Hayes (2011) found that party stereotypes are more powerful than gender stereotypes. Assessments of candidate attributes can be affected by news coverage when candidates are portrayed in ways that challenge traditional partisan images. In fact, voters view

candidates more favorably when media coverage portrays them in ways that challenge traditional partisan stereotypes of Democrat or Republican. Hayes also found that party heuristics were influential in judging the 2006 United States Senate candidates' personal attributes. Lavine and Gschwind (2007) found that party identification was key for both ideological and non-ideological voters when evaluating presidential candidates, arguing that it provided a social identity, and a basic judgmental anchor for voters.

However, there is contradictory research on how party affiliation and gender bias interact together in candidate evaluation, and whether they affect voters' perceptions and choice. Politicians violate and conform to both gender stereotypes and party stereotypes. Specifically, female politicians violate gender stereotypes (inherently through their occupation), but rarely violate party stereotypes. Regardless of political party affiliation, Koch (2000) argued that voters utilize gender to infer candidates' ideological orientations. The consequences of these inferences differ for Republicans and Democrats. Democratic female candidates are punished, likely because gender stereotypes lead voters to believe they are more liberal than they are and voters chose the Republican opponent, whereas Republican female candidates benefit from seeming more liberal, and have better electoral prospects. Stereotypes also may not override traditional political variables, such as party. Rather, gender stereotypes are more episodic and appear only in some races. The authors also stress that gender stereotypes may play a role in races involving Republican woman, because gender stereotypes for Democratic women are more consistent, in contrast to gender stereotypes for Republican women. Dolan and Sanbonmatsu (2009) found that Republican women were less likely to benefit from issue competency stereotypes, than Democratic women did among Democratic voters. Democrats are also more likely to hold gender stereotypes than benefit women in politics, in contrast to Republicans. Republicans' views of

conservative social and political ideology proved to be more detrimental towards women.

Women who defy traditional gender roles, such as marriage and motherhood, are punished through vote choice, among the electorate, particularly among voters who hold more traditional gender beliefs (Bell & Kaufmann, 2015).

Based on the above studies, gender stereotypes, in relation to both competency and policy strengths and political party affiliation, may provide a key dynamic in how women can achieve political office. There is no one defining factor that influences vote choice; rather multiple factors contribute. Research on gender stereotypes in politics has shown that gender is inherently linked with stereotypes and perceptions regarding competence and policy. In addition, political party stereotypes address and dictate beliefs about gender roles, and various issue areas. Integrating stereotypic violation of partisan stereotypes (either Democratic or Republican) across male and female politicians reveals how these stereotypes can affect vote choice, and how a voter's views on gender roles and partisan affiliation affect candidate evaluation and vote choice. The current study examined how voters evaluate presidential candidates after he or she violates their respective party line on a key issue. In order to draw conclusions about voter behavior and candidate evaluation, this study holds all variables constant, such as incumbency, and candidate qualifications, but manipulates the gender and political party of the candidate. Many political science studies, such as those by Dolan (2014), Sanbonmatsu (2002), and Lawless (2004), utilize data from previous elections, such as the American National Election Survey. While these studies offer an important look at voting behavior, the experimental design used here effectively isolates the variables to test specifically how party and gender stereotypes affect evaluations of candidates.

Because partisanship has increased over the past decades and is a highly motivating force in voter behavior, and gender is a particularly salient factor in the 2016 presidential election and potentially beyond, the current work has important implications. In addition to the rising political and financial influence of female centric political groups, such as the National Organization for Women, EMILY's List and the Susan B. Anthony List, the number of serious female candidates and politicians has been steadily rising. In the 2016 presidential election, each respective party has a female candidate. Because of this unique political climate, gender attitudes and stereotypes are extremely important to study. By manipulating and measuring these variables, the current design is more nuanced in ascertaining the interactions of party and gender stereotype specifically on various markers of candidate evaluation. In order to examine how these violations or confirmations of stereotypes affect candidate evaluation, a survey was created in which participants evaluated fictional candidates on traits that voters have used to describe their ideal or a good politician, vote choice, and issue competence. These attributes were examined as a function of how stereotypically masculine or feminine they are. As discussed earlier, vote choice is not merely a yes or no choice; rather it is the amalgamation of multiple factors, such as masculine and feminine traits, competency, warmth, perception of ability to govern and issue choice. As a result, these variables were examined in the current study to assess evaluations of political candidates.

Based on the literature above, it was hypothesized that the political party and gender of a candidate, coupled with participants' political party identification, would affect how participants evaluate candidates on traits related to masculinity, femininity, ability to govern, warmth, and competence. It was expected that participants would evaluate female candidates who violate party line more negatively than their male counterparts, because women holding an occupation

would violate gender stereotypes. Thus, participants should evaluate Republican female candidates more negatively than their Democratic counterparts, because of associations of masculinity with Republicanism. Female Republicans are likely to be perceived negatively because being a politician violates both gender stereotypes which encompass motherhood and marriage over a career (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy & Glick, 1999) and party stereotypes, which prioritize men over women in the Republican party (Dolan & Lynch 2014; Dolan & Sanbonmatsu, 2009). It was expected, however, that Republican male candidates and Democratic male candidates will be equally evaluated because the stereotype of a male politician and of a good politician both fall in line with the stereotypes of men, as with the stereotypes of a Republican (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). Lastly, we hypothesized that participants with more conservative ideas about gender roles would negatively evaluate female candidates than participants with more liberal views on gender roles, because female politicians violate traditional gender stereotypes (Bell & Kaufmann, 2015; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993; Koch, 1999; Paul, Paul & Smith, 2007; Smith & Fox, 2001).

Pilot Study

Before beginning the experiment, a pilot test was conducted to select issue statements that could be easily identified as Republican or Democratic in nature. First, a Gallup poll (July 2015) asking the American electorate about the issues they deemed most important to vote choice in the 2016 presidential election was examined. After cross-referencing the survey data, a list was compiled of 10 issue areas deemed important to the American electorate. The 2012 party platform of the Republican and Democratic party was reviewed, and statements were written that reflected both a hypothetical Democratic and Republican House Representative's beliefs on each of the ten issues (see Appendix A).

One hundred participants located in the United States recruited using Mechanical Turk were instructed to review each set of statements and determine which statement was something a typical Republican would say, and which statement a typical Democrat would say. Amazon Mechanical Turk is a crowdsourcing website which allows for widespread dissemination of surveys to participants in exchange for monetary compensation. Demographic information of the participants is listed in Appendix B. In order to determine which statements would be utilized in the study, the participants viewed each statement and evaluated them on a seven-point scale from ‘strongly Republican’ to ‘strongly Democratic.’ A series of t-tests were conducted to compare the Democratic and Republican statements to each other and ascertain that participants established the statements as opposites on the political spectrum. All the statements were statistically significant such that they were clearly and fairly deemed partisan by participants, except for one statement (see Appendix A for list of statements and significance.) This survey also asked voters to rank issues in order of importance to their vote choice in order of personal importance (see Table 1) and in the 2016 presidential election (see Table 2). Finally, the survey included questions about demographic information and partisan affiliation. In order to determine which statements to utilize, the Democratic statements were reverse coded, and then a Cronbach’s alpha analysis was run to determine the reliability of the statement sets. The purpose of this statistical analysis was to determine whether the statement sets were linked in correlation- reverse coding the Democratic sets of statements allowed for testing the correlation between the two sets of data. Any statements that fell below .7 were not utilized (see Table 3). Personal rankings were also factored into choosing which statements to utilize in the campaign biography. The mean of these ranking was calculated, and three of the issues that ranked in the top five

(government operation, taxes and healthcare) were chosen, unless the statements had a Cronbach's alpha score of below .7.

Method

Participants

Two hundred participants located in the United States were recruited from Amazon mechanical Turk and offered monetary compensation for participating in the survey. The sample comprised of 48% male, and 51.5% female participants. 8.4% identified as African, 7.9% identified as Asian, 80.7% as Caucasian/European, 6.4% as Hispanic/Latino, .5% as Indian, 1% as Middle Eastern, and 3% as Native American. 89.1% identified as heterosexual, 3% as homosexual, 5.4% as bisexual, 1% as queer, and .5% as pansexual. This study was approved by the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary.

Materials

Candidate Biographies. Four different biographies describing presidential candidates were created. Each candidate biography listed biographical information, such as family and education, political credentials and information on positions across three separate issues, as established by the pilot study. These biographies were identical with the exception that they differed in the gender of the candidate and which party he or she was affiliated with. Three statements regarding the candidate's positions on taxes, healthcare, and the size and scope of the federal government were listed below the biography. Three statements was determined to be the ideal number of statements because it would provide enough context for participants to learn about the candidates, but short enough that the participants would remain interested. In addition, the key issues positions differ, based on the candidate's affiliation; if the candidate was a Republican, he or she took a Democratic position on taxes and the size of the federal government

and if the candidate was Democratic, he or she took a Republican position on taxes and the size of the federal government as well. In all four conditions, the candidates' position on healthcare was consistent with their political party's. Two of the three statements were contradictory in order to convince participants that the candidate was defying party stereotypes without causing the participants to misconstrue candidates' political party affiliation. A candidate who identified as Republican, yet took Democratic views on all the issues presented could mislead the participants. (See Appendix B for examples of candidate biographies.)

Study Candidate Perceptions. Evaluations of the traits of the candidate were assessed through a series of questions. A full list of all the questions asked is listed in Appendix B. On a seven point scale from "not well at all" to "extremely well", participants rated the candidate on a series of traits. These questions assessed the perceived masculinity and femininity as illustrated by a series of traits (e.g., how well would the adjectives assertive, coarse, warm and gentle describe the candidate), their competence and warmth (how well competent, warm, and caring described them), and their ability to be a good politician (e.g., competence, ability to build consensus, and ambition). In addition, participants indicated how likely they would be to vote for the candidate from extremely unlikely to extremely likely (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993; Hayes, 2011, Dolan, 2014, Dolan, 2010; Okimoto & Briscoll, 2010). The adjectives in these scales were aggregated into broad categories: male adjectives (assertive, coarse, tough, aggressive, self-confident, stern, masculine, active and rational), female adjectives (warm, gentle, feminine, sensitive, emotional, talkative, and cautious), ability to govern (provides strong leadership, compassionate, intelligent, decisive, experienced, honest, ability to build consensus, ability to change government), competence (ambitious, strong, competent, productive) and warmth

(supportive, caring). Reliability analyses indicated that the aggregated variables produced an alpha score greater than .7, indicating acceptable reliability.

Gender Attitudes and Affect. Participants were asked how well the masculine and feminine adjectives described men and women, (from one: extremely unlikely to seven: extremely likely). To assess positive and negative affect towards men and women, a feeling thermometer (from zero to one hundred with one hundred being the warmest) about both men and women was administered. Lastly, participants answered Spence, Helmrich and Stapp's (1973) Attitudes towards Women scale, a fifty-five point scale which tests how much participants from one (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree) with traditional gender roles. The scale asked questions regarding traditional gender roles in different areas, such as vocation, education, personal relationships, marriage and independence of women. The scale's reliability was high, with an alpha score of .95.

Procedure

Participants first read each candidate biography. Participants were randomly assigned to read the profile of a male or female candidate, regardless of participants' partisan identification. After reading the candidate biographies, participants evaluated the candidate on masculinity, femininity and good politician scales (ability to govern, competence and warmth). Next, a manipulation check was included that required the participants to identify the political party and gender of the fictional candidate to ascertain that they had read the candidate biographies. Lastly, participants evaluated men and women on the gender attitudes and affect measures, and finally filled out the demographic information. Following their completion of the measures, they were provided with a debriefing statement and the contact information of the primary investigator.

Results

In order to examine whether the candidate's gender and the political party of the candidate and participants affected perceptions of the candidate, a series of 2 (gender of the candidate: male or female) x 2 (political party of the candidate: Republican or Democrat) x 2 (political affiliation of the participant: Republican or Democrat) univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted.

Masculine Traits

An aggregate variable was created to examine perceptions of the candidate's masculine traits ($\alpha = .74$). This analysis revealed a marginally significant main effect of candidate gender, ($M_{male} = 6.86, SE = .11, M_{female} = 4.62, SE = .10$), $F(1, 115) = 2.79, p = .098, \eta^2 = .024$. As depicted in Figure 1, the main effect of gender was qualified by an interaction between the candidate's gender and political party, $F(1,115) = 2.60, p = .110$, and $\eta^2 = .02$. Simple main effects analyses revealed that for male candidates, there was a marginally significant effect of candidate's political affiliation, $F(1,84) = 3.27, p = .074$ and $\eta^2 = .037$, such that Republicans were evaluated higher ($M_{Republican} = 4.93, SE = 0.12$) than Democrats ($M_{Democrat} = 4.63, SE = 0.12$). For female candidates, there was no effect of a candidate's political affiliation, such that Republicans ($M = 4.69, SE = 0.10$) were not evaluated significantly differently than Democrats ($M = 4.62, SE = 0.10$).

Feminine Traits

An aggregate variable was created to examine perceptions of the candidate's feminine traits ($\alpha = .75$). Analyses with this measure as the dependent variable revealed that there was a significant main effect of gender, revealing that males ($M = 3.77, SE = 0.12$) were rated as less feminine than females ($M = 4.45, SE = .11$), $F(1,116) = 18.50, p < .001, \eta^2 = .138$.

Competence

An aggregate variable was created for adjectives associated with competence to examine perceptions of the candidate's overall political competence ($\alpha = .86$.) There was a marginally significant main effect for the candidate's gender, showing that males ($M_{male} = 5.28, SE = .15$) were rated as less competent than females ($M_{female} = 5.59, SE = .14$), $F(1,116) = 2.35, p = .128$ and $\eta^2 = .02$.

Governance

An aggregate variable was created for adjectives associated with a candidate's ability to govern well ($\alpha = .90$). There were no significant effects for the candidate's gender, $F(1,116) = 1.40, p = .239, \eta^2 = .012$, candidate's political party, $F(1,116) = .61, p = .4437, \eta^2 = .005$, nor the participant's party identification, $F(1,116) = .09, p = .767, \eta^2 = .001$.

Warmth

An aggregate variable was created to measure a candidate's perceived warmth ($\alpha = .82$). There were no significant effects for the candidate's gender, $F(1,117) = .72, p = .399, \eta^2 = .006$, candidate's political party, $F(1,117) = .08, p = .779, \eta^2 = .001$, nor participant's political party, $F(1,117) = .2, p = .654, \eta^2 = .002$.

Regression Analyses of Attitudes Towards Women Scores and Candidate's Gender

Multiple regression analyses were used to test the hypothesis that participants' sexism towards women (determined by the Attitudes Towards Women scale) and a candidate's gender would predict participants' ratings of a candidate's ability to govern, as defined by good governance, competence and warmth aggregate variables. Self-reported sexism and candidate gender were entered on the first step and the interaction term between the dummy-coded candidate gender and mean-centered sexism variable was entered on the second step.

The results of the regression indicated that the predictors explained a marginally significant amount of the variance in the dependent variable of good governance, $R^2 = .05$, $F(3, 146) = 2.41$, $p = .069$. It was found that there was a marginally significant interaction, $\beta = -.62$, $p = .078$. Perceptions of female candidates' ability to govern was significantly predicted by Attitudes towards Women scores, $r = -.24$, $p = .034$, such that participants who reported more sexist attitudes perceived female candidates as having less ability to govern. Predictions of male candidates' ability to govern was unaffected by sexism, $r = .039$, $p = .739$.

Multiple regression analyses with the same independent variables and interaction term were conducted with ratings of perceived competence as the dependent variable. The model with the interaction term was significant, $R^2 = .10$, $F(3, 147) = 5.489$, $p = .001$. Results revealed a significant self-reported sexism and candidate gender interaction, $\beta = -.59$, $p = .023$. Perceptions of female candidates' perceived competence was significantly affected by conservative Attitudes Toward Women scores, $r = -.34$, $p = .002$, such that participants who reported more sexist attitudes perceived female candidates as being less competent. Predictions of male candidates' perceived competence was not affected by sexism, $r = .029$, $p = .805$.

Regression analyses with the same independent variables and interaction term were conducted with perceived warmth as the dependent variable. The model with the interaction term was not significant, $R^2 = .03$, $F(3, 148) = 1.38$, $p = .251$.

Discussion

Although many other studies have examined the interaction between gender and party stereotypes on candidate evaluations, this study sought to answer similar questions through utilization of different mechanisms, specifically the effects of stereotypic expectancy violations on candidate evaluation. Rather than analyzing past election data, this study sought to hold all

variables constant and examine solely the interaction of gender and party stereotypes on candidate evaluation to confine and examine these variables using an experimental design. Additional strengths of the current study were that it utilized a sample representative of the United States and had a large sample size, making it possible to generalize the results to the United States as a whole, rather than confining it to one region or demographic group. The purpose of this study was to utilize social psychological concepts of stereotypic expectancy and violations to examine how a candidate's political party and gender, in addition to the participants' political party, affected voters' evaluation of a candidate. It was hypothesized that these variables would affect perceptions of the candidates' masculinity, femininity, ability to govern, competence, and warmth. Specifically, it was expected that participants would evaluate Republican female candidates more negatively than their Democratic counterparts but that Republican male candidates and Democratic male candidates will be equally evaluated. Female Republican candidates were expected to be evaluated more negatively because they violate both gender stereotypes of women as mothers and wives and Republican party stereotypes, which emphasize masculinity (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy & Glick, 1999; Dolan & Sanbonmatsu, 2009; Dolan & Lynch, 2014). Furthermore, as previous work established the Republican Party values men over women, it was expected that Republican participants would judge Republican female candidates the most negatively (Dolan & Lynch 2014; Dolan & Sanbonmatsu, 2009). As the stereotype of a male politician and of a good politician falls in line with the stereotypes of men, no differences in evaluations of men were expected (Conover & Feldman, 1989; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993; Paul, Paul & Smith, 2004). However, results from the current study indicated that there were no three-way interactions between a candidate's gender, political party, and participants' political identification. In general, results showed that male candidates were rated as more masculine and

female candidates were rated as more feminine, but there was only one variable on which there was an interaction which demonstrated that male Republicans were seen as marginally more masculine than male Democrats.

In addition, because previous work has suggested that, in addition to political party, gender attitudes may play a part in candidate evaluations as well (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993; Dolan & Sanbonmatsu, 2009), it was hypothesized that gender of the candidate and sexism would predict candidate ratings. Indeed, participants who held more conservative views regarding gender roles and stereotypes exhibited more of a preference for male candidates over female candidates, at least on some of the variables.

Interactions Between Gender, Political Party and Political Identification

Analyses revealed no strong interactions between a candidate's gender, candidate's political party and the participant's party identification, offering no support for the hypothesis that candidates of different genders and political parties would be evaluated differently based on gender stereotypes. There were no significant interactions in judgments of masculinity, femininity, good governance, competency, or warmth. Participants that identified with either political party evaluated male and female politicians similarly, regardless of the candidate's political party affiliation. These results indicated that, while participants held gender bias, they were not enacted in conjunction with political identification when evaluating candidates. Previous literature has argued that voters utilize political party as a primary heuristic when evaluating presidential candidates, rather than enacting both party identification and gender stereotypes in conjunction (Lavine & Gschwind, 2007). However, this notion was directly violated by Hayes' (2011) findings that party stereotypes are more powerful than gender stereotypes, but that assessment of candidates can be affected by news coverage. Currently, both

political parties have prominent female candidates in the race for president (Carly Fiorina and Hillary Clinton). Since these candidates have been heavily represented in the presidential race, and have performed well in debates, participants may have developed more egalitarian views of female candidates, and subsequently evaluated female candidates more positively. Fox and Smith (2001) argue that male voters do not enact gender stereotypes, regardless of the candidate's gender. Examining participant gender may have offered evidence of male voters failing to enact gender stereotypes when evaluating candidates. However, a lack of male participants affected the statistical power and thus the ability to look at an additional between-subjects variable. Future research should examine participant gender as a factor.

The current political climate could also offer explanations for the results of this study. In line with Schneider and Bos' (2014) findings, female politicians are associated with different adjectives than the broader group of women, yet they are not associated with masculine traits. This study may explain why female politicians are not evaluated highly on masculine traits. However, female candidates were rated as more feminine than male candidates in the current study, contrary to their findings. One explanation for this may have been, at the time of data collection, both political parties had female candidates ranked highly in recent polling. For example, Hillary Clinton, the primary frontrunner for the Democratic nomination, has utilized a 'grandmother ethos', emphasizing her role as a mother, and grandmother in her bid. Carly Fiorina has discussed issues regarding women and families, such as abortion. Character portrayals, coupled with discussion of issues that centers around women and their traditional gender roles may have affected evaluations of femininity of female candidates. This national transformation in presidential politics, coupled with the highest percentage of women holding

political offices in American history, may have led to a shift in voters' perceptions of women in politics.

Although only marginally significant, male Republicans were evaluated higher on individual traits associated with masculinity, such as coarse, tough, aggressive, stern, masculine and rational than male Democrats. There was no effect of political party for the female candidates. This finding can be attributed to the linkage between gender stereotypes and political parties; traditional masculine stereotypes are typically associated with Republican ideals, as argued by Dolan and Sanbonmatsu (2009) and Dolan and Lynch (2014). The linkage between traditional masculinity and Republican ideals may have effects on future elections by dissuading voters who do not identify with the values and characteristics associated with traditional masculinity. In addition, dynamics within the party may be affected, either by dissuading female Republicans from running for political office or for achieving leadership positions within the party. The lack of association of femininity or masculinity with the Democratic Party may attract more voters who could be dissuaded by the Republican Party's emphasis on masculinity. The Republican Party is not the only group that emphasizes masculinity. Fox (1998) found that voters prefer masculine traits for higher offices, while typical feminine traits and areas of 'female' political strengths were neither a liability, nor an asset. The association of Republicanism with masculinity may affect which party is voted in higher office. Though Democrats are not associated with masculinity or femininity, they may have a disadvantage if these stereotypes are applied at the polls. While there was no evidence of negative evaluations of female Republicans, these findings have implications for them, either through recruitment or their ability to move within the party. For example, Sanbonmatsu (2009) found that Republican women were less likely to benefit from issue competency stereotypes, than Democratic women.

Gender Attitudes and Candidate Evaluation

ANOVA analyses revealed that female candidates were marginally associated with being more competent. This finding is not consistent with previous literature regarding gender stereotypes and competency. As discussed before, the current political landscape may have affected these results. Hillary Clinton had previously served as a United States Senator and Secretary of State, while Carly Fiorina was the CEO of Hewlett-Packard, a Fortune 500 company. Two prominent female political candidates holding high offices may have affected the public's opinion on women and competency. Voters' attitudes, as affected by political climate, may explain female politicians' association with competency. Dolan (2010) argued that voters who perceived women as more competent and having appropriate policy characteristics of a successful leader (typically masculine adjectives) were more likely to support a female candidate. Regression analyses analyzing participants' gender attitudes provided further insight into why participants evaluated female candidates as more competent than their male counterparts.

Regression analyses revealed female candidates were more likely to be negatively evaluated if participants held conservative views on gender roles and gender stereotypes. Participants' sexism affected how they evaluated candidates' ability to govern as well as their perceived competence. Participants who held more sexist views, according to the Attitudes Towards Women scale, had more negative evaluations of female candidates on both ability to govern well and competence. These findings contribute to previous literature, which argues that voters' held stereotypes affect how voters evaluate candidates (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). Participants holding more traditional gender roles evaluated female candidates more negatively because female candidates are violating stereotypes for women, which encompass motherhood,

and marriage over a career (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy & Glick, 1999). These results also offer support for previous literature that argues that voters utilize stereotypes for candidate evaluation. Dolan (2010) found that voters utilized masculine and feminine stereotypes in rating political candidates if they held traditional stereotypes. She also found that voters who perceived women as possessing appropriate policy competence and personality characteristics were more likely to support a female candidate. These findings have future implications in the examination of how voters evaluate candidates, especially when integrating them into other aspects of candidate evaluation. With an increase in diversity of politicians within the United States, an investigation of gender stereotypes interacting with stereotypes about race and sexuality merit examination. Voters who hold bias on race and sexuality may be less likely to vote for these candidates due to held biases. However, studying how these biases interact with a candidate's political party offers an interesting examination of the mechanisms behind vote choice. Though political party is a voter's main heuristic for vote choice, do a voter's biases against race and sexuality interact if the candidate and voter identify with the same party? On a practical level, campaigns' knowledge of voters' gender through data collection may affect how campaigns target voters. Rather than spending money on voters who are not likely to vote for a candidate based on gender, campaigns can target voters who hold gender beliefs that are advantageous to the candidate. On an institutional level, states that are more sexist may be disproportionately affected, because voters in those states would be less likely to vote for female candidates for political office.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study addressed important questions involving how political candidates are perceived as a function of gender and political party, one important limitation of the current work

is the lack of statistically significant findings. There are multiple reasons for why these results may have occurred. One reason for this may have been that there was an unequal distribution of participants in either political party; a majority of participants identified as Democrats. A larger number of Democrats in the sample may have skewed the sample, because there was more power behind the results for Democrats and less for the Republicans. Fewer Republicans in the sample offered less statistical power, and less variance within the sample. This study also included participants who identified as moderate Republicans or moderate Democrats; while this inclusion gave increased power to the analyses it also disregarded the increase in partisanship in the American electorate, which may have affected the results of the study. An increase in partisanship in the United States is reflected in partisan candidates, who do not typically violate party line. More partisan participants could have led to more extreme evaluation of candidates who violated party line, which may have produced more significant results. Thus, these results need to be interpreted cautiously. While the utilization of Mechanical Turk allowed for obtaining a large and geographically diverse sample, it also has its own flaws. Many of our participants identified as Democratic. Participants from Mechanical Turk are experienced in taking psychology surveys, and social desirability may have played a part in their answers. Certain aspects of this study require further research. Research on this topic should also examine different variables that affect voting behavior. In her 2010 study, Dolan found that voters who perceived women as possessing appropriate policy competence and personality characteristics expected of successful leaders were more likely to support a female candidate; in contrast, people who saw men as better suited for office were less likely to support female candidates and the idea of them in office (Dolan, 2010). This study did not examine those variables; doing so may have resulted in significant effects. Examining different variables, such as policy

competence and traits associated with successful leaders may offer more insight into candidate evaluation, because they are directly associated with ability to govern. While holding many variables constant in candidate evaluation, such as incumbency and personal history, it was difficult to account for the sociopolitical environment occurring at the time of data collection, such as the prominence of female Republican and Democratic candidates in the presidential race. Future research in this topic should either seek to account for external factors, such as economic, social and political climate, while holding other factors constant, or incorporate static factors for voters, like gender stereotypes and expectancies into live data collection, such as the American National Election Studies.

Conclusion

The results of this study did not provide significant support for the hypothesis that there would be an interaction of political party, gender and political identification in candidate evaluation. The current study found that female candidates were perceived as more feminine and male candidates were perceived as more masculine, but that these effects were not further moderated by political party of the candidate or the participant. The exception to this, however, was the association of masculinity with the Republican Party, which supports previous research. Lastly, voters who held more conservative gender roles were more likely to negatively evaluate female candidates on their ability to govern and their political competence. This research has implications on research involving candidate evaluation and stereotypes by providing evidence of the effects of stereotypes on candidate evaluation, and provoking examination into how race and sexuality may affect candidate evaluation. This topic merits further investigation because of its implication for national politics, and ultimately gender roles and stereotypes in American society. Addressing the causes (whether from societal or institutional barriers towards women

entering politics) behind a lack of representation of women in government can help change representation, and dismantle traditional stereotypes of women as solely wives and mothers.

References

- Alexander, D., & Andersen, K. (1993). Gender as a factor in the attribution of leadership traits. *Political Research Quarterly*, 46(3), 527-545. doi:10.1177/106591299304600305
- Anzia, S. F., & Berry, C. R. (2011). The Jackie (and Jill) Robinson effect: Why do congresswomen outperform congressmen? *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3), 478-493. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00512.x
- Ashmore, R., & Delboca, F. (1979). Sex stereotypes and implicit personality theory - toward a cognitive-social psychological conceptualization. *Sex Roles*, 5(2), 219-248. doi:10.1007/BF00287932
- Atwater, L., Brett, J., Waldman, D., DiMare, L., & Hayden, M. (2004). Men's and women's perceptions of the gender typing of management subroles. *Sex Roles*, 50(3-4), 191-199. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000015551.78544.35
- Bartholow, B., Fabiani, M., Gratton, G., & Bettencourt, B. (2001). A psychophysiological examination of cognitive processing of and affective responses to social expectancy violations. *Psychological Science*, 12(3), 197-204. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00336
- Bartholow, B. D., & Dickter, C. L. (2008). A response conflict account of the effects of stereotypes on racial categorization. *Social Cognition*, 26(3), 314-332. doi:10.1521/soco.2008.26.3.314
- Bartol, K. M., & Butterfield, D. A. (1976). Sex effects in evaluating leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(4), 446

- Bell, M. A., & Kaufmann, K. M. (2015). The electoral consequences of marriage and motherhood: How gender traits influence voter evaluations of female candidates. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*, 36(1), 1-21. doi:10.1080/1554477X.2015.985150
- Bergan, D. E. (2012). Partisan stereotypes and policy attitudes. *Journal of Communication*, 62(6), 1102-1120. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01676.x
- Bettencourt, B., Dill, K., Greathouse, S., Charlton, K., & Mulholland, A. (1997). Evaluations of ingroup and outgroup members: The role of category-based expectancy violation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33(3), 244-275. doi:10.1006/jesp.1996.1323
- Burgoon, J. (1986). Expectancy violations: Theory, research, and critique. *Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association*.
- Carr, P. B., & Steele, C. M. (2010). Stereotype threat affects financial decision making. *Psychological Science*, 21(10), 1411-1416. doi:10.1177/0956797610384146
- Conover, P. J., & Feldman, S. (1989). Candidate perception in an ambiguous world: Campaigns, cues, and inference processes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33(4), 912-940.
- Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 118-127.
- Dolan, K. (2005). Do women candidates play to gender stereotypes? Do men candidates play to women? Candidate sex and issues priorities on campaign websites. *Political Research Quarterly*, 58(1), 31-44. doi:10.1177/106591290505800103

- Dolan, K. (2010). The impact of gender stereotyped evaluations on support for women candidates. *Political Behavior*, 32(1), 69-88.
- Dolan, K. (2014). Gender stereotypes, candidate evaluations, and voting for women candidates: What really matters? *Political Research Quarterly*, 67(1), 96-107.
doi:10.1177/1065912913487949
- Dolan, K., & Lynch, T. (2014). It takes a survey: Understanding gender stereotypes, abstract attitudes, and voting for women candidates. *American Politics Research*, 42(4), 656-676.
doi:10.1177/1532673X13503034
- Falk, E., & Kenski, K. (2006). Issue saliency and gender stereotypes: Support for women as presidents in times of war and terrorism. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(1), 1-18.
doi:10.1111/j.0038-4941.2006.00365.x
- Fiske, S. (2000). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the seam between the centuries: Evolution, culture, mind, and brain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(3), 299-322. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(200005/06)30:3<299::AID-EJSP2>3.0.CO;2-F
- Fiske, S., Cuddy, A., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878-902. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878

- Fiske, S., Xu, J., Cuddy, A., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 473-489. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00128
- Fox, R. L., & Lawless, J. L. (2004). Entering the arena? Gender and the decision to run for office. *American Journal of Political Science, 48*(2), 264-280.
- Fox, R. L. & Smith, E.R. (1998). The role of candidate sex in voter decision-making. *Political Psychology, 19*(2), 405-419. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00110
- Gibbons, F. X., O'Hara, R. E., Stock, M. L., Gerrard, M., Weng, C., & Wills, T. A. (2012). The erosive effects of racism: Reduced self-control mediates the relation between perceived racial discrimination and substance use in African American adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(5), 1089-1104. doi:10.1037/a0027404
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey, Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(12), 1323-1334. doi:10.1177/01461672972312009
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109-118. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109
- Hayes, D. (2011). When gender and party collide: Stereotyping in candidate trait attribution. *Politics & Gender, 7*(2), 133-165. doi:10.1017/S1743923X11000055

- Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993). The consequences of gender stereotypes for women candidates at different levels and types of office. *Political Research Quarterly*, 46(3), 503-525.
- Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993). Gender stereotypes and the perception of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(1), 119-147.
- Hughes, F., & Seta, C. (2003). Gender stereotypes: Children's perceptions of future compensatory behavior following violations of gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 49(11-12), 685-691. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000003341.73966.61
- Inzlicht, M., & Kang, S. K. (2010). Stereotype threat spillover: How coping with threats to social identity affects aggression, eating, decision making, and attention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(3), 467-481. doi:10.1037/a0018951
- Jussim, L., Coleman, L. M., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 536.
- Koch, J. W. (1999). Candidate gender and assessments of senate candidates. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(1), 84-96.
- Koch, J. (2000). Do citizens apply gender stereotypes to infer candidates' ideological orientations? *Journal of Politics*, 62(2), 414-429.
- Lavine, H., & Gschwend, T. (2007). Issues, party and character: The moderating role of ideological thinking on candidate evaluation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 37(1), 139-163. doi:10.1017/S0007123407000075

- Lawless, J. (2004). Women, war, and winning elections: Gender stereotyping in the post-september 11th era. *Political Research Quarterly*, 57(3), 479-490. doi:10.2307/3219857
- Lefkowitz, E. S., Shearer, C. L., Gillen, M. M., & Espinosa-Hernandez, G. (2014). How gendered attitudes relate to women's and men's sexual behaviors and beliefs. *Sexuality & Culture*, 18(4), 833-846.
- Martell, R., Parker, C., Emrich, C., & Crawford, M. (1998). Sex stereotyping in the executive suite: "much ado about something". *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13(1), 127-138.
- Masser, B., & Abrams, D. (2004). Reinforcing the glass ceiling: The consequences of hostile sexism for female managerial candidates. *Sex Roles*, 51(9-10), 609-615. doi:10.1007/s11199-004-5470-8
- Okimoto, T. G., & Brescoll, V. L. (2010). The price of power: Power seeking and backlash against female politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(7), 923-936. doi:10.1177/0146167210371949
- Paul, D., Paul, R., & Smith, J. (2007). No place for a woman: Evidence for gender bias in evaluations of presidential candidates. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(3), 225-233. doi:10.1080/01973530701503069
- Peterson, R. (2001). On the use of college students in social science research: Insights from a Second-Order Meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(3), 450-461. doi:10.1086/323732

- Richeson JA, S. J. (2006). A social psychological perspective on the stigmatization of older adults. *National Research Council (US) Committee on Aging Frontiers in Social Psychology, Personality, and Adult Developmental Psychology*,
- Sanbonmatsu, K., & Dolan, K. (2009). Do gender stereotypes transcend party? *Political Research Quarterly*, 62(3), 485; 485-494; 494.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2002). Gender stereotypes and vote choice. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(1), 20-34. doi:10.2307/3088412
- Schneider, M. C., & Bos, A. L. (2014). Measuring stereotypes of female politicians. *Political Psychology*, 35(2), 245-266. doi:10.1111/pops.12040
- Skitka, L., & Maslach, C. (1990). Gender-roles and the categorization of gender-relevant behavior. *Sex Roles*, 22(3-4), 133-150. doi:10.1007/BF00288187
- Smith, E., & Fox, R. (2001). The electoral fortunes of women candidates for congress. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(1), 205-221. doi:10.2307/449215
- Spence, J., Helmrich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2(4), 219-220.
- Vescio, T., & Weaver, K. (2013). Prejudice and stereotyping. *Oxford Bibliographies*,
- Williams, D. R., & Mohammed, S. A. (2013). Racism and health I: Pathways and scientific evidence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(8), 1152-1173.
doi:10.1177/0002764213487340

Appendix A

Pilot Study

List of Statements and Issue Area (first statement is Republican in ideology, second statement set is Democratic in ideology)

Participants saw all twenty statements in a random order, and evaluated each on a seven-point scale from strongly Republican to strongly Democratic.

The way the government operates in Washington D.C.

1. Rep. Smith believes in reducing the size, outreach and services of the federal government
2. Rep. Smith believes in maintaining or expanding the size, outreach and services of the federal government.

Regulation on Financial Institutions

3. Rep. Smith believes in reducing and eliminating regulations on financial institutions
4. Rep. Smith believes in increasing and strengthening regulations on financial institutions

Unemployment

5. Rep. Smith believes economic growth will solve unemployment. Economic growth will be achieved through tax cuts, and regulating government spending.
6. Rep. Smith believes offering tax incentives towards businesses and support for the unemployed will solve unemployment.

Healthcare

7. Rep. Smith believes in repealing Obamacare and fostering private market solutions for healthcare.
8. Rep Smith believes Obamacare is the best solution to the healthcare crisis.

Campaign Laws and Campaign Finance Regulation

9. Rep Smith believes that campaign finance should be less regulated
10. Rep Smith believes that campaign finance laws should be tightened

Immigration

11. Rep Smith believes in strengthening our borders, and keeping illegal immigrants out of the country.
12. Rep Smith believes in offering illegal immigrants a path to citizenship.

Economy in General

13. Rep Smith believes in cutting taxes.
14. Rep Smith believes in raising taxes on the highest earners in the United States.

Foreign Policy

15. Rep Smith believes in a stronger foreign policy military agenda, particularly in regards to Iraq and ISIS.

16. Rep Smith believes diplomatic negotiation will be the best way to solve the crisis in Iraq.

Income and Wealth Distribution in the United States

17. Rep Smith believes that income inequality will solve itself through the free market.

18. Rep Smith believes income inequality will be solved through government intervention and raising the minimum wage.

Abortion

19. Rep Smith does not support abortion under any circumstances.

20. Rep Smith believes in unrestricted access to abortion.

Table 1

Ranking of Personal Importance of Issue Area

<u>Ranking by Importance</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>Std. Error Mean</u>
The way the government operates in Washington, DC	101	5.2871	2.96761	.29529
Regulation on financial institutions	101	5.6931	2.05788	.20477
Unemployment	101	4.1881	2.10101	.20906
Healthcare	101	3.6436	2.19355	.21827
Campaign laws and campaign finance regulation	101	7.6931	2.27922	.22679
Immigration	101	6.0396	2.55703	.25443
Income and wealth distribution in the United States	101	4.7921	3.05063	.30355
Foreign policy	101	6.7921	2.40548	.23935
The economy in general	101	3.6040	2.55374	.25411
Abortion	101	7.2673	2.87712	.28628

Table 1

Table 2

Ranking of Importance of Issue Area in 2016 Vote Choice

<u>Issue Ranking for 2016 Election</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>Std. Error Mean</u>
The way the government operates in Washington, DC	100	5.24	1.386	.139
Regulation on financial institutions	100	5.08	1.522	.152
Unemployment	100	5.95	1.123	.112
Healthcare	98	6.15	1.161	.117
Campaign laws and campaign finance regulation	100	4.68	1.657	.166
Immigration	100	5.36	1.467	.147
Income and wealth distribution in the United States	100	5.71	1.635	.163
Foreign policy	100	5.18	1.192	.119
The economy in general	100	6.34	.807	.081
Abortion	100	4.75	1.872	.187

Table 2

Table 3

Statement Correlation

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Mean of Reverse Coded Statements</u>	<u>Personal Ranking</u>	<u>2016 Vote Choice</u>	<u>Cronbach's Alpha</u>
The Economy in General	2.2673	3.604	6.34	0.692
Healthcare	1.94	3.6436	6.15	0.784
Unemployment	3.4752	4.1881	5.95	-0.37
Income and Wealth Distribution in the United States	2.5396	4.7921	5.71	0.361
Government Operation	2.719	5.2871	5.24	0.775
Regulation on Financial Institutions	2.69	5.6931	5.08	0.767
Immigration	2.0693	6.0396	5.36	0.601
Foreign Policy	2.5693	6.7921	5.18	0.624
Abortion	1.7677	7.2673	4.75	0.693
Campaign Laws and Campaign Finance Regulation	2.8465	7.6931	4.68	0.782

Table 3

		<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Valid	Male	56	55.4	56.6
	Female	42	41.6	42.4
	Other	1	1.0	1.0
	Total	99	98.0	100.0
Missing	System	2	2.0	
Total		101	100.0	

Table 4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Extremely liberal	14	13.9	14.0
	Liberal	24	23.8	24.0
	Slightly liberal	18	17.8	18.0
	Moderate; middle of the road	19	18.8	19.0
	Slightly conservative	9	8.9	9.0
	Conservative	14	13.9	14.0
	Extremely conservative	1	1.0	1.0
	Haven't thought much	1	1.0	1.0
	Total	100	99.0	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.0	
Total		101	100.0	

Table 5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very Republican	5	5.0	5.0
	Moderate Republican	15	14.9	15.0
	Moderate	27	26.7	27.0
	Moderate Democrat	24	23.8	24.0
	Very Democrat	17	16.8	17.0
	Strong Democrat	12	11.9	12.0
	Total	100	99.0	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.0	
Total		101	100.0	

Table 6

Appendix B

Candidate Biographies

Robert McGuire is a Democratic politician running for president in 2016. He is serving his second term in the United States Senate. Before being elected Senator, he served as a Representative in the United States House of Representatives, and in the local government. Senator McGuire has a wife, and two children. Below is a list of his political views-

- Senator McGuire believes in cutting taxes.
- Senator McGuire believes Obamacare is the best solution to the healthcare crisis.
- Senator McGuire believes in reducing the size, outreach and services of the federal government

Robert McGuire is a Republican politician running for president in 2016. He is serving his second term in the United States Senate. Before being elected Senator, he served as a Representative in the United States House of Representatives, and in the local government. Senator McGuire has a wife, and two children. Below is a list of his political views-

- Senator McGuire believes in raising taxes on the highest earners in the United States.
- Senator McGuire believes in repealing Obamacare and fostering private market solutions for healthcare.
- Senator McGuire believes in maintaining or expanding the size, outreach and services of the federal government.

Elizabeth McGuire is a Democratic politician running for president in 2016. She is serving her second term in the United States Senate. Before being elected Senator, she served as a Representative in the United States House of Representatives, and in the local government. Senator McGuire has a husband, and two children. Below is a list of her political views-

- Senator McGuire believes in cutting taxes.
- Senator McGuire believes Obamacare is the best solution to the healthcare crisis.
- Senator McGuire believes in reducing the size, outreach and services of the federal government

Elizabeth McGuire is a Republican politician running for president in 2016. She is serving her second term in the United States Senate. Before being elected Senator, she served as a Representative in the United States House of Representatives, and in the local government. Senator McGuire has a husband, and two children. Below is a list of her political views-

- Senator McGuire believes in raising taxes on the highest earners in the United States.
- Senator McGuire believes in repealing Obamacare and fostering private market solutions for healthcare.
- Senator McGuire believes in maintaining or expanding the size, outreach and services of the federal government.

Questionnaire

How well do the following adjectives describe the candidate you read about? (7 point scale: 'not well at all' to 'extremely well')

Male Adjectives- Assertive, coarse, tough, aggressive, self-confident, stern, masculine, active, rational

Female Adjectives- Warm, gentle, feminine, sensitive, emotional, talkative, curious

Adjectives Relating to Good Governance- Provides strong leadership, compassionate, intelligent, decisive, experienced, honest, ability to build consensus, ability to change government

Adjectives Relating to Competence and Warm- Ambitious, strong, competent, productive, supportive and caring

Manipulation check

Please identify the gender of the candidate whose profile you read (male or female)

Please identify the political party of the candidate whose profile you read (Republican Party, Democratic Party, Not sure, other)

Attitudes Towards Women Scale (from 1, strongly disagree to 4, strongly agree); Questions with asterisks were reverse coded

1. Women have an obligation to be faithful to their husbands
2. Swearing and obscenity is more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.
3. The satisfaction of her husband's sexual desires is a fundamental obligation of every wife.
4. *Divorced men should help support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working.
5. Under ordinary circumstances, men should be expected to pay all the expenses while they're out on a date.
6. *Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
7. *It is all right for wives to an occasional casual extramarital affair.
8. *Special attentions like standing up for a woman who comes into a room or giving her a seat on a crowded bus are outmoded and should be discontinued.
9. *Vocational and professional schools should admit the best qualified students, independent of sex.
10. *Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
11. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.
12. *Husbands and wives should be equal partners in planning the family budget.
13. Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as holding open the door or helping them with their coats.
14. *Women should claim alimony not as persons incapable of self-support but only when there are women to provide for or when the burden of starting life anew after divorce is obviously heavier for the wife.
15. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
16. The initiative in dating should come from the man.
17. *Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing laundry.
18. *It is insulting to women have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
19. *There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
20. *A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.

21. *Parental authority and responsibility for discipline of the children should be equally divided between husband and wife.
22. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
23. *Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
24. *Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
25. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
26. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
27. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
28. It is childish for a woman to assert herself by retaining her maiden name after marriage.
29. *Society should regard the services rendered by the women workers as valuable as those of men.
30. It is only fair that male workers should receive more pay than women even for identical work.
31. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
32. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage.
33. *Women should demand money for household and personal expenses as a right rather than as a gift.
34. *The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
35. *Wifely submission is an outworn virtue.
36. There are some professions and types of businesses that are more suitable for men than women.
37. Women should be concerned with their duties of childrearing and house-tending, rather than with desire for professional and business careers.
38. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
39. A wife should make every effort to minimize irritation and inconvenience to the male head of the family.
40. *There should be no greater barrier to an unmarried woman having sex with a casual acquaintance than having dinner with him.
41. *Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the idea of femininity which has been set by men.
42. Women should take the passive role in courtship.
43. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
44. *The intellectual equality of woman with man is perfectly obvious.
45. *Women should have full control of their persons and give or withhold sex intimacy as they choose.
46. The husband has in general no obligations to inform his wife of his financial plans.
47. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

48. Women with children should not work outside the home if they don't have to financially.
49. *Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
50. *The relatively amounts of time and energy should be devoted to household duties on the one hand and to a career on the other should be determined by personal desires and interests rather than by sex.
51. As head of the household, the husband should have more responsibility for the family's financial plans than his wife.
52. *If both husband and wife agree that sexual fidelity isn't important, there's no reason why both shouldn't have extramarital affairs if they want to.
53. he husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family in all matters of law.
54. *The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.
55. Most women need and want the kind of protection and support that men have traditionally given them.

What is your gender? (Male, female, other)

What is your current state of resident? (Write-in)

What is your age? (Write in)

This question is about your family's total income in 2015, before taxes. This figure should include income from all sources, including salaries, wages, pensions, Social Security, dividends, interest and all other income. What was the total income of your family in 2015? (Write-in)

How would you describe your race/ethnicity? (Check as many general categories that apply and specify all possible details)

- African
- Asian
- Caucasian/European
- Hispanic Latino
- Indian (India)
- Middle Eastern
- Native American
- South American
- Other

What is your religious background, if any? (Write in)

What is your sexual orientation? (Write in)

Here is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? (Seven point scale: extremely liberal to extremely

conservative; haven't thought much)

From strong Republican to strong Democrat, how would you define your political orientation?
(Seven point scale: 'Strong Republican' to 'Strong Democrat')




Figure 1. Ratings of masculinity as a function of candidate’s political party and candidate’s gender.