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This research seeks to reveal ways in which political candidate image is influenced by gender; the gender both of candidates and voters. It also explores the joint role of party affiliation and gender in determining candidate image. Improved understanding of the function of gender in determining candidate image may be useful in closing the male-dominated gender gap that characterizes American political arenas currently. Yet, few studies have directly examined the relationship between candidate image and gender in the context of electoral politics. And most studies that have assessed these relationships have been limited by the use of actual candidates rather than supposed candidates. It is likely the results of such research were influenced, to some degree, by fixed notions about the actual candidates. In this study, candidate image was measured along six well-established dimensions using 29 seven-point semantic differential items. The political affiliation and gender of subjects were collected also. Five-hundred-forty actual voters leaving randomly-selected polling sites in the City of San Diego during the 2000 presidential election participated in the study. Voters were asked to examine one of two political mailers; reflecting either a male or female candidate. Factor analysis was conducted on the semantic differential items followed by reliability tests on each set of variables grouped together by factor analysis. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was used to eliminate items that negatively influenced the reliability of the factor scales. The resulting factors were interpreted based on underlying construct differentiating the grouped factors. Factors were averaged and a single composition score assigned for each subject in each set of factors. Once completed, analysis of variance was used to test the hypothesis according to a 95 percent decision rule. The results disconfirmed all three hypotheses: (1) Voters were expected to rate the image of the female candidate lower than their male counterpart; (2) Female voters were expected to rate the female candidate higher than male voters; and (3) Self-identified Republican voters were expected to rate female candidates lower than Democrat voters. According to the findings, gender and political affiliation did not have significant influence on voter perceptions. These results supported an existing rival theory; women are discouraged and/or restricted from becoming political candidate and therefore, rarely make it on the ballot.
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CHAPTER 1
CANDIDATE IMAGE: IMPLICATIONS FOR WOMEN SEEKING PUBLIC OFFICE

In 1869, John Stuart Mill (1869/1970) contended that eliminating laws that oppressed women would not only enable, but assure their equality to men. Since then the laws that once prevented women from fully participating in American government have been eradicated. However, these oppressive laws have, in many cases, been replaced by pervasive beliefs that keep women from achieving equal status to men in American society. For instance, women are no longer burned at the stake for speaking their minds. Instead, outspoken women are commonly characterized as overbearing, abrasive, argumentative, domineering, and an entire host of other derogatory adjectives generally reserved for women in power. Women are no longer considered the property of their husbands. Instead, they risk being deemed lesbian or intolerable when they reach a certain age without marrying. Today, women who use their minds are not expected to lose their ability to bear children, as once believed. Instead, they are assumed by many to be selfish and neglectful parents if they choose to have careers in addition to children. Women are no longer denied access to literacy and learning, or academic institutions at large, but their success is largely attributed to external factors such as luck, while women’s failures are generally attributed to a lack of ability (Lott, 1992). Women in the United States are no longer denied the right to vote, own property, or speak in public, yet their role in political affairs remains perfunctory.

Women now make up 51 percent of the population and constitute 46 percent of the out-of-home labor force. Yet, only 13 percent of United States Senators, only 13.8 percent of United States Representatives, and only 10 percent of United States governors are women (Center for American Women and Politics, 2001). According to psychologist, women are most likely to be judged in a stereotypic manner when they represent less than 15 to 25 percent of a given group (Heilman, 1984). When they make up less than 15 percent of the workforce in a given occupation, women earn “solo” status, meaning they are generally less
happy, treated as outsiders, and likely to look elsewhere for more self-affirming positions in the future (Heilman, 1984). Collectively, these effects may advance the notion that women are ill suited for public office, discourage women from running for office, and prematurely retire women who currently hold office.

This research seeks to reveal general differences in voter’s perceptions of female candidates as opposed to male candidates. As such, the focal concept of this study is candidate image. For these purposes, *candidate image* is defined as the perception of a candidate’s attributes in the minds of receivers. Understanding how certain character traits that make up candidate image are influenced by gender will reveal ways for women to combat image related barriers that contribute to the notion that women are ill suited for public office. In turn, the findings may provide a foundation for encouraging more women to run for office and help level the playing field, such that women engaged in electoral politics receive affirmation comparable to that received by man.

This research is based on the premise that American voters judge political candidates according to longstanding, culturally embedded stereotypes that are highly influenced by gender. Stereotypical assumptions may routinely cause female candidates to be perceived less favorably than male candidates. For example, women are stereotypically more emotional and vulnerable than men, while men are more rational and less sensitive to criticism (Jamieson, 1995). Assessed on these characteristics alone, men are likely to be perceived as better candidates for public office. Simultaneously, some stereotypical characteristics of women may actually enhance their image as political candidates. For instance, women are stereotypically assumed to be better communicators than men (Jamieson, 1995). Overall, gender-based stereotypes associating different strengths and weaknesses with men and women may skew the actual characteristics of both male and female candidates.

Thus far stereotypic assessments, in electoral politics have generally favored men contributing to a large disparity between male and female office holders. This disparity may compound the influence of stereotypes because “singular or rare individuals attract more attention, are evaluated more extremely, are more likely to be perceived as enacting stereotyped roles, and are believed to have a greater, sometimes more disruptive impact on the group” (Spence & Helmreisch, 1978, p. 29). These results, however, are no unfavorable in-and-of-themselves. For example, female candidates may attract more media attention with
less effort, be evaluated as more devoted to core issues, and be perceived as able to enact
core issues, and be perceived as able to enact
more change within the political arena than the average male candidate.

At the same time, men and women cannot simply engage in stereotypically masculine
or feminine character traits in order to compete with candidates of the opposite sex. Often,
characteristics exhibited by men are not assessed in the same way when they are exhibited by
women and vice versa. While impossible to determine, one can speculate whether a male
candidate in the same position would have been criticized for being ambitious and having
future political aspirations beyond the U.S. Senate.

Beyond ambition, many characteristics considered positive in men are perceived
differently when applied to women. For example, an angry man is threatening and powerful,
while an angry women is a “bitch.” Where a man is a visionary, a woman may be too
progressive. A man is persistent, while a woman is pushy. A man has strong convictions, but
a woman is stubborn and unreasonable. A man who drinks a lot can hold his liquor, while a
woman is a lush. Likewise, many characteristics suitable to women are negative when
applied to men. For example, an emotional woman is sensitive, while an emotional man is a
wimp. These stereotypes are illogical, yet they resonate with many of the stereotypical
assumptions that are embedded in American culture.

Consequently, political campaign designs developed with male candidates in mind
are not adequate for promoting female candidates. A clearer understanding of how female
candidates are perceived differently from male candidates will enable both female and male
candidates to accentuate their naturally perceived strengths and diminish and/or reveal the
stereotypical myths behind perceived weaknesses. To test whether deep-seated, culturally
embedded biases preclude American voters from judging female candidates on the same
merits as their male counterparts, this study examines differences in perception of candidate
image as a function of candidate gender. The following research questions are proposed:

- **RQ1**: Generally, do voters evaluate the images of female candidates differently than
  they evaluate the images of male candidates?
- **RQ2**: Specifically, do women voters evaluate the images of female candidates and
  male candidates differently than male voters?
- **RQ3**: Is there a relationship between party affiliation and candidate image?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The influence of candidate image in electoral politics has been an ongoing source of investigation for many years. Candidate image is defined as the perception of a candidate in the minds of voters. However, a limited number of studies have directly examined the relationship between candidate image and gender. This study investigates the relationship between candidate image and candidate gender in the context of electoral politics.

Providing the groundwork for such an investigation, this chapter explicates candidate image. To begin, various conceptual definitions of candidate image are examined, resulting in the redefinition of candidate image. Next, the process of candidate image formation is examined. This is followed by an explanation of why candidate image is a powerful predictor of voting behavior. Next, a foundation for the link between candidate image and gender is established. Subsequently, the defining attributes and the ways in which candidate image have previously been operationalized are examined, resulting in the operationalization of candidate image for this study. This chapter closes with the hypotheses tested in this study.

CONCEPTUAL DEFINITIONS OF CANDIDATE IMAGE

Candidate image is a subset of the concept of image. While image applies to commercial products, companies and other organizations, candidate image applies only to candidates seeking election to public office. Candidate image includes obscure, often unconscious influences and predispositions that may distinguish candidates in the minds of voters. Paramount to this research is the capacity for the definition of candidate image to isolate pre-existing attitudes toward female candidates—or women in general—that will impact voters’ perceptions, regardless of the candidate’s message.

The foundation for this definition of candidate image comes from previous research focusing on the construct of image in both political and non-political contexts. While studies that apply the construct of image to non-human objects were not included in this review, studies that use alternative or interchangeable terms to describe image are included. For
instance, various researchers have used terms such as credibility, ethos, and individual orientation either interchangeably with image. Regardless of the term used, image has been described in one of three ways. In some cases, image was described as a perception; the often-irrational assessment of a candidate based on minimal knowledge of the individual, organization, or object about which image is held (Hacker, 1995; McCroskey, 1997). In other instances, image was characterized as a projection; a forceful message of representation communicated intact—or partially intact—from a source to a receiver (Paterson & McLure, 1976). Last, image was on occasion referred to as some aggregate of both a perception and a projection (Kaid, 1995; Nimmo & Savage, 1976; Pike, 1985; Shyles, 1984).

For example, Hacker (1995) described candidate images as “mental representations of candidates…[that] are changeable with situations” (p. 73). In addition, McCroskey (1997) referred ethos as “the attitude toward a source of communication [political candidate] held at a given time by a receiver” (p. 87). Both definitions identify candidate image as a perception held in the minds of receivers.

In contrast, Paterson and McLure (1976) contended that candidate image depends on what the candidate represents to voters, such as party affiliation, past performance as a public figure, and what the candidates say they represent. When image is regarded as a projection, candidates or image projectors are defined as exerting implicit control over how candidates are perceived. Such definitions are in line with the so-called “magic bullet” theory of media, which assumes that the media have an all-powerful effect upon public opinion. This paradigm assumes that an information source (specifically the media) has the power to send a message (the magic bullet) to an audience, transferring an intact message into the minds of audience members. Such powerful effects views were replaced with a limited and/or complex effects paradigm (Littlejohn, 1999, p. 348). This more recent view contends that messages projected by candidates may condition the views of some voters, some of the time. Nevertheless, many researchers define image as predominantly source controlled.

Other researchers define image as a complex construct involving both what is projected and what is perceived. For instance, Nimmo and Savage (1976) described source credibility as the perception of a voter that is a result of the voter’s “subjective knowledge,” combined with “the messages projected by the candidates” (pp. 8-9). Moreover, in direct reference to political candidates, Shyles (1984) described image as a “perceived or projected
cluster of personality traits” (p. 406). Similarly, Kaid (1995) described image as a “complex construct that reflects both what a candidate projects and what a voter perceives” (p. 131). Pike (1985) described image as the product of an ongoing transaction between the image source and the perceivers. These definitions suggest that image is a construct suspended somewhere between projection and perception.

The varied use of concepts related to image complicates efforts to formally explicate the meaning of image. Moreover, many of the researchers have relied upon attributes in operationalizing image, without ever attempting to explicate the meaning of image at the conceptual level. Contradictions among conceptual definitions of image fall into three categories, including: (1) that which is perceived by an observer, (2) that which is projected by a source, and (3) an abstract combination of the two. Since messages sent are unlikely to be perceived by receivers exactly as the sender intends, these three definitions of image are incompatible.

Although perceptions may be influenced by efforts to project a specific image, these efforts cannot determine perceptions, nor are they guaranteed to have an impact. Therefore, candidate image is define here as an evolutionary perception of a candidate that is held in the mind of an observer. Although candidate image may be conditioned by multiple external factors, the perceiver’s individual interpretation of a candidate is an internal cognitive construction. For example, candidates may send out commercial messages that portraying themselves as well educated. However, a voter may perceive the candidate as inept, consciously or unconsciously attending only to the messages projected by and about the candidate that support that view. Essentially, defining candidate image as the overall perception of a candidate in the minds of receivers accounts for the internal contributors to perception such as unconscious assumptions and cultural predispositions.

**Candidate Image Formation**

If candidate image is defined as a perception held by observers, several theories provide a framework for understanding how candidate image is formed. At a very basic level, cognitive response theory posits that perceivers are persuaded more by their own response to a message than the message itself (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). This lends support to the
argument that candidate image is fundamentally the result of the observer’s own predispositions.

In a more complex model, Hacker (1995) described candidate image formation as a six-step process in which voters process messages from mass media, talk among their peers about their perceptions, develop a political schemata, integrate their discussions with their political schemata, reconcile their integrated political schemata with messages from the media, and ultimately make voting decisions based upon the image formed. This model indicates that candidate image is the product of interaction between three sources of information: mediated messages from or about the candidate, interpersonal conversations between the voter and her or his peers, and the voter’s way of cognitively perceiving and organizing a complex situation or set of stimuli (schemata). This theory supports the view that candidate image is a construct held by the perceiver, but conditioned by an internal need to reconcile both media messages and social interactions with personal opinions.

Cybernetic theory, on the other hand, explains behavior without presuming the existence of an elaborate decision-making process. In relation to image development, the cybernetic model suggests that instead of thoroughly seeking out information regarding candidates in order to form images of candidates, the typical voter evaluates candidates by tracking a few core indicators (Kendall & Paine, 1995). This minimizes the amount of time and energy a voter has to spend on political decision making, conserving that energy for more vital tasks. According to cybernetic theory, voters look for a few core issue positions, and/or individual characteristics in candidates. These indicators are based primarily upon personal experience and social position. For example, an individual employed by the timber industry might pay close attention to the candidate’s positions on the expansion of road less areas on Forest Service property, while focusing little attention on other characteristics or positions on issues of the candidate.

Persuasion theory posits that people form cognitive systems in order to make sense of the world around them (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). These cognitive systems involve multiple individual cognitions that interconnect in a way that establishes a stable structure through which an individual understands the world. Although these systems strive for stability, they do adjust to accommodate new information. In relation to the development of candidate image, the cognitions result in fairly stable schemata through which an individual perceives
political candidates. Contributors to the political schemata may include family values, personal experience directly associates with political issues, and interpersonal interactions relating to political values. Similar to Hacker’s (1995) model of candidate image formation, persuasion theory places greater importance on observer attributes in image development than external influence, including the candidate.

Regardless of their differences, all of these theoretical approaches support the idea that the formation of candidate image is largely dependent on individual attributes and predispositions of the observer, lending even more support to the definition of candidate image as a perception, largely influenced by internal predispositions. This is of major significance because considerable research has indicated that candidate image is a powerful determinant of the outcomes of electoral politics.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF CANDIDATE IMAGE**

Candidate image was identified as a “one of the most important but least understood facets of American politics” (Miller, Wattenberg, & Malanchuk, 1985, p. 183). More specifically, Nimmo and Savage (1976), identified candidate image is the “best single predictor of voting behavior” (p. 38). Several researchers concluded that candidate image has a more powerful influence on voting behavior than the issues of the election (Clark, 1979; Whalen, 1976).

At the same time, the influence of candidate image appears irrational, based on feeling rather than fact. For example, Hellweg, Dionisopoulos, and Kugler (1986) contended that voters report that their voting decisions are based upon issues, but the research indicates that they actually align themselves with candidates prior to any meaningful discussion of the issues. Moreover, Roberts (1981) argued that voters assess whether a candidate is likable prior to determining their own position on the issues, let alone the position of the candidate. Overall, findings suggest that voting behavior and therefore electoral results may be preempted by candidate image—which is largely a product of emotive predispositions as opposed to logically derived assessments. Given these findings, the influence of candidate gender may be one of the emotive predispositions that functions within individuals to create candidate image. However, the ways in which candidate image intersects with candidate gender remains ambiguous. Enhanced understanding of how different segments of the
population respond to the gender of a candidate could provide insight into how campaign communication might be modified to reduce the gender-related disparities among those running for and elected to public office.

**LINK BETWEEN CANDIDATE IMAGE AND GENDER**

Gender exerts a powerful impact on the way people see themselves and others. Defined as “the learned significance of one’s sex,” the influence of gender begins early in life (Sapiro, 1983, p. 36). Female candidates are still a novelty in many respects. As indicated in the research questions voters’ perceptions of female candidates may be influenced by gender.

Arguably, gender-based stereotypes negatively affect perceptions of female candidates, creating double standards. In some cases however, stereotypes may enhance the image of female candidates. The influence of societal stereotypes is a prevailing factor in the assessment of political candidates, especially women. According to Jamieson (1995), women are much more likely to be judged according to gender-based stereotypes than men. Although women have been politically influential in various ways throughout history, women in the United States did not gain significant access to electoral politics as candidates and office holders until the 1970s. As more women run for and are elected to office, their emergence is met with intrigue, interest, and resistance. Overall, the integration of women into electoral politics and other positions of power directly challenge the current and historical role of women in American society. One result of this challenge may be that female candidates are observed more intensely than traditional white male candidates.

In fact, Jamieson (1995) contended that “women who succeed in politics and public life will be scrutinized under a different lens from that applied to successful men, and for longer periods of time” (p.16). For example, female candidates in the 1970s were expected to be “assertive rather than aggressive, attractive without being a sexpot, [and] selfconfident but not domineering” (Paizis, 1977). Although attitudes toward female candidates have progressed since the seventies, female candidates in the 90s were still being warned to appear “as clear and independent a decision maker as any man,” as well as “more trustworthy and caring” (Wit, Paget, & Matthews, 1994). Ultimately, when measured against men, women candidates are expected to project equal competence and superior character.
Moreover, media coverage of female candidates exhibits a ubiquitous focus on candidates’ femaleness rather than their positions on issues and relevant experience. For example, a female candidate’s style of dress is more likely to be reported in the media than her position on the issues (Lansing, 1991). Essentially, gender has been established as a cue for voters to use in their evaluation of both male and female candidates (Sapiro, 1982). The endurance of this linkage was supported by Dolan (1997), who found a “tendency for voters to rely on gender stereotypes about how members of each sex will perform in office” (p. 28).

Simultaneously, gender-based assessments typically lead voters to evaluate candidates in ways that unduly favor men (Jamieson, 1995; Sapiro, 1983; Wit et al., 1994).

This disparity is related to the notion that womanhood and power are mutually exclusive. Prior research in psychology indicated that characteristics generally deemed feminine are inconsistent with maturity (Broverman & Broverman, 1970). One study even asserted that desirable feminine characteristics include: childlike, gullible, shy, soft-spoken, tender, and yielding (Bem, 1987). In contrast, the same study identified aggressive, ambitious, assertive, competitive, and personality strength as desirable characteristics of men (Bem, 1987). The judgment of female and male candidates according to these two dichotomous standards marginalizes women candidate. The two contradictory standards represent “femininity” and the “modern role” of women (Sapiro, 1983, p. 6). The traditional standards of femininity involve being “nuturant, passive, emotional, home-oriented and subordinate to men” (Sapiro, 1983, p. 6). In opposition, the modern role of women is judged according to one’s degree of “rationality, striving, and [level of] achievement” (Sapiro, 1983, p. 6). By simultaneously holding women to both standards, while holding men accountable to only one, female candidates are marginalized when compared to their male counterparts. Examples of this include the finding that women’s achievements are more likely to be attributed to external factors such as “luck or ease of task, or by high effort, an internal, but unstable factor” (Lott, 1992, pp. 179-180). Similarly, physical attractiveness is an attribute that may help men but hurt women. When assessing corporate success, attractive men presumably achieve their success through hard work and ability, while attractive women purportedly achieve their success by sleeping with their boss (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985). Physical attractiveness, which is generally seen as an asset to political candidates
(McCroskey, Jensen, & Todd, 1972), may be a liability to female candidates. These are only a few examples of the double standards that women candidates are likely face.

In addition to facing double standards, Jamieson (1995) argued that women in leadership must also confront double-binds, positions that require people to make one of two choices where one or both penalizes them. For example, women are often “advised to market themselves as generic” or non-female candidates in order to avoid criticism regarding the ways in which their gender influences their views and decision making (Thomas, 1997, p. 49). At the same time, a woman running for office under the pretense that she is unlike other women suggests that only anomalous women are capable of political leadership. Simultaneously, this tactic may obfuscate the messages women candidates give to voters. Contradictions in the messages women project often result in a “complicated, disjointed, and fragmented narrative” of the female political candidate (Williams, 1998, p. 50). To illustrate, Hillary Rodham Clinton was severely criticized as First Lady for retaining her maiden name and statements that she was not “some little woman standing by my man,” or “just a little woman who can stay home and bake cookies and have teas.” (Jamieson, 1995, p. 24). While trying to maintain her credibility as a political leader independent of her husband, these actions effectively pitted the First Lady against traditional homemaking in favor of a career. This, in effect, positioned her in opposition to many of the women, children, and families she most readily professed to represent.¹

In addition, men are viewed as more competent than women, an important distinction since competence has been found to be highly influential in voters’ perceptions of candidates. According to a prominent campaign consultant, men are viewed as “competent until proven otherwise, whereas women have to prove they are competent” (as cited in Wit et al., 1994, p. 116). Supporting this comment, an experiment similar to the present study revealed that female candidates are perceived as weaker and less knowledgeable than male candidates with identical credentials (Mericle, Lenart, & Helig, as cited in Riggle, Miller, Shields, &

¹ In Eyewitness to power: The essence of leadership Nixon to Clinton, it was argued that Rodham Clinton’s experience is not representative of other women in politics, but the product of her own ubiquitous blunders (Gergen, 2001). For a more extensive analysis of the evolution of Hillary Rodham Clinton’s image refer to the Symposium on Hillary Rodham Clinton’s image: Content, control, and cultural politics (Brown, 1997; Gardetto, 1997; Winfield, 1997)
Johnson, 1997). Other researchers have found that women candidates must appear strong and
cOMPETENT, which contradicts the public/private paradigm that women may be honest and
COMPASSIONATE, but they are not as strong or as smart as men (Jamieson, 1995; Kern & Edley,
1994). Exacerbating differences in perceptions, Jamieson (1995) contended that the
characteristics of femininity, most often ascribed to women, are counter to the characteristics
associated with competence. More specifically, competence is often portrayed as a trait that
is mutually exclusive of femininity (Jamieson, 1995). Hence, in relation to many leadership
characteristics, men in power start with a positive image and can focus on simply
maintaining it, whereas women must earn their image and focus on maintaining it.

Moreover, women are traditionally portrayed as less composed than men. According
to stereotype, most women cry more readily than men and express their emotions in a freer
fashion. Character portrayals in most entertainment media, as well as popular “self-help”
books such as *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (Gray, 1992) perpetuate these
gender-based stereotypes.

In contrast, numerous studies since the late 1980s indicate that voters regard female
candidates and officeholders as more authentic, caring, and of higher character than their
male counterparts (Boles, 1989; Newman, 1994; Thomas, 1997). In 1989, Boles found that
voters perceived female candidates are more honest than male candidates. Simultaneously,
the National Women’s Political Caucus reported, “voters [both male and female] assume that
women are more honest and caring” (Newman, 1994, p. 22). Further, Thomas (1997)
concluded, “the public sees women as more accessible, more honest, more moral and…less
swayed by politics as usual” (p.29). Conspicuously, stereotypical feminine traits parallel the
traits where female candidates are rated higher, when compared to male candidates. This
corresponds with research indicating that female candidates are rated more favorably in
reference to stereotypically feminine issues and male candidates are rated higher in regard to
stereotypically masculine issues (Leeper, 1991; Rosenwasser, Roger, Fling, Silvers-Pickens,
& Butemeyer, 1987). Arguably, women are perceived as more honest and caring than men
because those are traits voters typically associate with women in general, not with any female
candidate in particular.

Research indicates that the gender of voters influences the way candidates are
perceived (Alexander & Anderson, 1993; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993; Wit et al., 1994).
Specifically, Huddy and Terkildsen (1993) found that male voters tend to devalue character traits commonly associated with being female, indicating that men are less likely than women to vote for a female candidate. Simultaneously, women are generally more concerned than men with being represented by someone of the same gender, indicating women may be more likely than men to vote for other women (Dolan, 1997). According to Bernstein (1997), women report a higher willingness to vote for female candidates because they believe that female candidates have more similar interests and are more trustworthy than men.

Partisanship has also been identified as a powerful predictor of voting behavior. According to Cook (1998), party affiliation between the voter and the candidate is a better predictor of who will vote for a female candidate, rather than the sex of the voter. At the same time, Bendyna and Lake (1994) found that men are becoming more and more likely to align themselves with the Republican Party and willing to vote for female Republicans. While the gender of a voter may not be as strong a predictor of voting behavior as party affiliation, gender remains an influential factor.

Although, gender is rooted in biological sex, the gender of voters and gender-based stereotypes unequivocally surpass biology’s contribution to gender differences in candidate image. Women are assessed in relation to masculine stereotypes associated with power and leadership and feminine expectations, creating a perceptual frame in which men have an advantage. Accordingly, the a priori function of this study is to isolate the specific ways in which candidate image, as the “best single predictor of voting behavior,” is influenced by gender of the candidate (Nimmo & Savage, 1976, p. 38). Advanced knowledge of how candidate image and gender intersect may enable female candidates to directly combat the gender-based perceptions that may prevent them from achieving parity to men in electoral politics.

**Limitations of Previous Research**

Prior research on candidate image typically involved actual candidates and/or electrons (Baxter, Young, & Bittner, 1973; Hellweg & King, 1983; Hellweg, King, & Williams, 1986; Kaid & Hirsch, 1973; Nimmo & Savage, 1974). Although this approach provides a useful, realistic research setting for studying candidate image, it poses other problems. Candidate image studies based on exposure to actual candidates are predisposed to
a very large number of covariates, such as the existence of an opponent, personal and public history of the candidate, incumbent versus challenger status, and any idiosyncratic conditions relevant to the election or that candidate specifically. These covariates may well overwhelm or, at the very least, obfuscate the general effects of candidate image, and the specific effects of candidate gender on image.

Simultaneously, another stream of research focused on image factors associated with the standard “ideal” candidate, or the “ideal President” (Hellweg, 1979; Miller & Jackson, 1976; Nimmo & Mansfield 1985; Tannenbaum, Greenberg, & Silverman, 1977). The pervasiveness of white male candidates in American political history has limited prevailing understanding of the relationship between candidate image and candidates who are neither white nor male.

Much of the research done on candidate image has relied on college students as subjects. In general, students are not representative of the public at large, nor register voters in particular. This severely limits the generalizability of research findings and implications for practical change in electoral politics.

To address these limitations, this study uses mock candidates rather than real politicians to collect information about a subject’s perceptions of candidate image. Furthermore, the research design isolates gender alone as a determinant of image attributes. This permits analysis of images of female candidates to determine if they are evaluated according to the same criteria used for male candidates. Finally, this study utilizes registered voters in the natural context of making voting decisions. Subjects were recruited for the study as they exited the polls on November 7, 2000.

**OPERATIONALIZATION**

In the present study, candidate image is operationalized along six dimensions: competence, composure, character, extroversion, sociability, and homophily. These dimensions were repeatedly identified in the literature on candidate image, public figure credibility, and source credibility. Furthermore, these dimensions were chosen because the majority of the defining attributes and dimensions used to capture the essence of candidate image in other studies could be categorized under one of these six dimensions.
Competence, composure, character, extroversion, and sociability were originally identified by McCroskey et al. (1972) as dimensions of perceived public figure credibility. In addition to these dimensions of candidate image, trustworthiness, expertness, safety, qualification, dynamism, charisma, clout, communicator intent, genuineness, leadership, demeanor, and composure were identified as dimensions of public figure credibility. For the purpose of this study, each of these attributes is categorized under one of more of McCroskey et al.’s (1972) five dimensions of public figure credibility. For example, expertise is one of the defining attributes of competence; trustworthiness (believability and honesty) is a defining attribute of character, according to McCroskey et al. (1972).

The sixth dimension of candidate image used in this research is homophily, the degree to which one perceives the self to be similar to another. Andersen and Todd de Mancillas (1978) identified three types of public figure homophily: attitude-belief homophily, background homophily, and personality homophily. Using these categories of homophily, Hellweg (1979), found that the ideal candidate was conceptualized as: (1) “quite” similar in beliefs, (2) “slightly” similar in goals for the country, political party, political attitudes, cultural background, political preferences, and political beliefs, and (3) “neutral” in personality similarity, social class, educational background, and goals in life. This suggests that breaking homophily down into categorical dimensions of attitude-belief, personality, and background may be simplistic, missing the complex influences of different attitudes and beliefs (i.e., overall beliefs versus political beliefs), interacting with background (i.e., cultural versus educational). For this reason, the homophily is designated a single dimension in this study, in an effort to capture the overall relationship between homophily and gender, through a set of questions that get at similarity in all of the ways listed above. In another study, Andersen and Kibler (1978) concluded that attitude “homophily is an excellent predictor of voter preference” (p. 11). Klahr (1969) linked homophily to competence, contending that perceive similarity between the candidate and the voter induces assumptions of candidate competence.

Moreover, the magnitude of the effect of homophily on voting behavior has been demonstrated repeatedly. Kendall and Yum (1984) examined the impact of homophily, images, and issues, and concluded that homophily was the strongest predictor of voting behavior among blue-collar voters. Kendall and Yum (1984) found that blue-collar voters
chose presidential candidates in a fashion similar to the way they might choose friends. Ultimately, they argued that the assumption that voting decisions are or should be based on rational assessment of the issues is an elitist view that does not accurately depict the way voters make decisions (Kendall & Yum, 1984).

Empirically, a candidate with a positive image is one who is perceived as competent, composed, having a high level of character, extroverted, sociable and similar to the voter. These constructs are operationalized through semantic differential scales using bipolar adjectives.

McCroskey et al. (1972) identified the attributes of competence as experience, training, expertise, and intelligence. Therefore, the bipolar adjectives used to operationalize competence are experience/inexperience, expert/inexpert, intelligent/unintelligent, competent/incompetent, and trained/untrained.

The attributes of composure are poise, attractiveness, and calmness (McCroskey et al., 1972). However, voters were limited to observing the candidate in a single mailer in this study. Therefore, the rating of composure is based solely on their rating of the candidate as attractive/unattractive.

McCroskey et al. (1972) identified the attributes of character as believability, admirability, honesty, reliability, responsibility, and honorability. Therefore, the bipolar adjectives used to operationalize character were believable/unbelievable, admirable/contemptible, honest/dishonest, reliable/unreliable, and responsible/undependable. In an effort to make measurement as parsimonious as possible, honorability was not included in the questionnaire.

McCroskey et al. (1972) identified the attributes of extroversion as adventurousness, verbosity, energy level, cheerfulness, confidence, and aggression. Because it would be difficult for voters to form an assessment of a candidate’s verbosity, energy level, and confidence from a single mailer, these items were not included in the scale of extroversion. The bipolar adjectives used to operationalize extroversion included adventurous/cautious, aggressive/meek, and cheerful/gloomy.

Last, McCroskey et al. (1972) identified the attributes of sociability as pleasantness, kindness, and good nature. The bipolar adjectives used to operationalize sociability were
good nature/irritable, kind/cruel, and sociable/unsociable. The construct of pleasantness was omitted because subjects could not readily assess that attribute from a mailer.

Finally, homophily was also operationalized with bipolar adjectives. Attitude-belief homophily was operationalized as political attitudes similar to/different than mine, goals for country are similar to/different than mine, and shares my beliefs/doesn’t share my beliefs. Background homophily was operationalized as background similar/dissimilar to mine. Personality homophily was operationalized as personality similar/dissimilar to mine and like me/unlike me.

**HYPOTHESIS**

Candidate gender is posited to impact candidate image, independent of messages candidates project about themselves. In addition to this main effect, research indicates the gender and political affiliation of a voter affects the direction and strength of the relationship between candidate image and candidate gender. Essentially, candidate gender is a conditional variable of candidate image, as is the gender and the political affiliation of the perceiver or voter. Therefore, prior research supports the following:

H$_1$: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate the overall image of a female candidate lower than they will rate the image of a male candidate.

As detailed in the literature review, prior research identified the dimension of competence as one of the most influential factors in voters’ perceptions of candidates. In general, women historically have been perceived as less competent than men. Research indicates that a woman’s achievements are more likely to be attributed to unstable external factors rather than enduring internal traits. Characteristics commonly associated with being female are incompatible with the characteristics associated with competence. Prior research provides support for the following hypothesis:

H$_{1a}$: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate female candidates as less competent than male candidates.

As shown in the review of the literature, popular culture characterizes women as less able to control their emotions than men. As recent as 1970, at the Democratic Party’s committee on national priorities, a committee member who was a physician publicly argued that “raging hormonal influences” caused by the menstrual cycle and menopause should
exclude women from executive responsibility. The doctor claimed that there are “physical and psychological inhabitants that limit a female’s potential” (Lyndon, 1970, p. 35). These perceptions support the following hypothesis:

\[ H_{1b} \]: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate female candidates as less composed than male candidates.

In contrast to the directionality of the previous hypotheses, prior research indicates that women are generally considered more trustworthy than men, supporting the following hypothesis:

\[ H_{1c} \]: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate female candidates as having higher character than male candidates.

Aggression is a defining attribute of extroversion; women are socialized to be less aggressive than men. The literature review supports the following hypothesis:

\[ H_{1d} \]: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate female candidates as less extroverted than male candidates.

Prior research also supports the following:

\[ H_{1e} \]: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate female candidates as more sociable than male candidates.

Given the small number of female candidates and office holders, voters are posited to view women candidates as somewhat of an anomaly, separating female candidates from men by sex and women by their level of distinction. Accordingly, both male and female voters are likely to see the female candidate as different from themselves, when compared to traditional white male candidates that most voters have become accustomed to. This posited difference in perceived homophily supports the following hypothesis:

\[ H_{1f} \]: After controlling for all other factors, voters will rate female candidates as less similar to themselves than male candidates.

Prior research indicates that female voters are more likely to vote for female candidates than male voters, but that party affiliation plays a role in willingness to vote for a woman candidate. These finding support the following hypotheses:

\[ H_{2} \]: After controlling for all other factors, female voters will rate female candidates higher than male voters.
$H_3$: After controlling for all other factors, voters who identify themselves as strong Republicans will rate female candidates lower than voters who identify themselves as strong Democrats.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study consists of a field experiment designed to measure the influence of gender on candidate image. This field experiment was conducted at seven polling sites within the City of San Diego on Election Day, 2000. Subjects were recruited to participate in the study as they exited polling sites. They were then randomly assigned to one of two groups. Subjects were exposed to one of two treatments, following by a posttest-only measure of candidate image. The treatment was the gender of the candidate, indicated by the photo on a campaign mailer that subjects were asked to read. Exclusive of the photo, the mailers were identical for both candidates. Both candidates were assigned the same androgynous name.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

This study used the experimental method in an effort to isolate the impact of gender on voters’ perceptions. Data collection was conducted in the field; gathered from actual voters in the natural context of a polling location on Election Day. Random assignment of subjects into groups, coupled with adequate sample size, precluded the need for a pretest, ensuring the initial comparability of the two groups in relation to the dependent variable. Use of a pretest was also rejected because it might have compromised the internal validity of the results by sensitizing the subjects’ initial perceptions of the candidate and/or revealing the true purpose of the experiment to subjects. Instead, the purpose of the study was masked: subjects were told that the goal of the study was to determine the impact of different types of advertising techniques on voters. By wording the goal as such, subjects’ perceptions were not compromised by the actual purpose of the study. In addition, mock candidates, rather than real candidates, were used to eliminate covariates associated with genuine candidates that might obfuscate the influence of gender. While the use of mock candidates may have reduced the realism of the experiment, it more importantly controlled for any effects that could have been associated with the subjects’ previous experience and knowledge of a real candidate.
TREATMENTS

Two political mailers were used (see Appendix A). The two mailers were completely identical with the exception of the candidate photo. One of the mailers displayed a photo of a male political candidate; the second displayed a photo of a female candidate. Due to the pervasiveness of white male candidates (relative to their share of the citizenry and labor force), the mailer with a photo of a white male candidate was designated the placebo treatment. An identical mailer with a photo of a white female candidate was designated the experimental treatment. The androgynous name Kris Adams is used to identify the candidate on both mailers.

Research indicates that party affiliation and issue positions take precedence over the influence of candidate gender. In an effort to isolate the impact of gender alone, the treatment does not identify the candidate's positions on any issues or the party affiliation of the candidate (Bernstein, 1988; Burrell, 1992, 1994). In addition, there is evidence that women seeking low-level offices (local city-council, county supervisors) are supported by voters, while those seeking high level offices (state or national legislative seats) are not. Therefore, the mailers specify that the candidate is running for United States Senate. Forty-seven percent of the subjects received a male treatment and 53 percent received a female treatment.

INSTRUMENTATION

After examining one of the mailers, subjects were asked a series of questions regarding their perceptions of the candidate, based on the mailer (see Appendix B). The questions included 29 seven-point semantic differential items designed to measure candidate image. In addition, subjects were asked to identify their political party affiliation, if they had ever voted outside of their party, and if they would consider voting outside of their political party. Voters were also asked several demographic questions used to describe the sample.

SUBJECTS

The research team surveyed 540 registered voters from the City of San Diego. Subjects were drawn from seven polling sites within the City of San Diego on Election Day, November 7, 2000. The polling sites were chosen in an effort to draw subjects from each of the eight voting districts established by the San Diego Registrar of Voters. The site with the
highest number of registered voters was chosen in each district. However, three sites were replaced with the second highest number of voters because the original site posed logistical problems for the researchers. One site had a high concentration for Spanish speaking voters, but only some of the interviewers were bilingual. The second site was located at a resident, making it impossible for researchers to approach a significant number of voters as they were leaving the site, while still adhering to the cities requirement to say 300 feet from entrance to the polling site. A third site was located in an area that may have put research team members at risk. Each of these sites was replaced with the site having the second highest number of registered voters. However, one of the sites was eliminated at the last minute because the volunteer in charge of the voting site was not receptive to the presence of researchers.

Fifty-two percent of the subjects were female and 48 percent were male. Forty-five percent of the subjects identified themselves as either Democrats or strong Democrats while 30 percent identified themselves as either Republican or strong Republican. Eleven percent of subjects identified themselves as independent, and another 11 percent described their political party affiliation as something other than Democrat, Republican, or Independent. Three percent of subjects decline to identify any political party affiliation.

The age of subjects ranged from age 18 to age 90, with 80 percent of the subjects aged 50 or under. Forty-one percent of subjects were between the ages of 18 and 25, 14 percent were 26 to 35, 28 percent were 36 to 55, and 14 percent were over 55. Three percent of subjects decline to state their age.

The cultural heritage of the subjects was diverse. Sixty percent of the subjects identified themselves as either white or of European American descent. Sixteen percent identified themselves as Mexican, Latino(a), or Hispanic. Two percent identified themselves as Chicano, Mexican American, Cuban American, or Puerto Rican. One percent identified themselves as Native American, and four percent as Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander. The remaining five percent of subjects identified themselves as other cultural categories and two percent decline to identify their cultural heritage.

**RESEARCH ASSISTANTS**

Forty-three research assistants were recruited to administer the experiment at local polling sites. Research assistants were enrolled in an upper division research methods course
in the School of Communication at San Diego State University. Each research assistant attended a two-hour training session in which they practiced administering the treatments and the questionnaires to each other. Feedback from the training was used to refine the treatment and questionnaire prior to use in the experiment.

**ADMINISTRATION**

Research assistants were assigned to work in four-hour shifts that overlapped on Election Day, ensuring that subjects were recruited at each site throughout the entire time that the polling sites were open on Election Day (11 hours). Research assistants approached subjects as they were leaving the polling site and asked if they would mind participating in a study. Once a potential subject indicated a willingness to participate, the researcher confirmed their eligibility by asking them if they were registered to vote in the City of San Diego. If the subject answered affirmatively, the research assistant then verbally read a statement of informed consent to the subjects, explaining the study and asking them to again indicate their willingness to participate. If they indicated that they were willing to participate, the research assistant marked “yes” on the informed consent question on the questionnaire and handed the subject a slip of paper providing the same informed consent protocol in writing.

Researchers alternated giving the subject either the female version of the treatment or the male version of the treatment following by a post-test questionnaire. Participation in the experiment took subjects about five to seven minutes (1-2 minutes looking at the mailer, and 4-5 minutes to participate in the interview).
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter describes the procedures used to analyze the data collected, and the results of the study in relation to each hypothesis. Hypothesis 1 was tested using factor analysis based upon both a previously identified set of factor scales for measuring candidate credibility and homophily (Hypothesis 1a-1f), and a second set of factors scales identified through factor analysis of the responses to the 27 semantic differential items in this study (Hypothesis 1). This exploratory factor analysis used the principal components method of extraction. Factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were rotated to a Varimax solution. Throughout this chapter, the set of factor scales previously identify by researchers will be referred to as a priori factor scales. The set of factor scales identified through factor analysis of the data collected in this study is referred to as exploratory factor scales. The a priori and exploratory sets of factor scales differed slightly. However, the results yielded using the different scales were consistent with each other; not supporting the research hypotheses in both cases. Hypotheses 2 and 3 were tested using only the exploratory set of factors scales. To test differences between treatments for the various hypotheses, analysis of variance was used, invoking a one-tailed test of significance whenever mean differences in the sample were consistent with the hypothesis.

DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY

First, factor analysis was conducted on the set of seven-point semantic differential items used to measure candidate image. Then reliability tests were conducted on each set of variables grouped together by the factor analysis. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was used to eliminate any items that reduced the reliability of the factor scales. The resulting factors were interpreted based upon the underlying construct tying the items in that factor together and distinguishing it from other factors. Each factor was then averaged to form a single composite score for each subject for that scale. Each of these factors represents a scale
of the exploratory factors of candidate image. Once these scales were completed, analysis of variance was used to test the hypotheses according to a 95 percent decision rule (alpha = .05).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that voters would rate the overall image of a female candidate lower than they rate the overall image of a male candidate. The exploratory scales resulting from factor analysis were used to test hypothesis 1. Analysis of variance tests were run on each of the scales with a reliability coefficient above .70. Then each scale was averaged to form a single composite score for each subject for that scale. This established the mean differences on each scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment, and those who received the female version of the treatment.

Hypothesis 1 can be distinguished from hypothesis 1a through 1f by the origin of factor scales used in each hypothesis. The five exploratory factor scales were used to test hypothesis 1. Alternatively, the five a priori scales were used to test hypotheses 1a through 1f. These scales were originally identify by McCroskey et al. (1972) and Andersen and Todd de Mancillas (1978). The a priori scales, with the exception of homophily, differed slightly from the exploratory scales that were derived through factor analysis of the current results. This study’s exploratory factor analysis yielded a scale of homophily identical to the homophily scale previously identified by Andersen and Todd de Mancillas (1978) and used in Hypothesis 1.

The a priori scales of character, competence, composure, extroversion, sociability, and homophily, which were previously identified by McCroskey et al. (1972) and Andersen and Todd de Mancillas (1978), were constructed by adding together the semantic differential items specifically used to operationalize each construct. Reliability tests were conducted on each scale using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient to eliminate any items that reduced the reliability of the scales. Then each scale was averaged to form a single composite score for each subject for that scale.

In order to test Hypothesis 1a, which posited that voters would rate female candidates as less competent than male candidates, an analysis of variance test was conducted to determine the mean differences on the a priori competence scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment and those who received the female version of the treatment.
To test Hypothesis 1b, which predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less composed than male candidates, an analysis of variance test was conducted to determine the mean differences on the *a priori* composure scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment and those who received the female version of the treatment.

To test Hypothesis 1c, which predicted that voters would rate female candidates higher in character than male candidates, an analysis of variance test was conducted to determine the mean differences on the *a priori* character scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment and those who received the female version of the treatment.

To test Hypothesis 1d, which predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less extroverted than male candidates, an analysis of variance test was conducted to determine the mean differences on the *a priori* extroversion scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment those who received the female version of the treatment.

Hypothesis 1e predicted that voters would rate female candidates as more sociable than male candidates. To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance test was conducted to determine the mean differences on the *a priori* sociability scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment, and those who received the female version of the treatment.

Hypothesis 1f predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less similar to themselves than male candidates. This hypothesis was tested using analysis of variance to determine the mean differences on the *a priori* sociability scale between voters who received the male version of the treatment, and those who received the female version of the treatment.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that female voters would rate female candidates higher than male voters. The exploratory scales of candidate image (ability, homophily, likeability, skill level, and respectability) were used to test this hypothesis. An analysis of variance test was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in the means between the ratings that female voters gave the female candidate and the way that male voters rated the female candidate.

Finally, Hypothesis 3 predicted that voters who identified themselves as Republican would rate female candidates lower than voters who identified themselves as Democrat. Like
Hypothesis 2, this hypothesis was also tested using the five exploratory scales that emerged from the original factor analysis in Hypothesis 1. Prior to testing the hypothesis, the voters who received the male version of the treatment and those who did not identify themselves as Democrat or Republican were removed from the sample. Analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there was any significant difference between the mean scores that Democratic voters gave the female candidate and the mean scores that Republican voters gave the female candidate.

RESULTS
For the most part, the results disconfirmed all three hypotheses. However, several of the factor analysis results approached significance in the predicted direction, and the skills scale was significant in support of the hypothesis (see Appendix C). Others strongly supported the null hypothesis or indicated an insignificant relationship in the direction opposite of that predicted.

HYPOTHESIS 1
Hypothesis 1 posited that voters would rate the overall image of a female candidate lower than they rated the image of a male candidate. The five exploratory scales of candidate image were used to test this hypothesis. Each scale provided a score between one and seven, with seven representing the most positive response. Analysis of variance was conducted on each scale to determine if there was a mean difference between voters who received the male version of the treatment and those who read the female version of the treatment.

The first scale of candidate image was an ability scale. The seven items with high loadings on the ability scale related to a candidate’s inherent or innate ability to perform the job. The qualities with high scores on this scale were distinguishable from learned skills. The traits associated with this scale included whether the candidate is just/unjust (loading = .70), nice/awful (loading = .69), honest/dishonest (loading = .68), responsible/undependable (loading = .67), kind/cruel (loading = .66), competent/incompetent (loading = .61), and intelligent/unintelligent (loading = .60). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the ability scale was .84.
In this and all subsequent tests, subjects not responding to an item in the set were excluded from the valid sample. Among the 484 voters in the valid sample, 223 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 261 were exposed to the female version. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned an average rating of 4.66 to the candidate on a seven-point semantic differential scale measuring perceived innate ability (where seven is high). Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.77 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the ability of the male candidate slightly lower than the female candidate. These results indicate a mean difference between the two groups in the opposite direction predicted. However, the difference is not significant according to the analysis of variance test, $F(1, 483) = 1.35, p = .25$.

The second scale of candidate image reflects the perceived homophily of the candidate in relation to the voter. Each of the five semantic differential items measuring perceived homophily generated a score between one and seven, where seven indicates the highest level of perceived homophily. The items with high loadings on the homophily scale include political attitudes similar to/different than mine (loading = .77), personality similarity/dissimilar to mine (loading = .73), like me/unlike me (loading = .64), shares/doesn’t share my beliefs (loading = .55), and goals for country are similar to/different than mine (loading = .53). This scale is characterized by whether or not the candidate is perceived as similar to the respondent. Rather than discreet character traits of the candidate, the items on this scale reflect a perceived similarity or lack of similarity between the voter and the candidate. The factor analysis originally identified six items with high loadings on the homophily scale. However, the removal of one of these items (background similar/dissimilar to mine) increased Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the homophily scale from .75 to .77.

Among the 483 voters in the valid sample, 221 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 262 were exposed to the female version. Those exposed to the male version gave an average rating of 4.35 to the candidate. Subjects exposed to the female version gave the candidate an average rating of 4.25. In the sample, voters rated the male candidate slightly more similar to themselves than the female candidate. These results indicated a relationship in predicted direction. However, the analysis of variance test indicated that these results are not significant according to the 95 percent decision rule. There is only an 84
percent change that the relationship in the sample is generalizable to the population from which the sample was drawn according to the, $F (1, 482) = .98, p = .16$.

The third scale of candidate image is a likeability scale. The four items with high scores on the likeability scale relate to a candidate’s overall social demeanor, including perception of the candidate as good natured/irritable (loading = .76), cheerful/gloomy (loading = .74), sociable/unsociable (loading = .74), and as having an overall positive/negative candidate image (loading = .57). This scale is characterized by whether or not the candidate is perceived as socially adept or not. The items with high loadings on this scale can be differentiated from other items in the survey based on their social significance. This scale measured whether the candidate had qualities voters might look for in a personal friend. Items such as nice/awful, kind/cruel, good/bad also had cross-loadings on this scale, but they had higher loadings on other scales. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the likeability scale is .76.

Among the 502 voters in the valid sample, 235 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 267 were exposed to the female version. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned the candidate an average rating of 4.99 on a seven-point semantic differential scale measuring perceived likability (where seven is high). Subjects exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 5.03 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the likeability of the male candidate slightly lower than the female candidate. In the sample, this reflects a relationship in the opposite direction of that predicted by the hypothesis. However, these results are not significant according to the analysis of variance test, $F (1, 501) = .10, p = .75$.

The fourth scale of candidate image encompasses items associated with the candidate’s skill level in relation to effectively performing the tasks of the job. The five items with high scores on the skills scale include trained/untrained (loading = .77), expert/inexpert (loading = .76), experienced/inexperienced (loading = .61), and reliability/unreliability (loading = .51). This scale is characterized by learned or acquired skills rather than inherent abilities, differentiating it from the ability scale and the other items in the survey. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the skills scale is .75.

Among the 486 voters in the valid sample, 226 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 260 were exposed to the female version of the treatment. Those exposed to
the male version of the treatment assigned an average rating of 4.27 to the candidate on a seven-point semantic differential scale measuring perceived skill level (where seven is high). Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.06 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the skill level of the male candidate higher than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a strong relationship in the predicted direction. The analysis of variance test indicates that these results are significant and generalizable to the larger population with a greater than 95% level of confidence, $F(1, 485) = 4.02, p < .05$.

Items relating to the perception of the candidate as respectable characterize the fifth scale of candidate image. The three items in the respectability scale include admirable/contemptible (loading = .77), believable/unbelievable (loading = .76), and good/bad (loading = .53). The items on this scale relate to the level of regard the candidate is given by the voters. The items with high loadings on this scale are all character traits associates a natural command for respect or lack of respect. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the respectability scale is .75.

Among the 499 voters in the valid sample, 236 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 263 were exposed to the female version. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned an average rating of 4.29 to the candidate on a seven-point semantic differential scale measuring perceived respectability (where seven is high). Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.42 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the respectability of the male candidate lower than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a relationship in the sample opposite of that predicted by the hypothesis. However the analysis of variance test indicates that the results are not significant, $F(1, 498) = 1.37, p = .24$.

Finally, there was a sixth scale of candidate image detected through exploratory factor analysis that was not used in testing the hypotheses. This scale is identified as the fine line scale because the semantic differential items making up this scale are not clearly positive or negative. This scale was excluded from the analysis because the reliability coefficient was only .47. The opposing adjectives in the fine line scale do not reflect one good trait and one bad trait, distinguishing them from the other semantic differential items. Rather, the ideal on these items would likely fall somewhere between the two adjectives, with too much of either trait reflecting negatively on the candidate. The three items on the fine line scale include
meek/aggressive (loading = 77), cautious/adventurous (loading = 66), and attractive/unattractive (loading = 51). Loadings for the other scales were computed without the effects of the fine line items.

Overall, only one of the five scales used in the analysis indicated a significant difference in the means. In this case, the ANOVA test indicated that voters do rate candidate differently based upon the gender of the candidate. They rate the female candidate less skilled than the male candidate. However, there were no other statistically significant differences in the way voters evaluated the image of female candidates as opposed to male candidates. For the most part, the results disconfirm the hypothesis.

Next, the a priori scales identified in previous research as indicators perceived character, competence, composure, extroversion, sociability, and homophily yielded similar results in hypotheses 1a through 1f. Hypothesis 1a predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less competent than male candidates. A scale of competence using experience/inexperience, expert/inexpert, intelligent/unintelligent, competent/incompetent, and trained/untrained was used to determine the voters’ perceptions of competence. The scale provided a score between one and seven, with seven representing the most positive response. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the competence scale is .74.

Among the 484 voters in the valid sample, 222 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 262 were exposed to the female version of the treatment. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned an average rating of 4.36 to the candidate on a seven-point semantic differential scale measuring perceived competence (where seven is high). Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.22 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the competence of the male candidate higher than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a difference between the two groups in the predicted direction. However, the difference is not significant according to the analysis of variance test and the 95 percent decision rule, $F (1, 483) = 2.15, p = .07$. However, there is a 93 percent chance that the relationship in the sample generalizes to the population of San Diego voters. While these results fail to confirm the hypothesis, they still indicate a “trend” for voters to perceive male candidates as more competent than female candidates (Broom & Dozier, 1990).
Hypothesis 1b predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less composed than male candidates. The scale for composure is based solely on voters’ ratings of the candidate as attractive/unattractive. This measure provided a score between one and seven, with seven representing attractive and one representing unattractive.

Among the 511 voters in the valid sample, 235 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 276 were exposed to the female version of the treatment. Voters exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned the candidate an average score of 4.01. Voters exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 3.86 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the composure of the male candidate higher than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a difference between the two groups in the predicted direction. However, the difference is not significant according to the analysis of variance test and the 95 percent decision rule. There is only an 87 percent chance that the relationship in the sample generalizes to the population of San Diego voters, \( F(1, 510) = 1.29, p = .13 \). These results fail to confirm the hypothesis that voters will rate female candidates as less composed than male candidates.

Hypothesis 1c predicted that voters would rate female candidates as having higher character than male candidates. A scale of admirable/contemptible, reliable/unreliable, honest/dishonest, believable/unbelievable, and responsible/undependable was used to identify voters’ perceptions of the candidate’s character. The character scale provided a score between one and seven, with seven representing the most positive response. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the ability scale is .75.

Among the 491 voters in the valid sample, 229 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 262 were exposed to the female version of the treatment. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned the candidate an average rating of 4.37. Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.44 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the character of the male candidate lower than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a difference between the two groups in the predicted direction. However, the difference is not significant according to the analysis of variance test and the 95 percent decision rule. There is only an 80 percent chance that the relationship in the sample generalizes to the population of San Diego voters, \( F(1, 490) = .68, p = .20 \). The hypothesis is not confirmed.
Hypothesis 1d predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less extroverted than male candidates. The extroversion scale uses adventurous/cautious and aggressive/meek to determine the subject’s perception of extroversion. Cheerful/gloomy was deleted from the scale of extroversion because Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient increased from .21 to .43 without the item. The scale provided a score between one and seven, with seven representing both adventurous and aggressive.

Among the 512 voters in the valid sample, 239 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 273 were exposed to the female version of the treatment. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned an average rating of 3.91 to the candidate. Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.00 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the extroversion of the male candidate lower than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a difference between the two groups in the opposite direction predicted. However, the difference is not significant, $F(1, 511) = .69, p = .41$. The hypothesis is not confirmed.

Hypothesis 1e predicted that voters would rate female candidates as more sociable than male candidates. A scale of sociability using good-natured/irritable and sociable/unsociable was used to determine subjects’ perceptions of sociability. One item (kind/cruel) was deleted from the scale because Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient increased from .60 to .64 without the item. The scale provided a score between one and seven, with seven representing the most positive response.

Among the 505 voters in the valid sample, 235 were exposed to the male version of the treatment and 270 were exposed to the female version of the treatment. Those exposed to the male version of the treatment assigned an average rating of 4.87 to the candidate. Those exposed to the female version assigned an average score of 4.91 to the candidate. In the sample, voters rated the sociability of the male candidate lower than that of the female candidate. These results indicate a difference between the two groups in the predicted direction. However, the difference is not significant according to the analysis of variance test and the 95 percent decision rule. There is only a 64 percent chance that the relationship in the sample generalizes to the population of San Diego voters, $F(1, 504) = .14, p = .36$. The hypothesis was not confirmed.
Hypothesis 1 predicted that voters would rate female candidates as less similar to them than male candidates. The *a priori* scale for homophily and exploratory scale for homophily are identical. Therefore, this hypothesis was already tested as a part of the tests in Hypothesis 1.

Research Question 1 asked if voters would evaluate the images of female candidates differently than they would evaluate the images of male candidates. Regarding hypothesis 1, 11 measures of candidate image were tested. Of the five measures of image generated through exploratory factor analysis of this data set, only the prediction that the female candidate would be perceived as less skilled was confirmed, $F(1, 482) = 4.02, p < .05$. Of the remaining four, two relationships were consistent with the hypothesis but not statistically significant; the remaining two relationships were inconsistent with the hypothesis. Neither was statistically significant. Of the six *a priori* measures of image from prior research, only the prediction that the female candidate would be perceived as less competent bordered on statistical significance, $F(1, 483) = 2.15, p = .07$. Of the remaining five relationships, four were consistent with hypothesis 1 in the sample, but not statistically significant. The remaining relationship was inconsistent with the hypothesis in the sample; this relationship was not statistically significant.

**HYPOTHESIS 2**

Hypothesis 2 predicted that female voters would rate the image of female candidates higher than male voters. The five exploratory scales used in Hypothesis 1 were used to test this hypothesis. To test Hypothesis 2, the voters who received male treatments were excluded. Then analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences between the average ratings given to the female candidate by male voters and female voters. The results of the ANOVA indicated that the female voters rated the female candidate higher than the male voters on four out of the five scales of candidate image. However, none of the results were statically significant, according to the 95% decision rule.

Among the valid sub-sample of 261 voters who received female treatments, the female voters rated the candidate as more able (4.80), than the male voters (4.73). This reflects a relationship in the predicted direction. However, these results are not statistically significant according to the 95 percent decision rule, $F(1, 260) = .34, p = .28$. The
relationship in the sample is generalizable to the larger population at a 72 percent level of confidence, which disconfirms the hypothesis that female voters would rate female candidates higher than male voters.

Among the valid sub-sample of 262 voters receiving female treatments, the female voters rated the candidate as more similar themselves (4.31), than did the male voters (4.20). This reflects a relationship in the predicted direction. However, these results are not statistically significant according to the 95 percent decision rule \( F[1/261] = .66; p = .21 \). The relationship in the sample is generalizable to the larger population at a 79 percent level of confidence, which disconfirms the hypothesis that female voters would rate female candidates higher than male voters.

Among the valid sub-sample of 267 voters receiving female treatments, the female voters rated the candidate as more likable (5.07), than did male voters (4.98). This reflects a relationship in the predicted direction. However, these results are not statistically significant according to the 95 percent decision rule, \( F(1, 266) = .37; p = .28 \). The relationship in the sample generalizes to the larger population at only a 72 percent level of confidence. The results disconfirm the hypothesis that female voters would rate female candidates higher than male voters.

Among the valid sub-sample of 260 voters receiving female treatments, the female voters rated the female candidate as more skilled (4.12) than the male voters (4.00). This indicates a relationship in the predicted direction. However, these results are not statistically significant according to the 95 percent decision rule \( F(1, 259) = .79, p = .19 \). The results generalize to the larger population at only a 81 percent level of confidence, disconfirming the hypothesis that female voters will rate female candidates higher than male voters.

Among the valid sub-sample of 263 voters receiving female treatments, the female voters rated the female candidate as less respectable (4.40) than the male voters (4.43). This reflects a relationship in the direction opposite of that predicted by the hypothesis. However, the analysis of variance test indicates that there is an 88 percent chance that the null hypothesis is true in the population of San Diego voters, \( F(1, 262) = .03, p = .88 \).

Research Question 2 asked if female voters would evaluate the images of female candidates differently than male voters. The hypothesis that female voters would rate female candidates higher than male voters was used to answer this research question. In each case
the hypothesis was disconfirmed, indicating that women voters do not evaluate the images of female candidates differently than male voters.

**HYPOTHESIS 3**

Hypothesis 3 predicts that voters who identify themselves as Republican will rate female candidates lower than voters who identify themselves as Democrat. Like Hypothesis 2, this hypothesis was also tested using the five exploratory factor scales that came out of the original factor analysis in Hypothesis 1. Prior to testing the hypothesis, the voters who received the male version of the treatment, and those who did not identify themselves as Democrat or Republican were selected out of the sample. Then analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in means between the ratings that Democratic voters gave the female candidate and the ratings that Republican voters gave the female candidate. The results of the ANOVA indicated that the Democratic voters rated the female candidate higher than the Republican voters on four out of the five scales. However, none of the results were statistically significant, according to the 95% decision rule.

Among the valid sub-sample of 201 voters who identified themselves as either Republican or Democrat, the Republicans rated the female candidate more able (4.81) than did the democrats (4.75). This relationship is in the opposite direction of that predicted. However, these results are not significant, $F (1, 200) = .19, p = .67$. This disconfirms the hypothesis that voters who identified themselves as Republican would rate female candidates lower than voters who identified themselves as Democrat.

Among the valid sub-sample of 196 voters who identified themselves as either Republican or Democrat, the Republicans rated the female candidate less like themselves (4.27) than did the Democrats (4.39). This relationship was in the predicted direction. However, these results are insignificant according to the 95 percent decision rule, $F (1, 195) = .77, p = .19$. There is only an 81 percent chance that the relationship in the sample is generalizable to the larger population of San Diego voters. This disconfirms the hypothesis that voters who identified themselves as Republicans would rate female candidates lower than voters who identified themselves as Democrat.
Among the valid sub-sample of 202 voters who identified themselves as either Republican or Democrat, the Democrats rated the female candidate more likable (5.06) than did the Republicans (5.05). This relationship is in the predicted direction. However, these results were so similar that they strongly support the null hypothesis, $F (1, 201) = .01, p = .46$.

Among the valid sub-sample of 199 voters who identified themselves as either Republican or Democrat, the Democrats rated the female candidate more skilled (4.24) than did the Republicans (4.12). This relationship is in the predicted direction, but it is not statistically significant according to the 95 percent decision rule, $F (1, 198) = .60, p = .22$. According to analysis of variance test, the relationship in the sample is only generalizable to the larger population at a 78 percent level of confidence. The hypothesis that voters who identify themselves as Republican will rate female candidates lower than voters who identify themselves as Democrat is disconfirmed.

Finally, among the valid sub-sample of 200 voters who viewed the female version of the treatment, and identified themselves as either Democrat or Republican, the Democrats rated the female candidates as more respectable (4.58) than did the Republicans (4.39). While this relationship was in the predicted direction, it disconfirms the hypothesis, $F (1, 199) = 1.36, p = .13$. The relationship in the sample is only generalizable to the larger population of voters with an 87 percent level of confidence.

Research Question 3 asked if there is a relationship between party affiliation and candidate image. The hypothesis that Democrats would rate female candidates more positively than male candidates was used to answer this research question. In each case, the hypothesis is disconfirmed indicating that political party affiliation does not have a significant influence the image of female candidates.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are contrary to those expected. According to these results, candidate gender does not have a significant influence on voter perception. The limitations of this study may have influenced the results. For instance, the one-page mailer may not have been a strong enough treatment to detect systematic differences in the way subjects evaluate the images of male and female candidates. Voters may have felt they could not adequately judge the candidate’s attributes and therefore scored the candidate neutral in most cases. In addition, San Diego voters may be more willing to embrace female candidates than voters from other parts of the country because San Diego has already had a significant number of long-term female office holders including Mayor Susan Golding, Supervisors Dianne Jacob and Pam Slater, State Senator Dede Alpert, and United States Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein. Furthermore, the results are not necessarily generalizable to the rest of the United States because sample was limited to San Diego residents. Moreover, the construct measured was image, not voting intention or actual voting behavior. While candidate image has repeatedly been identified as a strong predictor of voting behavior, the two are not synonymous. The measurement of candidate image produced by this study may not dictate analogous voting behavior.

At the same time, many recent studies support the validity of the finding that voter’s do not make distinctions based upon candidate gender alone. As opposed to image related research, voting studies have consistently found no differences in the electoral support of candidates based on candidate’s gender when all other factors are equal (Bernstein, 1986; Cook, Thomas, & Wilcox, 1994; Darcy & Schramm, 1977; Darcy, Welch, & Clark, 1994). Concurrently, actual election results have demonstrated that when women run, they win as often as men (Burrell, 1992, 1994; Newman, 1994), and that voters do not discriminate against women (Bledsoe & Herring, 1990; Carroll, 1994; Gaddie & Bullock, 1995). Cook’s (1998) summary of the current state of women as candidates provides a basis for making sense of the results of this study:
Men win many more elections in America than women, but this is not due to voter bias. There are more men in office for two reasons. First, most of the candidates for office are male. It is impossible to elect a woman to a given office if no woman runs. Second, most incumbents are men and incumbents usually win reelection. (p. 71)

Alternatively, some research points toward a balance between the positive and negative impacts of gender on the female candidate. Specifically, women were able to effectively capitalize upon their status as “different” in the 1992 election (Thomas, 1997). During this election, female candidates campaigned on their position as “outsiders,” claiming more humane values, less political corruption, and “special expertise in domestic issues” (Thomas, 1997, p. 48). This approach won women a record number of seats in the House (47), the Senate (6), and executive offices below the gubernatorial level (51) (Travis, 1997). Ultimately, preferences given to female candidates by voters may be sufficient to nullify the impact of any biases that favor male candidates.

However, these two explanations still fail to account for the disparity between male and female candidates. A rival theory that could account for the disproportion number of female candidates is that a hierarchy of power among political leaders that restricts and/or discourages women from seeking public office. Support for this theory can be found in the literature.

First, Sapiro (1983) contends that few women hold public office because they are not encouraged to do so and/or others seldom reinforce their attempts. Simultaneously, younger men with little experience are often encouraged to run for office, while women rarely receive encouragement unless they have extensive experience (Dubeck, 1976), or winning the seat, regardless of who runs, appears hopeless to political leaders (Uhlener & Schlozman, 1986). In addition, prospective female candidates report being treated with low regard by party recruiters (Carroll, 1994). Adding to the complexity of the disparity among elected officials, women generally place a high level of importance on the intrinsic rewards of their work such as the quality of their interpersonal relations on the job and working conditions (Gomez-Mejia, 1983). Given this, women with political aspirations may frequently redefine their profession goals in an effort to seek more positive work conditions and self-affirming professional relations.
Overall, the self-reported experiences of women also support the rival theory. The most common experiences reported by potential women candidates fell into two categories. First, and most prevalent, potential women candidates referred to “old-boys networks” that failed to include or support women in ways that would allow them to be nominated as candidates (Niven, 1998). Second, potential female candidates reported being discouraged from running based upon their gender (Niven, 1998). In a study of bias against female elected officials by party leaders, almost two-thirds of the women surveyed reported “party leaders had discouraged them from running for office because of their gender” (Niven, 1998, p. 64). Experiences such as this are likely to have a powerful impact on women’s decision to run for offices when 85% of the same population of women reported “they would not run for higher office if their party was unsupportive” (Niven, 1998, p. 66).

Overall, the results of this study and collaborating research suggests that the barriers preventing women from achieving parity with men in electoral politics may not be a product of candidate image, but may be the result of political leaders’ responses to women interested in becoming candidates. Accordingly, at least three rival hypotheses that could be used to build on the results of this study: (1) Women who express interest in running for political office will, more often than men, be discouraged from doing so by political leaders, (2) women interested seeking elected office will be less likely than men to actually become candidates, and (3) women who enter politics with the intention of eventually running for office will be less content than men with similar aspirations.
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APPENDIX A

FEMALE AND MALE TREATMENTS
Dear Voter:

I am genuinely dedicated to improving government and addressing your concerns. My extensive experience as an honest, fair, and outspoken advocate for positive changes in government represent the kind of leadership I intend to bring to the Senate. I will not back away from challenges, or fear the effects of change. Rather, I will provoke open discussion of issues, with a respect for difference and a focus on solutions. It is my goal to re-establish your faith and trust in our government. While I am only one person, I believe that change begins within the individual, and I guarantee that my integrity, vision and commitment will not be compromised by outside agendas, or partisan struggles for power. In me you can expect a leader that is accountable to you!

Sincerely,

Kris Adams

Committed to...

✓ Honest, fair leadership
✓ Making government your government
✓ An aggressive approach to your concerns
Dear Voter:

I am genuinely dedicated to improving government and addressing your concerns. My extensive experience as an honest, fair, and outspoken advocate for positive changes in government represent the kind of leadership I intend to bring to the Senate. I will not back away from challenges, or fear the effects of change. Rather, I will provoke open discussion of issues, with a respect for difference and a focus on solutions. It is my goal to re-establish your faith and trust in our government. While I am only one person, I believe that change begins within the individual, and I guarantee that my integrity, vision and commitment will not be compromised by outside agendas, or partisan struggles for power. In me you can expect a leader that is accountable to you!

Sincerely,
Kris Adams

Committed to...

✓ Honest, Fair Leadership
✓ Making Government Your Government
✓ An Aggressive Approach to Your Concerns
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
Hi, I'm ________ and I am a student at San Diego State University. I am completing a research project with Professor David Dozier. We are asking people who are voting today if we could have about seven minutes of their time to ask some questions about political advertising. From this study, we hope to better understand how voters make decisions about candidates. If you agree to participate, your answers will be kept completely anonymous. Also, if you don't feel comfortable answering any of my questions, just say so and we'll skip that one. I'm going to show you a political advertisement like the kind you get in the mail around election time. This advertisement is for a hypothetical candidate. Once you've read the advertisement, I'm going to ask you your impressions of the candidate, based on that advertisement. Are you willing to help us out with our study?

☐ YES → SAY: Great! Here's a sheet that further explains what we're doing in case you have questions later on. HAND INFORMED CONSENT SHEET AND APPROPRIATE MAILER TO PARTICIPANT AND SAY: Please take a minute to review this advertisement and let me know when you're done.

☐ NO → SAY: Thanks anyway. Have a nice day/evening.

WHEN SUBJECT IS FINISHED LOOKING AT MAILER, YOU SAY: Now I would like your views about this candidate, based just on what you have seen in this mailer. Please follow along on this sheet while I ask you to rate this candidate. [HAVE SUBJECT TURN ADVERTISEMENT OVER TO LOOK AT RATING SHEET.] For example, consider the first two words EXPERIENCED and INEXPERIENCED. If you consider the candidate very EXPERIENCED based on what you have just read, then give the candidate a one. If you consider the candidate very INEXPERIENCED, then give the candidate a seven. If your opinion of the candidate's EXPERIENCE falls somewhere in between, please give me the number that best reflects your opinion. So how would you rate the candidate on the experienced-inexperienced scale?

Let's do the second one. From one to seven, how would you rate the candidate on the believable-unbelievable scale?

REPEAT FOR ALL PAIRED ADJECTIVES ON THE RATING SHEET.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Code DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Believable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unbelievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Admirable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contemptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unattractive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Background similar to mine (i.e. social class &amp; culture)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Background dissimilar to mine (i.e. social class &amp; culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cheery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gloomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Goals for country are similar to mine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goals for country are different than mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I would NOT vote for this candidate for President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would vote for this candidate for President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adventurous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would NOT vote for this candidate for Senate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would vote for this candidate for Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inexpert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Good-natured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Unjust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unlike me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Positive Candidate Image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Negative Candidate Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Awful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Personality similar to mine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personality dissimilar To mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Political attitudes similar to mine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political attitudes different than mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Undependable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Doesn't share my beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shares my beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unreliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next seven questions concern your party affiliation and some general information about you. Your responses will remain anonymous.

1. Do you generally consider yourself a:
   □ Strong Democrat (1)
   □ Democrat (2)
   □ Strong Republican (3)
   □ Republican (4)
   □ Independent (5)
   □ Other: ____________________________ (6)
   □ DK/NA (9)

2. Have you ever voted for a candidate outside your own political party?
   □ Yes (3) SKIP TO 3
   □ No (1) GO TO 2a
     □ Unsure (2) GO TO 2a
     □ DK/NA (9) SKIP TO 3

2a. Would you consider voting for a candidate outside your party?
   □ Yes (3)
   □ No (1)
   □ Unsure (2)
   □ DK/NA (9)

3. How would you describe your marital status? LET RESPONDENT PROVIDE ANSWER THEN CODE AS FOLLOWS:
   □ Single and never married (1)
   □ Currently married (2)
   □ Divorced (3)
   □ Separated (4)
   □ Widowed (5)
   □ Co-habiting (6)
   □ Other: ____________________________ (7)
   □ DK/NA (9)

4. About what do you think your total household income was last year for yourself and your immediate family before taxes?

$___________ annual household income (-9 = refused; -8 = unsure)
5. Are you of Mexican, Latino, or Hispanic Descent?
   □ No (1) GO TO 5a
   □ Yes (2) SKIP TO 6
   □ DK/NA (9) SKIP TO 6

5a. What is your race or ethnicity? LET RESPONDENT PROVIDE
    ANSWER THEN CODE AS FOLLOWS:
   □ White/European American (1)
   □ Black/African American (2)
   □ Latino/Hispanic/Chicano/Mexican American/Cuban American/
     Central American/Latin American/Puerto Rican (3)
   □ Native American (4)
   □ Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander (5)
   □ Other __________________________ (7)
   □ DK/NA (9)

6. How many years of formal education you have completed:
   (i.e. EIGHTH GRADE IS 8 YEARS, 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE IS 14 YEARS)
   □ DK/NA (-9)

7. About what is your age? _______
   □ DK/NA (-9)
   □ Refused (-8)

   This completes our interview. If you would like to participate in follow up
   research or receive a copy of the results of this research please add your e-mail
   address to our list. Thank you very much for your time.

   [RESEARCH ASSISTANT TO COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:]

8. GENDER OF SUBJECT:
   □ MALE (1)
   □ FEMALE (2)

9. GENDER OF RESEARCH ASSISTANT:
   □ MALE (1)
   □ FEMALE (2)
APPENDIX C

MEANS AND ANOVA TABLES
## Hypothesis 1 - Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Ability Scale</th>
<th>Homophily Scale</th>
<th>Likability Scale</th>
<th>Skills Scale</th>
<th>Respectability Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mean</td>
<td>4.6624</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.0051</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mean</td>
<td>4.7652</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>4.7178</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.9719</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Hypothesis 1 - ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Scale* Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>455.009</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>456.28</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophily Scale* Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>569.903</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>571.069</td>
<td>482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability Scale* Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>640.546</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>640.678</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Scale* Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.989</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>601.453</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>606.442</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectability Scale* Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>701.014</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>702.949</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hypothesis 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, & 1f - Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Competence Scale</th>
<th>Composure Scale</th>
<th>Character Scale</th>
<th>Extroversion Scale</th>
<th>Sociability Scale</th>
<th>Homophily Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mean</td>
<td>4.3577</td>
<td>4.0085</td>
<td>4.3668</td>
<td>3.9142</td>
<td>4.8681</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.0829</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>1.0438</td>
<td>1.1757</td>
<td>1.2479</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mean</td>
<td>4.2206</td>
<td>3.8551</td>
<td>4.4412</td>
<td>4.0018</td>
<td>4.9093</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.9726</td>
<td>1.5353</td>
<td>0.9619</td>
<td>1.2024</td>
<td>1.2503</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>4.2835</td>
<td>3.9256</td>
<td>4.4065</td>
<td>3.9609</td>
<td>4.8901</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.0259</td>
<td>1.5219</td>
<td>1.0005</td>
<td>1.1897</td>
<td>1.2481</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hypothesis 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, & 1f - ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment * Treatment</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence Scale</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>2.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>506.051</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508.308</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composure Scale</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1178.186</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1181.174</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Scale</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>489.863</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490.539</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion Scale</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>722.241</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>723.219</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability Scale</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>784.937</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>785.150</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophily Scale</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>569.903</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>571.069</td>
<td>482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Subject</td>
<td>Ability Scale</td>
<td>Homophily Scale</td>
<td>Likability Scale</td>
<td>Skills Scale</td>
<td>Respectability Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mean</td>
<td>4.7300</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.9349</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mean</td>
<td>4.7985</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>4.7652</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.9420</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 2 - Female Treatment only - ANOVA Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Scale* Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophily Scale* Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability Scale* Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Scale* Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectability Scale* Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party by Democrat or Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hypothesis 3 - Female Treatment Only - ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Scale* party by democrat or republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>164.896</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165.05</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophily Scale* party by democrat or republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>192.474</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193.233</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability Scale* party by democrat or republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>259.640</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>259.651</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Scale* party by democrat or republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>218.080</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218.744</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectability Scale* party by democrat or republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>244.548</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246.222</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>