

**\*The Intersection of Party and Gender Stereotypes in Evaluating Political Candidates**

Monica C. Schneider  
Department of Political Science  
Miami University  
125 Harrison Hall  
Oxford, OH 45056  
MSchneider@muohio.edu

Angela L. Bos  
Department of Political Science  
College of Wooster  
1189 Beall Avenue  
Wooster, OH 44691  
abos@wooster.edu

\*Paper prepared for the New Research on Gender and Political Psychology Conference, March 3-5, 2011. We thank Natalie Noyes, Samantha McNelly, Abigail Ledman, Chelsea Fowler, and David Small for research assistance. Please do not cite without the authors' permission.

The Intersection of Party and Gender Stereotypes in Evaluating Political Candidates  
When presented with political candidates voters are aware of their many group memberships; most significantly, their gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and party affiliation. Scholarly research has typically examined the effects of stereotypes of a single group on voter decisions (e.g., Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a; Rahn, 1993), for example, focusing either on the stereotypes of candidates based on either their gender or their party. As a more diverse population of candidates emerge, understanding how voters process two or more stereotypes jointly will become increasingly important, particularly for predicting how voters will choose a candidate who is most 'like' them to represent them in office (Pitkin, 1967). Drawing on theory and evidence from the discipline of psychology, the present study consists of tests designed to directly address the psychological mechanisms involved in processing and applying combinations of stereotypes. The methodology used here was developed to provide a model for understanding stereotype combinations.

Stereotypes, or beliefs about social groups (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981), have powerful influences on voters' judgments about candidates' personality traits, ability to handle particular issues, and assessments about candidates' beliefs and ideologies. Of particular interest in the current work is the simultaneous influence of gender and party stereotypes. The gender and party combination is significant and interesting in part because gender and party are highly salient categories. The party affiliation of a candidate is arguably the most important information one can know about a candidate (Lau & Redlawsk, 2006); gender is also highly visible in political campaigns (Kahn, 1996).

Indeed, prior research has consistently found evidence of stereotyping based on gender and party. That is, in comparison to male candidates, voters view women candidates as more empathetic, more liberal, and better at handling matters of health care and poverty, as well as those issues that particularly affect women. Male candidates, compared to their female counterparts, are seen as more assertive and tough, more conservative, and more capable at handling issues relating to the military, budget deficit/economy (e.g., Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a). Republican candidates are seen as stronger

leaders, more moral, and better equipped to deal with issues regarding military defense and taxes; Democrat candidates are viewed as more empathetic, as well as being better prepared to handle policy areas like education, the environment, and health care (Hayes, 2005; Petrocik, 1996; Sides, 2006).

While prior research has not found gender alone to be a particular impediment to winning office (c.f., Darcy & Schramm, 1977; Ekstrand & Eckert, 1981), gender stereotypes may combine with party stereotypes to elicit particular evaluations of candidates' traits or competency. Only a handful of scholarly articles investigate how stereotype *combinations* influence voter decisions (Dolan, 2004; Huddy & Capelos, 2002; King & Matland, 2003; Koch, 2000; Sanbonmatsu & Dolan, 2009). Yet, it is difficult to ascertain clear overall conclusions. The conclusion of at least one study is that party dominates evaluations to the exclusion of gender (King & Matland, 2003; Matland & King, 2002), while other studies conclude that gender stereotypes differ based on the party affiliation of the candidate (Sanbonmatsu & Dolan, 2009). Thus, to resolve this impasse, we draw from psychological theories of stereotype combinations and, from them, develop a set of predictions which we then test.

### **Theory and Hypotheses of Stereotype Combinations**

Currently, psychological science offers competing models of understanding how such stereotype combinations may operate when evaluating political candidates. The first is a Category Dominance model. In this model, when a perceiver encounters a person with multiple stereotypes, one stereotype will be activated and dominate impressions (Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). Which stereotype is activated may be dependent on context, specific features of the situation, individual differences in attention and motivation, or accessibility (Fiske, et al., 1999; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). Since political party stereotypes are strong and may be more pertinent to the context of political decisions than gender may be (Hayes 2009; King and Matland 2002), a Category Dominance model might predict that party stereotypes will emerge as the main organizing category,

regardless of gender. Consistent with the category dominance model, there is some evidence of the primacy of party in evaluations, particularly vote choice (i.e., King & Matland, 2003).

*Category Dominance Hypothesis:* The Category Dominance model would predict that we would observe main effects of party, but not gender, across a wide range of trait, issue competency, and ideological candidate evaluations.<sup>1</sup>

A second theory predicts that the stereotypes of gender and party may act in an *additive* manner. For example, Ridgeway and colleagues (Correll & Ridgeway, 2003) proposed that gender acts as a 'diffuse category'; in particular, people ascribe a lower status position to a woman, compared to a man, even when additional characteristics are the same. In this way, gender, unlike other categories, affects a vast variety of judgments. From this perspective, instead of a single category dominating cognition, gender would continue to influence voters' thoughts about a political candidate, even while political party is a highly dominant. For example, knowing that a politician is a woman can lead to particular judgments (such as lower competency or capability of handling issues in the interest of women) whereas knowing the candidate's party can lead to a different set of judgments (such as ideology). The combination of gender and party could reasonably lead a voter to rate the politician highly on both gender-based and partisan-related traits and issues. For example, King and Matland showed that Republican women, compared to Republican men, were seen as more trustworthy and empathetic, despite other evaluations of them being dominated by partisan stereotypes (King & Matland, 2003). In another study, gender, regardless of party, dominated evaluations in that women, compared to men, were more competent to handle women's issues (Huddy & Capelos, 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> While it could certainly be the case that gender stereotypes would be more dominant than party, this seems unlikely given current evidence that party affects more evaluations than gender. We believe, however, that further studies would be necessary to explicitly test the assumption that party is a more permanently accessible stereotype compared to gender.

*Diffuse Model Hypothesis:* The Diffuse model, in contrast to the Dominance model, would predict main effects of party and main effects of gender on a range of trait, issue competence, and ideological evaluations.

Finally, based on their Parallel Processing model, Kunda and Thagard (1996) predicted that two stereotypes *combine* to influence cognition, rather than merely being added together. Some evidence showed that gender and party has a combination effect: Democratic women were viewed as better than their male counterparts on education, but the same is not true for Republican women (Sanbonmatsu & Dolan, 2009). Republican respondents were more likely to think that male Republican politicians are better at handling crime than their female counterparts. Finally, women were viewed as more liberal than men, bringing female Democrats further from the mainstream and female Republicans closer to the middle (Dolan, 2004; King & Matland, 2003; Koch, 2000; Sanbonmatsu & Dolan, 2009).

*Parallel Processing Hypothesis 1:* The Parallel Processing model would predict that when respondents evaluate candidates with various combinations of descriptors – gender and party jointly influence evaluations, thus leading to significant interactions between party and gender. Importantly, based on this model, stereotype combinations will commonly yield *emergent properties* that are part of neither base category. That is, when respondents evaluate candidates with varying party-gender combinations - e.g., female Republican, male Republican, female Democrat, and male Democrat – we should see emergent attributes that describe the conjunction of the two stereotypes but which are not a part of either of the base groups' stereotypes (Hastie, Schroeder, & Weber, 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, Miller, & Claire, 1990). Thus, the parallel processing model predicts the existence of emergent attributes, while the dominance and diffuse stereotype models would predict no such emergent attributes.

In addition, the parallel processing model would predict that for unusual combinations of base categories, such as female mechanics, perceivers should generate more emergent attributes than for

typical combinations (Hastie, et al., 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, et al., 1990). The reason for the presence of more emergent attributes is due to the befuddled perceiver, who does not know what to do with these contradictory stereotypes and must therefore generate additional causal explanations to reconcile his or her confusion. In the case of our research, female Republicans are the most unusual category, in part because of their relative rarity on the political scene. For example, only half as many Republican, twenty-four, as compared to forty-eight Democratic women are currently serving in the U.S. Congress (CAWP 2011). Further, Republican women are unusual in the sense that stereotypes of females as being empathetic and liberal are very different from stereotypes of Republicans as conservative and capable of handling military issues, for example. While Male Democrats could be considered another unusual group because of their conflicting base categories, they represent a large portion of the political scene and are therefore may not be very unusual in the minds of voters.

*Parallel Processing Model Hypothesis 2:* Combination categories should reveal emergent attributes; Republican female candidates should have the most emergent attributes.

Based on studies in psychology (Hastie, et al., 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, et al., 1990), we examine more precisely which model best describes how party and gender stereotypes combine to affect political evaluations.

### **Method: Participants and Procedure, Design and Measures, and Coding**

#### *Participants and Procedure*

Participants in Sample 1 were undergraduate students from a large, public Midwestern university, collected in spring and summer semesters, 2010. This sample consisted of 161 people, 66% women, and 10.6% nonwhite with a median age of 20. Participants in Sample 1 were recruited during their class period. The experimenter introduced the study by saying that it was a study of how people view particular social groups and informed the students that they were under no obligation to

participate. Students either received extra credit or were paid \$2. All students entered their name into a drawing to win one of two \$25 gift cards.

The second sample consisted of individuals waiting for jury duty at a county courthouse in a mid-sized Midwestern city. Potential jurors are randomly summoned from lists of registered voters. This sample consisted of 194 people, 65.6% women, 21.4% non-white, with a median age of 49. For Study 2, the Hamilton County Jury Commissioner provided his permission to the researchers to invite jurors to participate in the study once a week (new jurors arrive every Monday and if they are unneeded are typically dismissed by the end of the week). Potential jurors wait to be called into two large rooms with televisions, one with round tables and one with theatre-style seating. We collected data from this pool on four occasions in June 2010. Refusal rates ranged from approximately 20-30%. As a benefit to participate, participants in this study were invited to put their name into a drawing to win one \$30 gift card to the local grocery store.

After announcing the study as well as its accompanying risks and benefits, the researcher and undergraduate assistants issued consent forms to the students and jurors. Those who gave verbal consent to participate received a questionnaire, and upon completion, they were given a debriefing sheet and either paid, given extra credit, and/or entered in the drawing.

### *Design and Measures*

Our study design follows closely the procedures used in earlier psychological studies using open ended responses to determine the content of stereotypes and the existence of emergent attributes (Hastie, et al., 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, et al., 1990). Specifically, participants in our study were asked to evaluate a politician from one of four base categories: Democrat, Republican, Female, or Male. Or, participants were given a politician from one of four conjunctive categories: Democrat and Male, Republican and Male, Democrat and Female, Democrat and Male. The conjunctive categories

were also presented in reverse order (i.e., Male and Democrat, Male and Republican, etc.), but since there was no pattern of differences in the order, these categories were combined.

As in previous studies (Hastie, et al., 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, et al., 1990), participants first created an open-ended list of the attributes or characteristics that would best describe their particular politician group.<sup>2</sup> Next, they made a list of the specific issues that a politician in their group would best be able to handle. In addition, we asked a series of closed-ended questions where they were provided a list of traits and asked to rate how well the trait described the politician from their group on each trait (1=Not well at all, 4=Very well). Using the same scale, they rated how well a politician from their group would handle a series of issues. The list of issues and traits in the closed-ended questions was created from commonly used issues and traits in prior research on gender and party stereotypes, as well as research on the use of traits in vote choice (Funk, 1999; Hayes, 2005; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a; Petrocik, 1996; Sides, 2006). Finally, participants rated the candidate on 7-point ideology and party affiliation scales in addition to answering some basic demographic questions.

Giving respondents the opportunity to provide open-ended responses is the most important element to this design. By allowing some open-ended responses, respondents can give us the vocabulary that they might use to describe the groups. Importantly, we can code for attributes that appear for the conjunctive categories that do not appear in the base groups. This kind of ‘bottom up’ approach where respondents generate the list of attributes has been used fruitfully in establishing the

---

<sup>2</sup> The specific instructions were designed to minimize social desirability bias and to make respondents feel comfortable being honest in their stereotypical evaluations. The directions, adopted from prior research (Garcia-Marques, Santos, & Mackie, 2006; Schneider & Bos, Forthcoming), read as follows: “Society is composed of many different groups about whom people in general have some knowledge. In fact, the ease with which people form relatively well-defined impressions about the individuals and social groups that surround them greatly simplifies their social life. On many occasions, either through hearsay or direct contact, we find out something about the impressions that people in general have about social groups. In this study, you will be asked to give your opinion about what people in general think about some social groups. Naturally, the impressions that people in general have about social groups may or may not reflect your personal beliefs. So give your answers based on what you know to be the culturally shared beliefs people in general have about those social groups, whether or not you believe those ideas to be true.”



stereotype content of other groups such as black politicians (Schneider & Bos, Forthcoming) as well as for various immigrant groups and blacks in general (Katz & Braly, 1933).

### *Coding*

To compile the open-ended responses into quantifiable data, we followed procedures outlined in the prior research (Hastie, et al., 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, et al., 1990). Two independent coders first examined the trait and issue data for redundancy. That is, if a trait or issue was mentioned twice (i.e., 'abortion' and 'pro-choice'), coders eliminated the redundant attribute. Disagreements in removal were resolved by discussion. Next, the coders went through the open-ended respondents for the base groups (Republican, Democrat, Male, and Female) and made a list of attributes (traits and issues were done separately) and assigned a number to each one. Similar attributes were put together in the same code (i.e., liar and dishonest). Coders referenced a thesaurus to ensure consistency in putting attributes together.

After completing the coding for each of the base groups, the researchers generated a list of the codes for each of the samples with counts of those codes. Using that list, coders turned to coding the attributes for the conjunctive categories. When an attribute appeared on the list for one of the groups that constituted the conjunctive category, coders used the same code number (i.e., if liar was code 4 and appeared for Republicans, the coder would use code 4 for liar for Republican Females). When the attribute did not appear on the list for either base group (i.e., if liar did not appear for either Republicans or Females) coders considered this an emergent attribute and created a new code. Disagreements were again resolved by discussion. Agreement in the coding list was calculated separately for the base groups, constituent groups and for each sample; percentages in agreement ranged from 60-70% of the codes that were exactly the same.

Based on extant research on traits and issue competency for both gender and party, we created scales of the closed-ended traits (leadership, integrity, competency, and empathy, masculine traits, and

feminine traits) and issues (male-stereotypical, female-stereotypical, issues in the interest of women, Democratic and Republican). The scales, the corresponding literature, and the particular scale items can be found in Table 1 along with a Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency for each sample and scale.

## **Results and Discussion**

To test our hypotheses, we proceed as follows. First, to test the dominance and diffuse models, we conduct a series of ANOVAs investigating the main effects of party, followed by main effects of gender. The dependent variables are the closed-ended trait and issue scales found in Table 1. As independent variables, we use the conjunctive category conditions (male Democrat, female Democrat, male Republican, and female Republican). This test is appropriate here because it investigates the main effect of party while controlling for gender (and vice versa). Second, as a test of the parallel processing model, we examine the interactive effects of gender and party, first examining the data for significant party-gender interactions and then exploring those interactions through post-hoc tests to see which party-gender combinations differ significantly from one another. Next, also as a test of the parallel processing model, in order to identify any emergent traits or issue expertise areas, we conduct a series of chi-squared tests using the open-ended trait and issue competency ratings. That is, we look for traits and issue competencies that emerge for the conjunctive category, compared to the constitutive or base groups.

### *Main Effects of Party*

Table 2 displays the means and F-test of statistical significance and illustrates that, across participants in both samples, participants saw Democrats, regardless of candidate gender, as possessing significantly more feminine traits, as more competent and as possessing more empathy. There was no difference between party candidates in possessing masculine traits, leadership, or integrity.

Further, when comparing Democrat to Republican politicians on issues they are capable of handling in Table 3, across both samples Democratic politicians are perceived as more competent to handle issues in the interest of women, female-stereotypical, and Democratic issues. Also displayed in Table 3, Republicans are seen as being more capable than Democrats to handle male and Republican issues (for Sample 1 only). There are also significant main effects of party on target ideology, shown in the middle third of Table 4; not surprisingly, Democrats are seen as significantly more liberal than Republicans, who fall on the conservative end of the scale.

The hypothesis from the dominance model, which suggests that party will dominate evaluations, is only partially at work in influencing the inferences on trait and issue stereotypes. While party stereotypes are particularly strong on influencing ideology, only Democrat stereotypes influenced trait evaluations. Specifically, Democrats are seen as possessing extremely feminine traits, including empathy. The same is not true for Republicans on masculine traits. For issues, the finding that Democrats are better at handling female-typical issues and issues in the interest of women was consistent across both samples; similar findings for the strengths of Republican politicians were not found consistently. In sum, the stereotype of Democrats seems to be stronger and more coherent – at least in this time period – than that of Republicans. While party does have an influence, we cannot conclude firmly that the dominance model is accurate because not all evaluations are influenced by party.

#### *Main Effects of Gender*

We next examined the main effects of gender in the same ANOVA analysis. We consider the female-typical traits and issues first. In Table 5, we show that women politicians, compared to their male counterparts, are seen as possessing significantly more feminine traits in both samples. Whereas other research has found women politicians to be perceived as more empathetic than men, when party is taken into consideration, we only see an advantage on the empathy dimension in Sample 2. Sample 2

participants also rated women more highly on the integrity dimension. In terms of issues, regardless of party, women are seen as more capable to handle a range of female-stereotypical, issues in the interest of women, and Democratic issues, found in Table 6. This finding was consistent across both samples.

In neither sample do we find main effects of gender where the male politician is perceived to be better on stereotypically male strengths. For example, male politicians are not seen as possessing more masculine traits than women politicians. Nor are male politicians seen as more competent or as better leaders; no gender difference was found on those dimensions. Only in Sample 1 were men seen as better able to handle masculine issues, and no difference emerged in either sample on Republican issues. Finally, we examine target ideology (refer to Table 4), finding that the main effect of gender on target ideology achieves marginal significance only Sample 2. In that sample, participants viewed female politicians as more liberal than their male counterparts irrespective of party.

These findings are consistent with the diffuse model that gender and party may be additive. Taking the effects of party together with the effects of gender, being a Democrat and being a female would both add 'points' to ratings on female-stereotypical, issues in the interest of women and Democratic issues. In particular, regardless of party, females have an advantage on those issues. Males, in contrast, do not enjoy similar advantages on masculine issues and are not rated as being more competent than female candidates. In sum, it seems as though while the Democratic party stereotype influences evaluations, so too does the stereotype of being female, regardless of party. Being a Republican or being male does not positively influence ratings on male- or Republican- typical issues or traits.

#### *Interactive Effects of Gender and Party*

To test the parallel processing model more directly, we examine the interactions between gender and party in both samples for both traits and issues. The interactive effects of gender and party on traits are shown in Table 7, yet there is no consistent pattern between the two samples, save for a

few cases where male Republicans are distinguished from all other groups. Put another way, all of the other conjunctive groups differ from male Republicans with regard to feminine traits and empathy in Sample 2, yet male Democrats, female Democrats, and female Republicans are largely indistinguishable from one another on these same items. The Bonferroni post-hoc tests confirm the lack of differences between male Democrats, female Democrats, and female Republicans. The only difference in Sample 1 was between male Republicans and male Democrats on masculine traits, where male Republicans possess significantly more of these traits.

Table 8 displays the interactive effects on issue competencies. In both samples, there are significant interactions on Democratic-owned issues. The nature of this interaction is that Republican males are generally distinguished from all other groups - female Democrats, male Democrats, and, notably, female Republicans - as being less capable at handling Democratic issues in both samples and issues in the interest of women (Sample 2). Also, while Republican females are not distinguishable from male Democrats in either sample, they are different from female Democrats such that they are less able to handle these issues. Male Republicans are significantly higher than all other groups in competency to handle male and Republican issues (Sample 1).

In Table 9, we break down the interaction effects by specific issues. As Table 9 shows, Republican males are rated significantly lower than the other conjunctive groups to handle issues like affirmative action for blacks, civil rights, keeping out of war, labor unions and the environment (all in Sample 1) and, in the Sample 2 for issues like: affirmative action for women, the wage gap, the welfare of children, and women's rights (in Sample 2). Inversely related to their incompetence on issues more associated with female candidates, in Sample 1, Republican males are perceived as more capable than all other party-gender combination groups on issues like terrorism, the military, and male issues more generally.

Importantly, with regard to issue competencies, female Republicans are rarely distinguished from female or male Democrats. Female Republicans are only significantly distinguished from female Democrats across the following few issues: gay rights, civil rights, and Democratic Issues (Sample 1 and Sample 2), women's rights (Sample 2), affirmative action for blacks (Sample 2), and Democratic issues more generally (both samples). Overall, across issue and trait interactions, the patterns reveal that Republican females differ as much from Republican males as female and male Democrats do.

Analysis of party-gender interactions, meant to test the first hypothesis of the parallel processing model, seem to suggest that interaction between party and gender matters particularly for Republican men and women. Being a Democrat – regardless of gender – gave an advantage on Democrat, female stereotypical, and issues in the interest of women. Being a woman also gave similar advantages on those issues. Yet for Republicans, it is only the male candidates who have the advantage on male-typical issues. Republican women are more in line with Democrats (regardless of gender) on issues that are typical of female candidates.

#### *Emergent Attributes*

Finally, we examined the open-ended trait mentions for emergent attributes that result for each party-gender group combination and report only significant attributes at  $p < .10$  level which at least approximately 5% of respondents mentioned across both conjunctive and base groups. We compared each conjunctive group to its base groups. For example, by comparing female Democrats to both females and Democrats, we can observe whether or not there are attributes that are different for female Democrats. Consistent with Kunda et al (1990), for the purposes of our analysis, we consider a trait or issue competency as emergent if there are one or fewer mentions of it for either base groups but there are three or more mentions of it for the conjunctive group.

For the conjunctive group of female Democrats, strong was an emergent attribute, but only in Sample 2 (see Table 10). However, there were several attributes that were used to describe female

Democrats that were used more frequently than either females or Democrats. While these are not true 'emergent' attributes, they are worth investigating. In both samples, words like ambitious (both samples), aggressive, and confident (Sample 2) were used to describe female politicians, but *not* female Democrats. Several other attributes were only or mostly used to describe female candidates: charming, open, unattractive, irrational, level, and representative, and caring (Sample 1 only). Attributes like young and liberal (Sample 1) and for the minority (Sample 2) are true for both female Democrats and Democrats, but not females.

For female Republicans, family-oriented and relentless were the only emergent attributes. In Sample 1, one respondent (6.67%) listed family-oriented for a female politician, no respondents (0%) listed it for Republican politician, and eight (30.77%) listed it for Republican female politician (see Table 11). For the trait relentless, 15.4% of respondents in Sample 1 chose that attribute for female Republicans but not for females or Republicans. Interestingly, a pattern develops in that Republican females lack several traits possessed by the base groups of female and/or Republican politicians. Compared to their female and Republican counterparts, not a single respondent mentioned that female Republican politicians were generous, rational, caring, or ambitious (Sample 1). In addition, one issue competency emerges for female Republicans: respondents mention that they are capable of handling family values, whereas this same issue is not mentioned for either Republican or women politicians (also see Table 11).

We predicted that female Republicans would be the most interesting case because there would be times when this group would line up with party and times when it would align with gender. Specifically, we find that female Republicans align more with females for the following traits: calm and peaceful (Sample 1) and ambitious, confident, caring (Sample 2). These are attributes typical of women. Female Republicans are in between their party and gender on a number of traits: favoring the status quo (Sample 1), well-educated, and aggressive (Sample 2). The emergent issues and trait of

family oriented and family values seems to be a unique blend of gender with conservative ideology. Finally, the data reveal that female Republicans align more with their party on the traits like wealthy and Christian (both samples), traditional (Sample 1), conservative, white, and insensitive (Sample 2).

The results for male Republicans do not yield any consistent patterns in emergent attributes in terms of traits or issues; only the issue competence on business matters was significant in one sample<sup>3</sup>. Given the findings for the main effects of gender and party, it is not surprising that these groups have more overlap with their party and gender than they do uniqueness (see Table 12 in the Appendix). Open-ended responses to the conjunctive group male Democrats (see Table 13 in the Appendix) generated three emergent attributes: reformer, knowledgeable, and capable to handle civil rights issues. Compared to their male and Democratic politician counterparts, male Democrats stand out on these traits and issue competency. While we predicted that male Democrats may not be an unusual conjunctive category, we find that the label generated as many emergent attributes as their female Republican politician counterparts.

In sum, these results provide some support for the parallel processing model. Few truly 'emergent' attributes are generated for the conjunctive categories. Yet, as predicted, female Republicans demonstrate the most unusual combination and, not surprisingly, they have some overlap with both Republicans and females. This is evidence that neither the dominance model nor diffuse model is at work because female Republicans are neither categorized with their party all the time, nor with their gender. Male Democrats, the other potentially unusual conjunctive category, also generated several emergent attributes.

## **Conclusions**

The way in which voters process candidates' multiple stereotypes is crucial for understanding how stereotypes influence vote choice and politician evaluations in an era of increasing diversity among

---

<sup>3</sup> The only exception to this was Civil Rights emerged for male Democrats in Sample 1.



politicians. Yet, only a few studies have contributed to our understanding of these stereotype combinations. We test out a particular open-ended methodology from psychology research (Hastie, et al., 1990; Hutter & Crisp, 2005; Kunda, et al., 1990) to further understand how gender and party stereotypes combine to affect evaluations. Specifically, we use this methodology to test three competing models: the dominance, diffuse, and parallel processing models.

We find that the dominance model – which predicts that party identification will overwhelm all types of evaluations – has more explanatory power for evaluations of Democrats than Republicans. Democrats are perceived as better equipped to handle their party-typical issues as well as female-stereotypical issues and issues in the interest of women. Democrats are also feminized: Regardless of the candidate’s gender, Democratic politicians at large are said to possess feminine traits. The reverse was not true for Republicans possessing masculine traits. While this conclusion is different from prior studies that determined that partisanship is the dominant stereotype (Huddy & Capelos, 2002; King & Matland, 2003; Matland & King, 2002), it is clear in these data that party does not dominate all of the time. The mix of findings found among these studies could mean that that for some participants or situations, gender dominates, and for others, party dominates. Put another way, future research might manipulate the salience of categories to investigate situations or contexts in which party or gender might dominate.

Women’s issues and traits still matter for women candidates, regardless of party. This is particularly strong evidence for the diffuse model. No matter which party, female politicians are seen as better able to handle issues in the interest of women. While women are not given a ‘boost’ on empathy – the feminine trait most relevant for political success (Funk, 1999) – they are still seen as possessing more typically feminine traits.

The interaction between gender and party is much more significant for Republicans, largely because of the competing stereotypes for females and Republicans. While few truly emergent

attributes were given by participants to describe the conjunctive categories, Female Republicans are the conjunctive group where the party-gender interaction matters most. The interaction and emergent traits analyses suggest that in many ways stereotypes of female Republicans more closely resemble those of Democrats who are male or female. On the other hand, they are closer to their party than their gender on some traits typically associated with Republicans. Whether this is an advantage or a disadvantage to Republican females is unclear. Prior researchers have argued that Republican females will have difficulty attracting more traditional Republican voters (King & Matland, 2003; Matland & King, 2002; Sanbonmatsu & Dolan, 2009). Indeed, to the extent that Republican females are more aligned with their Democratic colleagues, they will certainly be more attractive to Democratic voters than Republican.

Taken together, the findings in this study reveal that both party and gender stereotypes matter. On some traits and issues, party matters more than gender. On other traits and issues, gender matters more than party. And, finally, the interaction between gender and party is crucial to the evaluations of Republican candidates. These findings suggest that further investigation into the context or situations under which party or gender might matter more or less is an important next step.

**Table 1: Scales**

Scale	Literature	Items	Cronbach's alpha: Sample 1	Cronbach's alpha: Sample 2
Issues				
Male-Stereotypical Issues	(Alexander & Andersen, 1993; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a; Lawless, 2004; Matland, 1994; Rosenwasser & Dean, 1989; Rosenwasser, Rogers, Fling, Silvers-Pickens, & Butemeyer, 1987; Rosenwasser & Seale, 1988; Sapiro, 1981)	A military crisis, corporate crime, foreign policy, leaders in business and industry, peace in the middle east, protection of the US from future attacks, terrorism	.848	.901
Female-Stereotypical Issues	(Alexander & Andersen, 1993; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a; Lawless, 2004; Matland, 1994; Rosenwasser & Dean, 1989; Rosenwasser, et al., 1987; Rosenwasser & Seale, 1988; Sapiro, 1981)	Affirmative action for blacks, health care, integrity in government, problems of the elderly, problems of the homeless, the educational system, the poor, the welfare of children	.898	.931
Issues in the interest of Women	(Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a)	Affirmative action for women , the controversy over abortion, women's rights, the wage gap between men and women	.852	.886
Democratic Issues	(Druckman, Kifer, & Parkin, 2009; Petrocik, 1996; Sides, 2006)	Affirmative action for blacks, Affirmative action for women, civil rights/race relations, gay rights, health care, labor unions, problems of the elderly, problems of the homeless, problems of the middle class, social security, environment, energy crisis, educational system, the poor, keeping the us out of war, wage gap between men and women, welfare of children, women's rights	.943	.963
Republican Issues	(Druckman, et al., 2009; Petrocik, 1996; Sides, 2006)	A military crisis, corporate crime, foreign policy, moral values, protection of the US from future attacks, taxes, terrorism, urban crime	.845	.907

Traits				
Leadership	(Funk, 1999; Kinder, 1986)	Commands Respect, Inspiring, Provides Strong Leadership, Gets things done	.711	.813
Integrity	(Funk, 1999; Kinder, 1986)	Moral, Decent, Honest, Ethical	.865	.895
Competency	(Funk, 1999; Kinder, 1986)	Intelligent, Knowledgeable	.890	.855
Empathy	(Funk, 1999; Kinder, 1986)	Compassionate, Really Cares about people like me, In touch with the people	.787	.846
Masculine Traits	(Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a)	Active, Aggressive, Assertive, Coarse, Masculine, Rational, Self Confident, Stern, Tough	.716	.652
Feminine Traits	(Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a)	Warm, Gentle, Feminine, Sensitive, Emotional, Talkative, Cautious	.818	.732

**Table 2: Main Effects of Politician Party on Trait Evaluations**

	Masculine Traits	Feminine Traits	Leader	Integrity	Competence	Empathy
<b>Sample 1</b>						
Democrat Politician	2.94 (.44)	2.68 (.62)	2.89 (.65)	2.78 (.77)	3.46 (.62)	2.84 (.81)
Republican Politician	3.08 (.42)	2.35 (.54)	2.89 (.63)	2.64 (.75)	3.13 (.79)	2.38 (.82)
<i>F</i>	2.50 (.117)	<b>9.72 (.002)</b>	.01 (.94)	.98 (.33)	<b>6.29 (.014)</b>	<b>8.30 (.01)</b>
<b>Sample 2</b>						
Democrat Politician	2.99 (.43)	2.62 (.53)	2.92 (.64)	2.81 (.67)	3.35 (.62)	2.85 (.77)
Republican Politician	2.99 (.39)	2.43 (.55)	2.80 (.66)	2.65 (.76)	3.07 (.73)	2.29 (.86)
<i>F</i>	.00 (.99)	<b>3.53 (.06)</b>	1.17 (.28)	1.44 (.23)	<b>5.53 (.02)</b>	<b>14.10 (.00)</b>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of possessing the traits. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 3: Main Effects of Politician Party on Issue Competency Evaluations**

	Women's Issues	Female-Typical Issues	Male-Typical Issues	Republican Issues	Democrat Issues
<b>Sample 1</b>					
Democrat Politician	3.35 (.65)	3.20 (.62)	2.40 (.70)	2.50 (.70)	3.24 (.52)
Republican Politician	2.69 (.84)	2.69 (.71)	2.67 (.75)	2.73 (.68)	2.60 (.68)
<i>F</i>	<b>28.91 (.00)</b>	<b>17.53 (.00)</b>	<b>4.67 (.03)</b>	<b>3.64 (.06)</b>	<b>36.89 (.00)</b>
<b>Sample 2</b>					
Democrat Politician	3.13 (.64)	2.99 (.67)	2.63 (.78)	2.62 (.78)	2.98 (.59)
Republican Politician	2.47 (.94)	2.41 (.85)	2.64 (.68)	2.61 (.68)	2.37 (.81)
<i>F</i>	<b>27.60 (.00)</b>	<b>20.96 (.00)</b>	.01 (.94)	.01 (.92)	<b>27.96 (.00)</b>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of capability of handling those issues. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 4: Main and Interactive Effects of Politician Gender and Party on Ideology Ratings**

	<b>Sample 1</b>	<b>Sample 2</b>
Male Politician	3.98 (2.03)	4.31 (2.03)
Female Politician	3.89 (1.91)	3.97 (1.88)
<i>F</i>	<i>.016 (.90)</i>	<b>2.85 (.09)</b>
Democrat Politician	2.19 (.86)	2.56 (1.19)
Republican Politician	5.62 (1.02)	5.70 (1.16)
<i>F</i>	<b>351.75 (.00)</b>	<b>230.32 (.00)</b>
Male Republican	5.72 (1.13)	5.83 (1.25)
Male Democrat	2.11 (.58)	2.74 (1.36)
Female Republican	5.52 (.90)	5.53 (1.04)
Female Democrat	2.27 (1.08)	2.34 (.94)
<i>F</i>	<i>.98 (.32)</i>	<i>.06 (.81)</i>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 7-point scale which ranged from 1=extremely liberal to 7=extremely conservative. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 5: Main Effects of Politician Gender on Trait Evaluations**

	Masculine Traits	Feminine Traits	Leader	Integrity	Competence	Empathy
<b>Sample 1</b>						
Male Politician	3.03 (.41)	2.35 (.60)	2.90 (.64)	2.63 (.84)	3.36 (.64)	2.51 (.98)
Female Politician	2.99 (.46)	2.69 (.55)	2.88 (.64)	2.80 (.65)	3.22 (.81)	2.71 (.66)
<i>F</i>	.184 (.67)	<b>9.72 (.002)</b>	.02 (.89)	1.46 (.23)	1.03 (.31)	1.45 (.23)
<b>Sample 2</b>						
Male Politician	3.01 (.44)	2.35 (.51)	2.79 (.62)	2.61 (.74)	3.16 (.70)	2.45 (.89)
Female Politician	2.97 (.37)	2.74 (.52)	2.94 (.68)	2.88 (.68)	3.26 (.68)	2.72 (.80)
<i>F</i>	.31 (.58)	<b>19.71 (.00)</b>	1.72 (.19)	<b>4.93 (.03)</b>	.70 (.41)	<b>3.66 (.06)</b>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of possessing the traits. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*



**Table 6: Main Effects of Politician Gender on Issue Competency Evaluations**

	Women's Issues	Female-Typical Issues	Male-Typical Issues	Republican Issues	Democrat Issues
<b>Sample 1</b>					
Male Politician	2.68 (.87)	2.78 (.82)	2.68 (.77)	2.70 (.75)	2.76 (.80)
Female Politician	3.37 (.60)	3.13 (.55)	2.40 (.67)	2.52 (.63)	3.11 (.50)
<i>F</i>	<b>31.22 (.00)</b>	<b>8.99 (.003)</b>	<b>5.01 (.03)</b>	2.43 (.12)	<b>12.83 (.001)</b>
<b>Sample 2</b>					
Male Politician	2.43 (.78)	2.41 (.76)	2.59 (.70)	2.52 (.71)	2.41 (.75)
Female Politician	3.24 (.76)	3.04 (.75)	2.69 (.76)	2.73 (.75)	2.99 (.68)
<i>F</i>	<b>44.94 (.00)</b>	<b>25.81 (.00)</b>	.66 (.418)	2.73 (.10)	<b>26.16 (.00)</b>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of capability of handling those issues. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 7: Interactive Effects of Party and Gender on Trait Evaluations**

	Sample 1					Sample 2				
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>F</i>
	MR	MD	FR	FD		MR	MD	FR	FD	
Masculine Traits	<b>3.17<sub>b</sub></b> (.36)	<b>2.88<sub>a</sub></b> (.42)	2.97 (.47)	3.01 (.45)	2.37 (.07)	3.00 (.42)	3.01 (.47)	2.97 (.37)	2.97 (.38)	.003 (.95)
Feminine Traits	2.15 (.47)	2.56 (.66)	2.58 (.52)	2.80 (.56)	<b>6.72</b> <b>(.00)</b>	<b>2.18<sub>BCD</sub></b> (.45)	<b>2.52<sub>A</sub></b> (.52)	<b>2.74<sub>A</sub></b> (.51)	<b>2.74<sub>A</sub></b> (.53)	<b>3.53</b> <b>(.06)</b>
Leader	2.98 (.56)	2.81 (.73)	2.78 (.70)	2.97 (.57)	.66 (.58)	2.74 (.59)	2.84 (.66)	2.87 (.74)	3.02 (.62)	.05 (.82)
Integrity	2.59 (.81)	2.67 (.89)	2.70 (.69)	2.91 (.61)	.873 (.46)	2.48 (.71)	2.73 (.75)	2.86 (.79)	2.91 (.55)	.68 (.41)
Competence	3.28 (.71)	2.81 (.73)	2.78 (.70)	2.97 (.57)	.66 (.58)	3.03 (.76)	3.30 (.62)	3.12 (.72)	3.41 (.63)	.011 (.92)
Empathy	2.23 (.92)	2.81 (.97)	2.55 (.67)	2.87 (.62)	<b>3.6</b> <b>(.02)</b>	<b>2.04<sub>ABC</sub></b> (.73)	<b>2.86<sub>A</sub></b> (.85)	<b>2.60<sub>A</sub></b> (.92)	<b>2.83<sub>A</sub></b> (.67)	<b>14.10</b> <b>(.00)</b>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of possessing the traits. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . The subscripts indicate where conjunctive groups differ significantly in a Bonferroni post-hoc test; a capital letter indicates that the mean comparisons indicate a significant difference between the two columns at a  $p < .01$  level, whereas a lower case letter indicates significance at  $p < .05$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 8: Interactive Effects of Party and Gender on Issue Competencies**

	Sample 1					Sample 2				
	A MR	B MD	C FR	D FD	F	A MR	B MD	C FR	D FD	F
Women's Issues	2.21 (.83)	3.06 (.72)	3.08 (.64)	3.64 (.40)	1.16 (.28)	<b>1.97<sub>ABC</sub></b> (.71)	<b>2.90<sub>A</sub></b> (.52)	<b>3.08<sub>A</sub></b> (.82)	<b>3.41<sub>A</sub></b> (.67)	<b>6.22*</b> <b>(.01)</b>
Female Issues	2.41 (.75)	3.07 (.75)	2.92 (.61)	3.33 (.41)	.935 (.34)	2.05 (.67)	2.79 (.67)	2.85 (.85)	3.23 (.58)	2.05 (.15)
Male Issues	<b>2.99<sub>bcd</sub></b> (.66)	<b>2.43<sub>a</sub></b> (.78)	<b>2.42<sub>a</sub></b> (.73)	<b>2.36<sub>a</sub></b> (.61)	<b>3.11+</b> <b>.081</b>	2.61 (.68)	2.56 (.74)	2.67 (.71)	2.71 (.83)	.118 (.73)
Republican Issues	2.98 (.61)	2.49 (.79)	2.53 (.67)	2.51 (.60)	<b>3.02+</b> <b>.09</b>	2.52 (.68)	2.51 (.74)	2.72 (.68)	2.75 (.83)	.023 (.88)
Democrat Issues	<b>2.25<sub>BCd</sub></b> (.68)	<b>3.15<sub>A</sub></b> (.65)	<b>2.87<sub>Ad</sub></b> (.54)	<b>3.34<sub>ac</sub></b> (.31)	<b>3.67</b> <b>.06</b>	<b>2.01<sub>BCD</sub></b> (.08)	<b>2.81<sub>AD</sub></b> (.59)	<b>2.79<sub>Ad</sub></b> (.77)	<b>3.19<sub>ABc</sub></b> (.51)	<b>3.04</b> <b>.08</b>

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of capability of handling those issues. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . The subscripts indicate where conjunctive groups differ significantly in a Bonferroni post-hoc test; a capital letter indicates that the mean comparisons indicate a significant difference between the two columns at a  $p < .01$  level, whereas a lower case letter indicates significance at  $p < .05$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 9: Significant Interactive Effects of Party and Gender for Specific Issues**

	Sample 1					Sample 2				
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>F</i>
	MR	MD	FR	FD		MR	MD	FR	FD	
AA for Blacks	2.10 <sub>BCD</sub> (.89)	3.42 (.86)	2.80 <sub>ab</sub> (.65)	3.15 <sub>A</sub> (.74)	12.35**	1.92 <sub>BCD</sub> (.81)	3.21 <sub>Ac</sub> (.79)	2.63 <sub>abd</sub> (.93)	3.32 <sub>Ac</sub> (.61)	22.95
Civil Rights	2.24 <sub>BCD</sub> (.83)	3.56 <sub>Ac</sub> (.70)	3.35 <sub>abd</sub> (.65)	2.81 <sub>Abc</sub> (.56)	16.9**	2.03 <sub>BCD</sub> (.94)	3.17 <sub>A</sub> (.78)	2.77 <sub>ad</sub> (.93)	3.36 <sub>Ac</sub> (.56)	17.02
Gay Rights	1.67 <sub>BCD</sub> (.20)	3.52 <sub>Ac</sub> (.12)	2.60 <sub>AbD</sub> (.22)	3.69 <sub>Ac</sub> (.11)	29.59**					
Keep Out War	2.05 <sub>b</sub> (.86)	2.93 <sub>a</sub> (.87)	2.69 (.97)	2.69 (1.12)	3.45*					
Labor Unions	2.00 <sub>Bcd</sub> (.95)	3.00 <sub>A</sub> (.88)	2.46 <sub>a</sub> (.58)	2.81 <sub>a</sub> (.63)	7.65**					
Environment	2.00 <sub>BCd</sub> (1.00)	3.41 <sub>A</sub> (.75)	3.38 <sub>A</sub> (.77)	2.88 <sub>a</sub> (.57)	16.54**					
Terrorism	3.29 <sub>bcd</sub> (.85)	2.44 <sub>a</sub> (1.09)	2.19 <sub>a</sub> (1.06)	2.19 <sub>a</sub> (.85)	6.31*					
Military	3.42 <sub>bCD</sub> (.75)	2.37 <sub>a</sub> (1.01)	2.27 <sub>A</sub> (1.04)	2.04 <sub>A</sub> (.93)	9.34**					
AA for Women						2.06 <sub>BCD</sub> (.86)	3.26 <sub>A</sub> (.67)	3.27 <sub>A</sub> (.78)	3.57 <sub>A</sub> (.57)	28.13**
Wage Gap						1.78 <sub>BCD</sub> (.76)	2.74 <sub>Ad</sub> (.74)	3.03 <sub>A</sub> (.93)	3.29 <sub>Ab</sub> (.72)	23.13**
Children's Welfare						2.06 <sub>bCD</sub> (.92)	2.83 <sub>ad</sub> (.89)	3.17 <sub>A</sub> (.95)	3.43 <sub>Ab</sub> (.63)	15.54**
Women's Rights						1.97 <sub>BCD</sub> (.81)	3.03 <sub>Ad</sub> (.75)	3.13 <sub>Ad</sub> (.93)	3.71 <sub>Abc</sub> (.53)	28.71**

*Note: Cell Entries are means for each sample and politician group on a 4-point scale where higher numbers mean greater likelihood of capability of handling those issues. Standard deviations are in parentheses. The F-statistic tests whether or not means are equal; we report the F-test with 1 DF with p-value in parentheses. Bold entries are significant at  $p < .10$ . The subscripts indicate where conjunctive groups differ significantly in a Bonferroni post-hoc test; a capital letter indicates that the mean comparisons indicate a significant difference between the two columns at a  $p < .01$  level, whereas a lower case letter indicates significance at  $p < .05$ . Cell Ns range from 47 to 66.*

**Table 10: Emergent Attributes - Female Democrats**

	<i>Female</i>	<i>Democrat</i>	<i>Female Democrat</i>	<i>Chi-Square Statistic (2 DF)</i>
<b>Sample 1 - Traits</b>				
Charming	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5.265+
Open	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5.265+
Unattractive	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5.265+
Irrational	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5.265+
Representative	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5.265+
<i>Ambitious</i>	4 (27%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10.961**
Level	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4.803+
Caring	5 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13.986**
Young	0 (0%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	5.789+
<i>Liberal</i>	2 (13%)	5 (45%)	13 (48%)	5.326+
<b>Sample 2 - Traits</b>				
<i>Liberal</i>	1 (7.1%)	12 (66.7%)	12 (41.4%)	11.539*
<i>Ambitious</i>	5 (35.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.9%)	11.029*
Well Educated	10 (71.4%)	1 (5.6%)	14 (48.3%)	15.343**
Aggressive	6 (42.9%)	1 (5.6%)	6 (20.7%)	6.547*
Working Class	0 (0%)	7 (38.9%)	1 (3.4%)	14.985*
Confident	4 (28.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (10.3%)	6.398*
Minority	0 (0%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (3.42%)	6.825*
For the People	0 (0%)	4 (22.2%)	0 (0%)	10.226*
Strong	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (13.8%)	4.724+
<b>Sample 1 - Issues</b>				
Abortion	9 (60%)	1 (9.1%)	14 (51.9%)	7.597*
Education	7 (46.7%)	1 (9.1%)	7 (25.9%)	4.569+
<b>Sample 2 - Issues</b>				
Welfare/Social Programs	1 (7.2%)	9 (50%)	7 (24.1%)	7.578*
Taxes	2 (14.3%)	10 (55.6%)	3 (10.3%)	13.283**
Size of Government	0 (0%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (3.4%)	6.825*
Civil Rights	1 (7.1%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (3.4%)	4.563+
Labor Relations	1 (7.1%)	3 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	5.045+

*Note: Cells contain the number of respondents free-listing each attribute or issue competency area for each base or conjunctive group. The percentage of respondents free-listing each trait or issue area is in parentheses. Shaded attributes or issues are those considered emergent by our definition where the trait or issue is mentioned by one or fewer respondents for a base group and three or more respondents for the conjunctive group. Italicized traits are significant in both samples.*

**Table 11: Emergent Attributes for Female Republicans**

	<i>Female</i>	<i>Republican</i>	<i>Female Republican</i>	<i>Chi-Square Statistic (2 DF)</i>
<b>Sample 1 - Traits</b>				
<i>Wealthy</i>	2 (13.3%)	10 (76.92%)	15 (57.69%)	12.45*
Generous	3 (20%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0%)	5.55+
Reason/Rational	3 (20%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0%)	5.55+
<i>Christian</i>	0 (0%)	5 (38.46%)	5 (19.23%)	6.84*
Traditional	0 (0%)	4 (30.77%)	2 (7.69%)	7.27*
<i>Caring</i>	5 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14.33*
<i>Ambitious</i>	4 (26.67%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0%)	8.10*
Calm/Peaceful	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.85%)	4.99+
Southern	0 (0%)	4 (30.77%)	0 (0%)	13.63*
Business-Oriented	1 (6.67%)	3 (23.08%)	0 (0%)	6.75+
Favor Status Quo	0 (0%)	4 (30.77%)	1 (3.85%)	9.60*
Family-Oriented	1 (6.67%)	0 (0%)	8 (30.77%)	7.40*
Relentless	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (15.38%)	4.65+
<b>Sample 2 - Traits</b>				
Conservative	0 (0%)	15 (93.8%)	20 (66.7%)	28.714**
<i>Wealthy</i>	1 (7%)	8 (50%)	8 (26.7%)	6.836*
White	0 (0%)	4 (25%)	3 (10.7%)	4.70+
<i>Ambitious</i>	5 (35.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (16.7%)	6.857*
Confident	4 (28.6%)	0 (0%)	5 (16.7%)	4.911+
<i>Caring</i>	5 (35.7%)	0 (0%)	3 (10.0%)	8.819*
<i>Christian</i>	0 (0%)	5 (31.3%)	10 (3.3%)	11.07*
Insensitive	0 (0%)	3 (18.8%)	2 (3.3%)	5.29+
Well-Educated	10 (71.4%)	6 (37.5%)	9 (30%)	6.896*
Aggressive	6 (42.9%)	5 (31.3%)	3 (10%)	6.525*
<b>Sample 1 - Issues</b>				
Taxes	1 (6.7%)	7 (53.8%)	4 (15.4%)	10.325*
<b>Sample 2</b>				
Unemployment	1 (7.1%)	5 (31.3%)	1 (3.3%)	8.254*
War	1 (7.1%)	4 (25%)	1 (3.3%)	5.608+
Terrorism	2 (14.3%)	3 (18.8%)	0 (0%)	5.649+
Children	3 (31.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	6.582*
Family Values	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (20%)	6.677*

*Note: Cells contain the number of respondents free-listing each attribute or issue competency area for each base or conjunctive group. The percentage of respondents free-listing each trait or issue area is in parentheses. Shaded attributes or issues are those considered emergent by our definition where the trait or issue is mentioned by one or fewer respondents for a base group and three or more respondents for the conjunctive group. Italicized traits are significant in both samples.*

## Appendix

**Table 12: Emergent Attributes for Male Republicans**

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Republican</i>	<i>Male Republican</i>	<i>Chi-Square Statistic (2 DF)</i>
<b>Sample 1</b>				
Well-Educated	10 (66.7%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (13.3%)	14.043*
<i>Conservative</i>	3 (20%)	6 (63.3%)	19 (63.3%)	7.55*
<i>Christian</i>	1 (6.7%)	5 (43.3%)	13 (43.3%)	6.351*
<i>Deceitful</i>	6 (40%)	4 (10%)	3 (10%)	5.848*
Aggressive	0 (0%)	3 (23.1%)	8 (26.7%)	4.811+
White	5 (33.3)	4 (30.8)	0 (0%)	12.67*
Rational	5 (33.3%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (6.7%)	6.505*
Traditional	0 (0%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)	5.556+
Southern	0 (0%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)	5.556+
Status Quo- Oriented	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	3 (10%)	6.464*
<b>Sample 2</b>				
<i>Conservative</i>	1 (6.7%)	15 (93.8%)	22 (61.1%)	24.528**
<i>Christian</i>	0 (0%)	5 (31.3%)	10 (27.8%)	5.652+
Ethical	2 (13.3%)	5 (31.3%)	2 (5.6%)	6.289*
Selfish	4 (26.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (8.3%)	6.256*
<i>Deceitful</i>	5 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.8%)	14.192*
Confident	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)	4.894+
Arrogant	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)	4.894+
<b>Sample 1</b>				
Natural Disasters	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9.069*
Gun Rights	0 (0%)	3 (23.1%)	9 (30%)	5.543+
Poverty	2 (13.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5.283*
Business and Corporations	0 (0%)	1 (7.7%)	7 (23.3%)	5.103+
<b>Sample 2</b>				
Social Security	3 (20%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (2.8%)	4.592+
Military	0 (0%)	2 (12.5%)	10 (27.8%)	5.975*
Gay Marriage	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.8%)	5.929*

*Note: Cells contain the number of respondents free-listing each attribute or issue competency area for each base or conjunctive group. The percentage of respondents free-listing each trait or issue area is in parentheses. Shaded attributes or issues are those considered emergent by our definition where the trait or issue is mentioned by one or fewer respondents for a base group and three or more respondents for the conjunctive group. Italicized traits are significant in both samples.*

**Table 13: Emergent Attributes - Male Democrats**

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Democrat</i>	<i>Male Democrat</i>	<i>Chi-Square Statistic (2 DF)</i>
<b>Sample 1 - Traits</b>				
Rational	5 (33%)	0 (0%)	4 (14.3%)	5.314+
<i>Liberal</i>	1 (6.7%)	5 (45.5%)	10 (35.7%)	5.612+
Reformer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (25%)	7.468*
Family-Oriented	4 (26.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11.232*
<b>Sample 2 - Traits</b>				
Well-Educated	7 (46.7%)	1 (5.6%)	14 (38.9%)	8.068*
<i>Liberal</i>	1 (6.7%)	12 (66.7%)	16 (44.4%)	12.269*
Aggressive	5 (33.3%)	1 (5.6%)	4 (11.1%)	5.789+
Working Class	0 (0%)	7 (38.9%)	3 (8.3%)	12.289*
Charming	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)	5.189+
Arrogant	3 (20%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (2.8%)	4.776+
Knowledgeable	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (13.9%)	4.941+
Selfish	4 (26.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	15.286**
Greedy	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.8%)	7.429*
<b>Sample 1 - Issues</b>				
<i>Welfare/Social Programs</i>	1 (6.7%)	6 (54.5%)	9 (32.1%)	7.153*
Healthcare	4 (26.7%)	6 (54.5%)	17 (60.7%)	4.548+
Balanced Budget	4 (26.7%)	1 (9.5%)	1 (3.6%)	5.332+
Environment	0 (0%)	3 (27.3%)	12 (42.9%)	8.944+
Military	5 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14.327*
Civil Rights	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (21.4%)	6.263*
<b>Sample 2 - Issues</b>				
<i>Welfare/Social Programs</i>	1 (6.7%)	9 (50%)	6 (16.7%)	10.423*
Economy	7 (46.7%)	2 (11.1%)	1 (2.8%)	16.683**
Taxes	4 (26.7%)	10 (55.6%)	10 (27.8%)	4.638+
Size of Government	0 (0%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (2.8%)	8.248*
Government Spending	0 (0%)	3 (16.7%)	1 (2.8%)	5.418+
Labor Relations	2 (13.3%)	3 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	6.016*

*Note: Cells contain the number of respondents free-listing each attribute or issue competency area for each base or conjunctive group. The percentage of respondents free-listing each trait or issue area is in parentheses. Shaded attributes or issues are those considered emergent by our definition where the trait or issue is mentioned by one or fewer respondents for a base group and three or more respondents for the conjunctive group. Italicized traits are significant in both samples.*



## References

- Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 1-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Correll, S. J., & Ridgeway, C. L. (2003). Expectation states theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher.
- Darcy, R., & Schramm, S. S. (1977). When women run against men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *41*(1), 1-12.
- Dolan, K. A. (2004). The impact of candidate sex on evaluations of candidates for the US house of representatives. *Social Science Quarterly*, *85*(1), 206-217.
- Ekstrand, L. E., & Eckert, W. A. (1981). The impact of candidate's sex on voter choice. *The Western Political Quarterly*, *34*(1, Special Issue on Women and Politics), 78-87.
- Fiske, S. T., Lin, M., & Neuberg, S. L. (1999). The continuum model: Ten years later. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Funk, C. L. (1999). Bringing the candidate into models of candidate evaluation. *Journal of Politics*, *61*(3), 700-720.
- Garcia-Marques, L., Santos, A. S. C., & Mackie, D. M. (2006). Stereotypes - static abstractions or dynamic knowledge structures? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(5), 814-831.
- Hastie, R., Schroeder, C., & Weber, R. (1990). Creating complex social conjunction categories from simple categories. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *28*(3), 242-247.
- Hayes, D. (2005). Candidate qualities through a partisan lens: A theory of trait ownership. *American Journal of Political Science*, *49*(4), 908-923.
- Huddy, L., & Capelos, T. (2002). Gender stereotyping and candidate evaluation. In V. C. Ottati, E. J. Posavac, J. Edwards, F. B. Bryant, R. S. Tindale, D. C. O'Connell, L. Heath & Y. Suarez-Balcazar (Eds.), *The social psychology of politics* (pp. 29-53). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993a). Gender stereotypes and the perception of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, *37*(1), 119-147.
- Hutter, R. R. C., & Crisp, R. J. (2005). The composition of category conjunctions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(5), 647-657.
- Kahn, K. F. (1996). *The political consequences of being a woman: How stereotypes influence the conduct and consequences of political campaigns*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *28*(3), 280-290.
- King, D. C., & Matland, R. E. (2003). Sex and the grand old party: An experimental investigation of the effect of candidate sex on support for a republican candidate. *American Politics Research*, *31*(6), 595-612.
- Koch, J. W. (2000). Do citizens apply gender stereotypes to infer candidates' ideological orientations? *Journal of Politics*, *62*(2), 414-429.
- Kunda, Z., Miller, D. T., & Claire, T. (1990). Combining social concepts: The role of causal reasoning. *Cognitive Science*, *14*, 551-577.
- Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming impressions from stereotypes, traits, and behaviors: A parallel-constraint-satisfaction theory. *Psychological Review*, *103*(2), 284-308.
- Lau, R. R., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2006). *How voters decide: Information processing during election campaigns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 93-120.

- Matland, R. E., & King, D. C. (2002). Women as candidates in congressional elections. In C. S. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Women transforming congress* (pp. 119-145). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Petrocik, J. R. (1996). Issue ownership in presidential elections, with a 1980 case study. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(3), 825-850.
- Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The concept of representation* (1972 ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rahn, W. M. (1993). The role of partisan stereotypes in information processing about political candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(2), 472-496.
- Sanbonmatsu, K., & Dolan, K. (2009). Do gender stereotypes transcend party? *Political Research Quarterly*, 62(3), 485-494.
- Schneider, M. C., & Bos, A. L. (Forthcoming). An exploration of the content of stereotypes of black politicians. *Political Psychology*.
- Sides, J. (2006). The origins of campaign agendas. *British Journal of Political Science*, 36(3), 407-436.