SEX AND THE GRAND OLD PARTY
An Experimental Investigation of the Effect of
Candidate Sex on Support for a Republican Candidate

DAVID C. KING
Harvard University
RICHARD E. MATLAND
University of Houston

We report the results of an experiment involving 820 randomly sampled adults. Half heard about a female Republican candidate for Congress. The other half learned of an otherwise identical male candidate. Democrat and Independent voters were more likely to trust, think qualified, view as a leader, and vote for the female Republican (contrasted with the male Republican). On the other hand, being female led to associations that hurt Republican women within their own party. We augment our experimental results by providing evidence that Republican women have done significantly worse than Democratic women in winning nominations in open-seat congressional districts.

Voters use a number of heuristic devices when evaluating candidates. One such device is an appearance heuristic that enables a voter to form a judgment about a candidate based on visual characteristics such as race or sex (Lau & Redlawsk, 2001). We have previously reviewed the extensive experimental literature testing for possible effects of one such appearance heuristic, the effect of candidate sex on candidate evaluations (Matland & King, 2002). In that review, we point out that this research suffers from significant design flaws. Previous experimental studies have tended to test for the effect of candi-

date sex in isolation, ignoring the possibility that this heuristic may be overwhelmed by other heuristics. In particular, experimental tests for the effect of candidate sex, overwhelmingly, have been done in isolation from perhaps the most crucial voting heuristic, candidate party.

This study represents a partial remedy to this problem by using an experimental design built into a national survey of a random sample of 820 U.S. adults. We consider whether a candidate's sex affects voter evaluations when a party signal is also given. This study provides only a partial remedy, as we are able to look at the effect of sex only on the evaluation of a Republican candidate, but we believe this is an important first step in providing a richer analysis of how party and candidate sex interact in the minds of voters. Furthermore, the effect of a candidate being female is especially interesting to study among Republicans because of the limited gains Republican women have made in comparison to Democratic women (Cooperman & Oppenheimer, 2001).[1]

VOTING DECISIONS

The literature on voting behavior has evolved during the past several decades to the point where we now readily admit that most voters have only limited information on which to make voting decisions (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996). Voters are cognitive misers who, when faced with the need to evaluate a candidate, are very unlikely to invest significant resources in gathering comprehensive information (Lau & Sears, 1986). Whereas the initial reactions to these findings were of considerable concern, more recently, political scientists have moved to argue that voters can do a reasonably good job of voting "correctly" even when they have only very limited information (Lau & Redlawsk, 1997).

Whereas there is disagreement as to what form the process of candidate evaluation may take—that is, online processing (Lodge, McGraw, & Stroh, 1989; Lodge, Steenbergen, & Brau, 1995) or the summation of considerations (Zaller, 1992)—there is fairly widespread agreement that crucial to actually making a decision is the use of a series of cognitive heuristics that allow a voter to make a meaningful choice even with fairly limited information (Popkin, 1995;

Sniderman, Brody, & Tetlock, 1991). Lau and Redlawsk (2001) describe five basic heuristics that voters can use to form an evaluation of a political candidate. They are a party-affiliation heuristic, an ideology heuristic, an endorsement heuristic, a viability heuristic, and an appearance heuristic.

In addition to using heuristic mechanisms to help make decisions more easily, individuals also lean heavily on schemata to assist in decision making. A schema allows a person to take one basic piece of information and impute a much broader set of characteristics to a stimuli. Schemata are road maps in our memories, based on socialization and prior experiences. They help us process new information quickly by providing hypothesized connections between traits, behaviors, and beliefs (Fiske & Kinder, 1981; Markus & Zajonc, 1985; Schank & Abelson, 1977). These hypothesized connections are effectively theories as to how pieces of information fit together. These theories may not be entirely correct for each case, but schemata provide a useful shorthand to help interpret actions and to allow individuals to come to a decision as to their affective perceptions of a stimuli, in this case, a voter evaluating a candidate (Lau, 1986; McGraw, 2000).

Previous research on party schemata found that given a candidate's party, voters could infer a candidate's position on issues, predict the candidate's placement on an ideological scale, and estimate their own willingness to support a candidate (Conover, 1981; Conover & Feldman, 1989; Feldman & Conover, 1983; Rahn, 1993). Rahn (1993) has run experiments showing that party schemata are so powerful that they can overwhelm issue information cues that are inconsistent with the party schema.

Whereas political psychologists and voting-behavior scholars have worked on describing how voting decisions are made, women and politics scholars have shown considerable interest in the question of whether being a woman helps or hurts a candidate. This question has been studied by looking at election outcomes, by evaluating survey results, and through a large number of experiments.

The nonexperimental literature, largely drawing on surveys from the American National Election Studies, has found that voters, at times, evaluate female candidates differently than male candidates (Alexander & Andersen, 1993; Cook, 1994; Cook & Wilcox, 1995;

Koch, 1999, 2000, 2002; McDermott, 1997). There is some indication that being female leads voters to assume a candidate is more liberal, has a greater policy expertise in a set of issue areas where compassion plays a prominent role, and has a greater store of feminine personality traits.

These studies are based on data that cover the whole country. The individual electoral contexts, however, can be quite distinct from one district to the next and from election to election. Under these conditions, the impact of a candidate's sex may rise or fall based on how "gendered" the salient issues are in the election (Dolan, 2001; Herrnson, Lay, & Stokes, 2003). With such great diversity and so many "moving parts" it can be difficult to identify exactly when female candidates are advantaged or disadvantaged and how.

Being able to track the precise manner in which changes in a variable can affect a decision process is one of the greatest strengths of experiments. Previous experiments, almost universally, find no direct effect of candidate sex on voting behavior (Matland & King, 2002). Several experiments, however, do find candidate sex affects estimations of a candidate's issue competency, personal traits, and beliefs (Banducci, Everitt, & Gidengil, 2002; Matland & King, 2002). In reviewing 15 separate published experimental studies on the effect of candidate sex on voter evaluations, we found two serious flaws repeatedly in the existing studies (Matland & King, 2002). First, experiments were done overwhelmingly on college undergraduates. There are serious concerns whether college undergraduates are a good sample to use when considering these sorts of issues (Sears, 1986). The other, and more principled, concern has to do with the poverty of the informational environment provided for respondents who were participating in experiments. Especially problematic is that, in the descriptions of the candidates to be evaluated, only 1 of the 15 published experiments included party labels.

Since the late 1950s, the voting behavior literature has consistently pointed to the central role party identification plays in evaluation of candidates (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960). As already noted, we also know that voters use party schemata to make many inferences concerning candidates. Yet this most basic of voting behavior truisms has not migrated to the experimental literature testing for the effects of candidate sex on women's representation. Party

labels are likely to be especially relevant when considering low information races, including elections to the U.S. House of Representatives (Abramowitz, 1980; Hinckley, 1980; McDermott, 1997).

In an ambitious summary of the existing literature on candidate sex effects, Banducci, Everitt, and Gidengil (2002) find that as the amount of information provided about hypothetical candidates increases, the number of sex effects decreases. Because only one of these previously published experiments included candidate-party labels, while also varying candidate's sex, it is possible that the existing experimental findings are built on a foundation of sand that would be washed away if the respondent's senses were hit by the tidal wave that is party identification.

In previous experiments, when respondents could not use a party heuristic to evaluate a candidate, we believe that they used a gender schemata to estimate candidate characteristics and positions. There are at least two reasons to believe this. First, Rapoport, Metcalf, and Hartman (1989) ran experiments and found that although few respondents in their control group were willing to make inferences of policy positions for candidates when the respondents had no information (15%), a substantially higher number (59%) inferred a candidate's policy positions based solely on personality traits. Therefore, we know respondents make political estimations using nonpolitical information. Second, the experimental evidence showing women have a superior expertise (compared with hypothetical male candidates) in specific policy areas occurs only in experiments when those specific policy areas are not part of the stimuli. For example, female candidates score higher on dealing with an issue such as health care, but only when health care is not discussed in the speech, candidate description, or stimuli presented to respondents. If health care is discussed, then the gender advantage disappears.[2] It seems clear that the respondents are using their gender schemata to estimate information about the candidate, but when individuated information that is more relevant is available, they do not use their gender schemata.

We wish to assess whether gender schemata still are politically relevant when a very powerful political signal (partisanship) is provided. We predict respondents will use their gender schemata to make estimations of candidate traits (empathy, trustworthy, leadership, qualified) that are consistent with existing gender schema theory (Bem,

1981). Gender schema theory finds that traits such as empathy and caring are prototypical female traits, whereas traits such as leadership, being articulate, and decisiveness are perceived as typically male traits. We believe a party heuristic will not provide strong signals in terms of these characteristics of an individual candidate and therefore we believe the gender schemata will have an effect. We expect, however, that the party heuristic will have a very strong effect on willingness to support the candidate, so that candidate sex will be deemed irrelevant to the willingness to support a candidate.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

This experiment presents results from a national survey sponsored by the Republican Network to Elect Women (RENEW).[3] A random sample of 820 adults from throughout the United States were polled December 6 to 8, 1993. Public Opinion Research, a leading polling firm, conducted the survey and designed it to conform to an experimental methodology. Each respondent was read the same candidate description; half of the sample was told the candidate was male, whereas the other half was told the candidate was female. Each respondent heard the following:

> I am going to read you a brief description of a potential candidate for Congress in this area. After I read this, I will ask you to evaluate [him/her]. The candidate is a Republican [man/woman] who has never run for office before, but has been active in the community. [She/He] is a businessperson who is running because [he/she] says that Congress "just doesn't get it" and wants to bring a commonsense business approach to government. [His/Her] first priority is to work to reduce government spending and waste.

After the candidate was described, respondents evaluated the candidate on a number of traits and on the likelihood they would vote for the candidate. Ideally, we would also have results where we compare male and female Democrats, but this experiment was designed to evaluate only Republican candidates. Nevertheless, with information on candidate sex and party labels, this experiment goes beyond previous experiments. It allows us to present preliminary evidence of what the

TABLE 1
Percent Evaluating Female Candidate More Favorably

	All	Republican	Independent	Democrat
Candidate . . .				
Can be trusted	8.61%***	3.15%	7.82%	19.14%***
Shares my concerns	6.38%**	1.60%	11.87%*	9.89%*
Is a strong leader	1.26%	−7.24%*	8.44%	5.41%
Is qualified	0.02%	−5.73%	1.28%	4.79%
Respondent very likely or somewhat likely to vote for the candidate	5.42%*	−0.11%	10.53%*	9.63%*
n	781	319	184	278

SOURCE: Public Opinion Research, for RENEW, December 1993.
*$p < .10$. **$p < .05$. ***$p < .01$.

consequences of candidate sex might be when it interacts with the Repub-lican Party label.

DATA AND DISCUSSION

As expected, a respondent's party identification has a dramatic effect on the likelihood of voting for the candidate, whether the candidate they heard about was male or female. Among Republican identifiers, 47.1% said that they were very likely to vote for the candidate, whereas only 9.2% saw it as not very likely or not likely at all. On the other hand, only 19.6% of the Democrats said they were very likely to support the candidate, whereas 36.1% saw it as not very likely or not likely at all. Independents held opinions between the two parties.

We are especially interested in how a respondent's party identification and a candidate's sex interact. Does being a woman hurt a candidate within the Republican Party, or perhaps help her with Independents and Democrats? The answer from our experiment to these dual questions is "yes." Sex matters, and it matters in different ways depending on the voter's party. In the first four rows of Table 1, we report the difference, based on candidate sex, in the percentage of respondents who report that the candidate is "very well" or "somewhat well" described by the indicated characteristics (as opposed to "not very well" or "not very well at all"). A positive percentage differ-

ence indicates that the female candidate is advantaged over an other-
wise identical male candidate.[4]

For the full sample, respondents consider the female Republican
more trustworthy and more likely to share their concerns than a simi-
larly described male Republican. The bottom row of Table 1 shows
that on the crucial aspect of voting, the sample as a whole is more
likely to vote for the female candidate. What is especially noteworthy,
however, is how these effects differ across party groups. In no case are
the positive effects being driven by Republicans. Although Independ-
ents and Democrats see the female Republican as being better
described as "sharing my concern," this is not true among Republican
respondents. The only significant effect appearing among Republican
respondents was in response to a request to evaluate the candidate "as
a strong leader." Republican respondents gave the female candidate
significantly lower marks. Being female appears to increase the likeli-
hood of garnering crossover votes, as the female candidate's advan-
tage in terms of likely support is 10% among Independent and Demo-
cratic voters. There is, however, no advantage in terms of support
among Republican respondents.

Table 1 is relatively easy to interpret, but it masks effects related to
how candidate and respondent characteristics interact. Therefore, we
turn to an ordered logit estimation to test the impact of candidate sex,
gender affinity, and party identification on voting and evaluations of
House candidates.[5] We use ordered logit because the dependent vari-
ables (candidate attributes) have four possible responses: "not very
well at all," "not very well," "somewhat well," and "very well." We
have run the models below testing for interactions between age, race,
income, and candidate sex and there were none. Accordingly, we
model voter preferences as a function of sex (candidate and respon-
dent), gender affinity, and party.

In Table 2, the values on all of the independent variables are either 0
or 1. The excluded category is Republicans, meaning the coefficient
estimate for the candidate's sex reflects how Republicans view the
female relative to the male candidate. The multivariate analysis gives
clarity to the issues raised above. If we first concentrate on candidate
traits, we find no direct candidate sex effects. In other words, on none
of the four descriptors of the candidate do the Republican respondents
exhibit a difference in evaluations between the male and the female

TABLE 2
Ordered Logit: Sex and Party Effects on the Evaluation of House Republican Candidates

Independent Variables	Candidate Shares My Concerns		Candidate Is Qualified		Candidate Can Be Trusted		Candidate Is a Strong Leader		Respondent Is Willing to Vote for Candidate	
	Dependent Variables Modeled									
Sex										
Candidate's sex (1 = female)	–0.05	(0.22)	–0.26	(0.23)	0.18	(0.22)	–0.40	(0.23)	–0.48**	(0.22)
Respondent's sex (1 = female)	0.17	(0.14)	0.07	(0.15)	0.07	(0.15)	0.15	(0.15)	–0.10	(0.14)
Gender affinity effect										
Interaction: respondent and candidate sex	0.01	(0.14)	0.13	(0.15)	–0.18	(.15)	0.02	(0.15)	0.06	(0.14)
Party effects										
Respondent is Democrat	–1.34***	(0.24)	–0.70***	(0.30)	–1.16***	(0.24)	–1.01***	(0.25)	–1.87***	(0.24)
Respondent is Independent	–1.11***	(0.27)	–0.37	(0.27)	–0.68**	(0.29)	–0.69**	(0.28)	–1.03***	(0.28)
Interaction: candidate sex and Democrat										
(1 = female & Democrat)	0.42	(0.33)	0.70**	(0.33)	1.10***	(0.34)	0.74**	(0.34)	0.84***	(0.32)
Interaction: candidate sex and Independent										
(1 = female & Independent)	0.41	(0.36)	0.14	(0.38)	0.32	(0.39)	0.70*	(0.38)	0.77**	(0.37)
Ancillary parameters										
Cutpoint 1	–2.74		–2.69		–2.75		–3.22		–3.19	
Cutpoint 2	–1.97		–1.40		–1.55		–1.92		–2.36	
Cutpoint 3	0.05		0.78		0.86		0.41		–0.22	
n	709		675		658		673		740	
Prob. > χ^2	0.0000		0.1237		0.0000		0.0062		0.0000	

SOURCE: Public Opinion Research, for RENEW, December 1993.
NOTE: Coefficients are ordered logit coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < .10$. **$p < .05$. ***$p < .01$.

candidate. Second, we find no gender affinity effects. To confirm these results, we tested for affinity effects only among female respondents and on multiple subsets of the population, including working women, Black women, wealthy and poor women, and so on. We found no effects.

The ordered logits do show that Republican female candidates are able to make up for some of what they lose, because of their party label, by being female. These effects as measured by the two-party and sex-interaction terms. Controlling for everything else, Democrats report the female Republican candidate is better qualified and more trustworthy than an otherwise identical male Republican candidate. Interestingly, the multivariate analysis fails to show a statistically significant advantage for women on one character trait (empathy) that is stereotypically thought to be to a female candidate's advantage. We do find, however, that both Democrats and Independents see the female Republican as a stronger leader than the male Republican.

Whereas trustworthiness and leadership skills are important, *votes* are paramount. To get a clearer idea of how respondents reacted to the hypothetical candidate, in terms of willingness to vote for the person, we have used the ordered logit coefficients in Table 2 to estimate the probability that specific respondent types would be "very willing" to vote for the candidate who was described to them. These results are shown in Table 3.[6] Two results come through unambiguously in Table 3. First, although votes from Democrats and Independents are limited because of their partisan predispositions against Republicans, the female Republican candidate gets more support from Democrats and Independents than the male Republican candidate. The female Republican gets 4% to 6% more Democrats who state that they are "very likely" to vote for her and a slightly stronger 5% to 8% of Independents who are "very likely" to vote for her. This result holds for both male and female Independents and Democrats. The second result is even stronger. Female candidates have serious problems within their own party. Republican partisans are much less likely to support a female candidate relative to an otherwise identical male candidate. Among male Republicans, there is a dramatic 13.6% drop in strong support if the candidate is female. Although the effect is slightly smaller among female Republicans, it is still quite powerful, as there

TABLE 3
Percent of Subpopulation That Is "Very Likely"
to Vote for the Republican Candidate

Respondent's Party	Respondent's Sex	Male Candidate	Female Candidate	Female Candidate (Dis)Advantage
Democrat	Female	14.8%	20.8%	+6.0%
	Male	16.9%	21.4%	+4.5%
Independent	Female	28.7%	36.2%	+7.5%
	Male	32.0%	37.0%	+5.0%
Republican	Female	53.0%	42.5%	(–10.5%)
	Male	56.9%	43.3%	(–13.6%)

is a full 10.5% fewer female Republican respondents who are "very likely" to support a female than would support an identical male.

One implication of these results is that the Republican Party, if it is interested in increasing its seats in Congress, should consider running more female candidates. Especially in districts where crossover votes from Independents and Democrats are necessary for Republican victories, a woman would appear to be better equipped to attract crossover votes. For a Republican woman to use her advantage in a general election, however, she must first win her own party primary. In further analysis, where we looked only at self-identified Republicans, the biggest gap in terms of being "very likely" to support the Republican candidate occurs among those who self-identified as "strong" Republicans.[7] This is especially problematic because strong partisans are far more likely to contribute time and money to a campaign, and they are much more likely to vote in primaries. Given that strong party identifiers are the most active slice of voters in primaries, our experimental data suggest that female Republicans will have a more difficult time getting nominated.

Why should staunch Republicans be more skeptical of a female candidate? McDermott (1997) and Koch (2000, 2002) persuade us that sex provides a low cost social information cue as to the ideological bent of a candidate. Voters may perceive female candidates as more liberal. We test for a similar effect. Our respondents were asked how well the term *conservative* described the candidate being evaluated. The results are instructive. For Democrats and Independents,

there was very little difference in evaluations. Among Democratic respondents, 33.1% of those evaluating the male candidate and 36.2% of those evaluating the female candidate said that the label conservative described the candidate "very well." For Independents, 34.8% said conservative described the female candidate "very well," whereas 27.5% of those hearing about the male candidate were of this opinion. In other words, for both the Democrats and the Independents, there was a small statistically insignificant effect indicating that the woman was more believable as a conservative. For Republicans, however, whereas 42.7% of those who evaluated the female candidate said the conservative label described her "very well," the equivalent response for the male candidate was 14 percentage points higher at 56.7%. In addition, for Republicans, the evaluation of how "conservative" the candidate is directly affected the vote. Of those who said the conservative label described the candidate "very well," 71% said that they were "very likely" to vote for the candidate, whereas only 27% of those who did not believe the conservative label fit "very well" were "very likely" to vote for the candidate.[8] To the extent conservatives are active in primaries, the impression that female Republicans are more liberal, than otherwise identical male candidates, works against women trying to win votes in the Republican primaries.

The experimental results imply that there are systematic differences across the two major parties in the manner sex interacts with candidacies. Republican women may have a more difficult time winning within their own party. To test this hypothesis on data beyond the experiment, we looked at open-seat congressional primaries over the past 12 years. Open seats are crucial as they are the engine that drives change in the makeup of Congress (Gaddie & Bullock, 2000).

The final column of Table 4 shows the total number of open-seat districts at each congressional election from 1990 through 2002. It also shows in how many of these districts a woman ran and won the nomination for the two major parties. One of the first results is that there are far more districts where women are running in open-seat primaries on the Democratic side than on the Republican side (by definition, the opportunities are equal because an open seat is always open for both parties).[9] There has been at least one female candidate in the Democratic primary in 48.1% of the districts where there have been open-seat primaries from 1990 to 2002. The equivalent percentage on

TABLE 4
Women's Success in Winning Primaries for Open Seats
to the House of Representatives

Year	Democrats			Republicans			Open Seats
	Districts With Female Candidates	Wins	Percentage Victorious	Districts With Female Candidates	Wins	Percentage Victorious	
1990	11	7	63.6	6	2	33.3	29
1992	40	23	57.5	19	11	57.9	72
1994	21	10	47.6	19	5	26.3	48
1996	20	7	35.0	12	4	33.3	51
1998	19	12	63.2	11	4	36.4	34
2000	16	9	56.3	13	4	30.7	32
2002	21	10	47.6	15	7	46.7	42
Total	148	78	52.7	95	37	38.9	308

SOURCE: Center for American Women and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, New Jersey and *Vital Statistics on Congress, 2001-2002* (Mann, Malbin, & Ornstein, 2002).

the Republican side is only 30.8%.[10] Furthermore, Democratic primary voters have shown a higher propensity to choose a female candidate when there is one on the ballot. In 52.7% of Democratic primaries in open-seat districts, where a woman has run, the party's voters have selected a female candidate. For the Republicans, on the other hand, women have won in only 38.9% of the districts where there was a woman running.[11] Just as our experimental data suggest, female Republican candidates have, indeed, had more difficulty than their Democratic counterparts in surviving the partisan rancor of the primary season.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn from our study. First, we wish to reemphasize the crucial role party plays in most U.S. elections. Candidates are partisan creatures, born of party primaries, vying for jobs in intensely partisan institutions. Even more important, voters see candidates first and foremost as partisans. As our experiment shows, party identification had a tremendous effect on how a candidate was evaluated, whereas the effects of sex were much more modest.[12] One impli-

cation of these results is clear. Partisan identification must be included in experiments that consider how voters evaluate candidates, even if the primary interest is on questions of candidate sex. A shortcoming of this experiment is that it looks only at Republican candidates.[13] It would be useful to run new experiments where both candidate sex and candidate party were varied to systematically test how they interact.

Second, we find gender schemata affected candidate evaluations. We find, however, these schemata did not work exactly as we expected. Gender schemata interacted with the candidate's party identification and that of the respondent to generate a series of effects. Being female did not provide the candidate with any advantages in terms of candidate traits among Republicans, but it did generate an ideological reaction as a female Republican was seen as less conservative than a male Republican. To Independent and Democratic voters, being a female Republican did not send a strong ideological signal; rather, it provided signals on a different set of candidate traits. Specifically, Democratic and Independent voters are predisposed to view female Republicans as more likely to share their concerns, be more trustworthy, and be better leaders than a male Republican. In practical terms, these more positive views of a female Republican would make it easier to garner more crossover votes.

Among these various results, the leadership results are particularly interesting. Leadership has previously been defined as a characteristically male trait in gender schemata studies. Yet here the female candidate was advantaged (among Democrats and Independents). This suggests that the assumption that male candidates have more male characteristics, such as leadership, simply because they are male is suspect.[14] Such assumptions ignore the fact that respondents take into consideration not only a candidate's sex but also many other attributes. A female Republican candidate is not seen merely as the sum of a gender schemata and a party schemata, but rather these interact to form a unique picture that is considerably more than the sum of its parts.

As we expected, the party heuristic had a powerful effect on support for the candidate. Contrary to our expectation, however, gender still had an effect on support for the candidate. Republican women appear to have significant problems within their own party and especially with the most activist elements in their party. We presented evi-

dence that women were hurt among strong Republicans because the candidate's sex appears to send a signal that the candidate is more liberal than a comparable Republican male. This could easily lead to Republican women having a harder time winning the party's nomination.

Women have made significant political gains over the past dozen years. Those gains, however, appear to have occurred primarily on the Democratic side of the aisle. It would behoove political scientists to carefully attend to questions of not only how does candidate sex play out among voters but also how they vary across the parties as we look for explanations for these trends.

NOTES

1. For example, in 1987 women made up 6.2% of the Republican House delegation. Fourteen years later, women were still only 8.1% of the Republican delegation. Juxtapose this with the Democratic side of the aisle where women have gone from 4.7% to 19.5% of the delegation in the same period (Matland & King, 2002).

2. The only exception to this we know of is Matland (1994), and he looks at a non–United States sample.

3. The data are available in Stata format from http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/~king/gender_data.dta.

4. The differences presented in the table are based on answers to the following question: "Now, based *just* upon what you have heard in the brief description I read, please tell me how well you believe each of the following descriptions fit this candidate."

5. An affinity effect occurs when voters favor someone who shares specific characteristics with them. A gender affinity effect occurs when women prefer female candidates, and men prefer male candidates. We might expect to see such an effect if voters believe someone of the same sex could better understand the problems faced by voters like him or her, or if a voter believes that it is important to get "someone who has the same background as me" into public office.

6. Estimates are made using the mfx function in Stata 7.0.

7. Among strong Republicans, 49.3% said they were "very likely" to support the female Republican candidate, whereas 66.7% said they were "very likely" to support the male Republican candidate, a gap of 17.4%. Combining weak Republicans and Republican leaners, 32.2% said that they were "very likely" to support the female Republican candidate, whereas 44.6% said that they were "very likely" to support the male Republican candidate, a gap of 12.4%.

8. To further analyze the effects of the various traits imputed to candidates on the likelihood of voting for a candidate, we ran an additional set of ordered logits (not shown) regressing the likelihood of voting for the candidate based on candidate traits (shares my concerns, qualified, trustworthy, strong leader, and conservative) with separate regressions for Republicans, Independents, and Democrats. Being conservative was statistically significant and had the greatest effect of all the traits variables on the likelihood that a Republican would be willing to vote for the

candidate. For the Independents and Democrats, on the other hand, being conservative had no statistical effect on the likelihood that the respondent would vote for the candidate.

9. We define a district as open seat if there are no incumbents running at the start of the primary season (i.e., a seat where an incumbent is defeated in the primary is not defined as an open seat). Note also our unit of analysis is congressional district, not individual candidate; there may be more than one woman running in these open primaries.

10. The difference between these two is statistical significant at the $p < .01$ level (two-tailed test).

11. This difference is statistically significant at the $p < .04$ level (two-tailed test).

12. Thompson and Steckenrider (1997) have run a series of quasi-experiments and report similar results.

13. There may be an additional concern because the data we use are a decade old. We don't see this as a serious problem. Our experimental findings indicate Republican voters less favorably evaluate female candidates than male candidates. The primary election results that we consider both confirm this result and show this results is not unique to the early 1990s. Women do worse in Republican primaries than in Democratic primaries throughout the 1990s and during the 2000 elections. Although the increase in victories among Republican women in 2002 is perhaps evidence of a change in this trend, it may also be true that Republican women have become so discouraged that only the extremely well qualified are bothering to mount a campaign. Although Republican women did as well as Democratic women in terms of winning open-seat nominations in 2002, Democratic women were running in almost 50% of the districts with open seats, whereas barely one third of the districts with open seats had a Republican woman vying for her party's nomination.

14. Banducci, Everitt, and Gidengel (2002) reach a similar conclusion in their survey of a set of experiments.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, A. I. (1980). A comparison of voting for United States senator and representative in 1978. *American Political Science Review*, *74*(3), 633-640.

Alexander, D., & Anderson, K. (1993). Gender as a factor in the attribution of leadership traits. *Political Research Quarterly*, *46*, 527-545.

Banducci, S., Everitt, J., & Gidengil, E. (2002, July 16). *Gender stereotypes of political candidates: A meta-analysis*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Internation Society of Political Psychology, Berlin, Germany.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive accounting of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, *88*, 354-364.

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W., & Stokes, D. (1960). *The American voter*. New York: Wiley.

Conover, P. J. (1981). Political cues and the perception of candidates. *American Politics Quarterly*, *9*(4), 427-448.

Conover, P. J., & Feldman, S. (1989) Candidate perception in an ambiguous world: Campaigns, cues, and inference processes. *American Journal of Political Science*, *33*(4), 912-940.

Cook, E. A. (1994). Voter response to women senate candidates. In E. A. Cook, S. Thomas, & C. Wilcox, (Eds.), *The Year of the Woman: Myths and realities* (pp. 217-227). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Cook, E. A., & Wilcox, C. (1995). Women voters in the "Year of the Woman." In H. F. Weisberg (Ed.), *Democracy's feast: Elections in America* (pp. 195-219). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Cooperman, R., & Oppenheimer, B. I. (2001). The gender gap in the House of Representatives. In L. Dodd & B. I. Oppenheimer (Eds.), *Congress reconsidered* (7th ed., pp. 125-140). Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dolan, K. (2001). Electoral context, issues, and voting for women in the 1990s. *Women & Politics*, *23*, 21-36.

Feldman, S., & Conover, P. J. (1983). Candidates, issues and voters: The role of inference in political perception. *Journal of Politics*, *45*, 810-839.

Fiske, S. T., & Kinder, D. R. (1981). Involvement, expertise, and schema use: Evidence from political cognition. In N. Cantor & J. F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), *Personality, cognition, and social interaction* (pp. 171-192). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gaddie, K., & Bullock, C. (2000). *Elections to open seats in the U.S. House: Where the action is*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Herrnson, P. S., Lay, J. C., & Stokes, A. K. (2003). Women running "as women": Candidate gender, campaign issues, and voter-targeting strategies. *Journal of Politics*, *65*(1), 244-255.

Hinckley, B. (1980). The American voter in congressional elections. *American Political Science Review*, *74*(3), 641-650.

Koch, J. W. (1999). Candidate gender and assessments of senate candidates. *Social Science Quarterly*, *80*, 84-96.

Koch, J. W. (2000). Do citizens apply gender stereotypes to infer candidates' ideological orientations? *The Journal of Politics*, *62*, 414-429.

Koch, J. W. (2002). Gender stereotypes and citizens' impressions of house candidates' ideological orientations." *American Journal of Political Science*, *46*(2), 453-462.

Lau, R. R. (1986). Political schemata, candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. In R. R. Lau & D. O. Sears (Eds.), *Political cognition: The 19th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lau, R. R., & Redlawsk, D. (1997). Voting correctly. *American Political Science Review*, *91*, 585-598.

Lau, R. R., & Redlawsk, D. (2001). Advantages and disadvantages of cognitive heuristics in political decision making. *American Journal of Political Science*, *45*(4), 951-971.

Lau, R. R., & Sears, D. O. (Eds.). (1986). *Political cognition: The 19th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition* (pp. 95-126). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lodge, M., McGraw, K., & Stroh, P. (1989). An impression driven model of candidate evaluation. *American Political Science Review*, *83*, 399-419.

Lodge, M., Steenbergen, M. R., & Brau, S. (1995). The responsive voter—Campaign information and the dynamics of candidate evaluation. *American Political Science Review*, *89*(2), 309-326.

Mann, T. E., Malbin, M. J., & Ornstein, N. J. (2002). *Vital statistics on Congress. 2001-2002*. Washington, DC: AEI Press.

Markus, H., & Zajonc, R. B. (1985). The cognitive perspective in social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, 3rd ed., pp. 137-230). New York: Random House.

Matland, R. E. (1994). Putting Scandinavian equality to the test: An experimental evaluation of gender stereotyping of political candidates in a sample of Norwegian voters. *British Journal of Political Science*, *24*(2), 273-292.

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.

McDermott, M. L. (1997). Voting cues in low-information elections: Candidate gender as a social information variable in contemporary United States elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, *41*(1), 270-283.

McGraw, K. M. (2000). Contributions of the cognitive approach to political psychology. *Political Psychology*, *21*(4), 805-832.

Popkin, S. L. (1995). Information shortcuts and the reasoning voter. In B. Grofman (Ed.), *Information, participation, and choice* (pp. 17-36). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan 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.

Rapoport, R. B., Metcalf, K. L., & Hartman, J. A. (1989). Candidate traits and voter inferences: An experimental study. *Journal of Politics*, *51*(4), 917-932.

Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 515-530.

Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., & Tetlock, P. E. (1991). *Reasoning and choice: Explorations in political psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, S., and Steckenrider, J. (1997). The relative irrelevance of candidate sex. *Women and Politics*, *17*(4), 71-92.

Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

David C. King is an associate professor of public policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, Cambridge, MA. He has previously done research on congressional organization and trust in government.

Richard E. Matland is an associate professor of political science at the University of Houston, Texas. He has previously done research on the effects of electoral institutions on women's representation in the United States and around the world.