Online Appendix

Table A1. Sample Characteristics and Benchmarking

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Trait Attacks Sample  (MTurk) | Issue Attacks Sample  (MTurk) | ANES 2008 | CCES 2012 |
| Race/Ethnicity\* |  |  |  |  |
| White | 83.4 | 83.6 | 74.2 | 73.9 |
| Black | 8.1 | 7.2 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| Hispanic | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 7.2 |
| Other | 8.2 | 9.3 | 6.0 | 6.8 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |
| HS or Less | 28.4 | 28.3 | 43.5 | 29.0 |
| Some College/AA | 18.0 | 19.8 | 28.7 | 36.9 |
| BA Degree | 39.5 | 39.8 | 18.3 | 20.8 |
| Graduate Degree | 14.8 | 12.1 | 9.5 | 13.3 |
| Other Demographics |  |  |  |  |
| Gender (% Female) | 46.4 | 47.1 | 54.9 | 53.2 |
| Age | 39.5 | 38.4 | 46.6 | 53.4 |
| Income | 20k-39k | 40k-59k | 35k-39k | 50k-60k |
| Party Identification |  |  |  |  |
| Democrat | 51.2 | 52.5 | 33.6 | 44.6 |
| Independent | 20.43 | 18.8 | 38.7 | 12.8 |
| Republican | 26.79 | 28.7 | 25.4 | 37.7 |
| Other/None | 1.59 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.9 |
| Ideology |  |  |  |  |
| Liberal | 50.3 | 51.6 | 12.5 | 24.6 |
| Moderate | 20.5 | 21.8 | 64.0 | 31.3 |
| Conservative | 27.5 | 26.6 | 19.8 | 37.2 |
| Other/None | 1.7 | 0.2 | 3.7 | 6.9 |
| N | 881 | 821 | 2322 | 1000 |

Entries for the ANES and CCES samples are weighted. \*Race and ethnicity do not add to 100% because respondents could select more than one racial group.

Table A2. Randomization Checks – Trait Attack Study

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Experimental Condition | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 |
| Age | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0.03\* | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | -0.06 | -0.04 | 0.02 | -0.49 | -0.38 | 0.07 | -0.05 | -0.01 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.22 |
|  | (0.34) | (0.33) | (0.34) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.34) | (0.34) | (0.35) | (0.34) | (0.35) | (0.34) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Party Id. | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.19\* | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.22\* | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.13 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income | -0.06 | -0.11 | -0.04 | -0.06 | 0.01 | 0.03 | -0.10 | -0.03 | -0.04 | -0.01 | -0.04 |
|  | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.12) | (0.11) | (0.12) | (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | -0.07 | -0.10 | -0.06 | 0.13 | -0.04 | -0.11 | 0.08 | -0.09 | -0.21 | -0.07 | 0.09 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race | 0.03 | -0.02 | -0.01 | 0.16 | 0.17 | -0.01 | -0.36 | -0.06 | -0.15 | -0.03 | -0.00 |
|  | (0.20) | (0.20) | (0.20) | (0.18) | (0.19) | (0.20) | (0.26) | (0.21) | (0.23) | (0.22) | (0.20) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -0.28 | 0.21 | -0.10 | -1.22 | -0.95 | 0.01 | -0.40 | -0.08 | 0.40 | -0.95 | -0.80 |
|  | (0.82) | (0.80) | (0.82) | (0.83) | (0.84) | (0.82) | (0.85) | (0.85) | (0.83) | (0.86) | (0.84) |

Entries are multinomial logit coefficients with standard errors in parentheses\* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001. Condition 11 (a control condition) is the baseline condition.

Table A3. Randomization Checks – Issue Attack Study

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Experimental Condition | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 |
| Age | 0.02 | 0.04\*\* | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | -0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.24 | -0.26 | 0.07 | 0.25 | -0.22 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.37 | 0.47 | 0.41 | -0.08 |
|  | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.35) | (0.36) | (0.35) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Party Id. | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.11 | -0.08 | 0.16 | -0.04 | -0.03 | 0.05 | 0.03 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.01 | -0.05 | 0.18 | -0.00 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.06 | -0.05 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.44\* | 0.25 | -0.07 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.31 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.18) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.33 | -0.01 | 0.17 | 0.28 | 0.09 | 0.21 |
|  | (0.22) | (0.21) | (0.22) | (0.22) | (0.22) | (0.22) | (0.25) | (0.23) | (0.22) | (0.25) | (0.23) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -1.91\* | -1.74\* | -2.57\*\* | -1.90\* | -0.80 | -2.15\*\* | -0.83 | -1.03 | -1.65\* | -1.66\* | -1.80\* |
|  | (0.78) | (0.78) | (0.81) | (0.79) | (0.76) | (0.79) | (0.78) | (0.79) | (0.78) | (0.82) | (0.80) |

Entries are multinomial logit coefficients with standard errors in parentheses\* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001. Condition 11 (a control condition) is the baseline condition.

Table A4. Additional Manipulation Check Evaluations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Issue Attacks | | | | Trait Attacks | | | |
| Condition | How critical was article | Dem. Assess. | Rep. Assess. | Diff. between Rep. and Dem. Assess. | How critical was article | Dem. Assess. | Rep. Assess. | Diff. between Rep. and Dem. Assess. |
| Female Dem Fem. Attack | 3.46 | 3.55 | 3.41 | -0.14 | 3.59 | 3.63 | 3.33 | -0.29 |
| Female Rep Fem. Attack | 3.46 | 3.36 | 3.56 | 0.20 | 3.42 | 3.40 | 3.38 | -0.01 |
| Female Dem Masc. Attack | 3.63 | 3.59 | 3.70 | 0.11 | 3.30 | 3.32 | 3.29 | -0.04 |
| Female Rep Masc. Attack | 3.56 | 3.58 | 3.57 | -0.01 | 3.55 | 3.42 | 3.59 | 0.17 |
| Female D Control | 1.67 | 1.56 | 1.62 | 0.05 | 1.87 | 1.68 | 2.00 | 0.32 |
| Female R Control | 1.81 | 1.67 | 1.80 | 0.13 | 1.88 | 1.81 | 2.00 | 0.19 |
| Male Dem Fem. Attack | 3.61 | 3.73 | 3.60 | -0.13 | 3.39 | 3.40 | 3.45 | 0.05 |
| Male Rep Fem. Attack | 3.48 | 3.60 | 3.50 | -0.10 | 3.31 | 3.40 | 3.33 | -0.07 |
| Male Dem Masc. Attack | 3.26 | 3.13 | 3.35 | 0.22 | 3.42 | 3.42 | 3.73 | 0.31 |
| Male Rep Masc. Attack | 3.65 | 3.56 | 3.62 | 0.06 | 3.48 | 3.58 | 3.32 | -0.27 |
| Male Dem Control | 1.74 | 1.72 | 1.76 | 0.05 | 1.87 | 1.85 | 1.82 | -0.03 |
| Male Rep Control | 1.88 | 1.98 | 1.88 | -0.09 | 1.75 | 1.67 | 1.95 | 0.28 |

Note: Question asked: How critical would you say the tone of the article was? Not at all Critical (1) Not too Critical (2) Somewhat Critical (3) Very Critical (4) Extremely Critical (5). Partisanship is self-reported partisanship of respondents. There are no statistically significant differences in partisan evaluations of criticalness overall.

Tables to accompany Figures 1-4

(see also replication materials for a full set of contrasts)

Table A5a to accompany Figure 1: Effect of Attacks on Candidate Evaluations – Trait Attack

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feminine traits | Masculine traits | Vote |
| Masc. Trait Attack | 0.48\*\*\* | -0.90\*\*\* | -0.34\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.08) | (0.12) |
| Fem. Trait Attack | -0.62\*\*\* | -0.09 | -0.65\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.08) | (0.12) |
| Constant | 0.05 | 0.33\*\*\* | 4.10\*\*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.09) |
| Observations | 871 | 871 | 865 |
| *R*2 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.03 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A5b to accompany Figure 1: Effect of Attacks on Candidate Evaluations – Issue Attack

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feminine issue competencies | Masculine issue competencies | Vote |
| Masc. Issue Attack | -0.02 | -0.38\*\*\* | -0.73\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.12) |
| Fem. Issue Attack | -0.58\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* | -0.92\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.12) |
| Constant | 0.20\*\*\* | 0.23\*\*\* | 4.19\*\*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.08) |
| Observations | 871 | 871 | 865 |
| *R*2 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.03 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A6a to accompany Figure 2: Candidate Party x Type of Attack – Trait Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate |  | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate |  | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate |
|  | Feminine traits | |  | Masculine traits | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Trait Attack | 0.32\*\* | 0.62\*\*\* |  | -0.90\*\*\* | -0.90\*\*\* |  | -0.50\*\* | -0.18 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.11) | (0.11) |  | (0.18) | (0.17) |
| Fem. Trait Attack | -0.76\*\*\* | -0.48\*\*\* |  | -0.04 | -0.14 |  | -0.59\*\*\* | -0.71\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.11) | (0.11) |  | (0.18) | (0.17) |
| Constant | 0.15^ | -0.04 |  | 0.33\*\*\* | 0.33\*\*\* |  | 4.20\*\*\* | 4.01\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) |  | (0.08) | (0.08) |  | (0.13) | (0.12) |
| Observations | 431 | 440 |  | 431 | 440 |  | 429 | 436 |
| *R*2 | 0.21 | 0.20 |  | 0.17 | 0.16 |  | 0.03 | 0.04 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A6b to accompany Figure 2: Candidate Party x Type of Attack – Issue Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate |  | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate |  | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate |
|  | Feminine issue competencies | |  | Masculine issue competencies | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Issue Attack | -0.05 | 0.03 |  | -0.30\*\* | -0.46\*\*\* |  | -0.79\*\*\* | -0.65\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.10) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.17) | (0.17) |
| Fem. Issue Attack | -0.70\*\*\* | -0.45\*\*\* |  | -0.35\*\*\* | -0.29\*\* |  | -1.07\*\*\* | -0.76\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.10) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.17) | (0.17) |
| Constant | 0.36\*\*\* | 0.03 |  | 0.32\*\*\* | 0.15\* |  | 4.33\*\*\* | 4.05\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) |  | (0.07) | (0.07) |  | (0.12) | (0.12) |
| Observations | 415 | 405 |  | 415 | 405 |  | 415 | 406 |
| *R*2 | 0.14 | 0.07 |  | 0.03 | 0.05 |  | 0.10 | 0.05 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A7a to accompany Figure 3: Candidate Gender x Type of Attack – Trait Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |
|  | Feminine traits | |  | Masculine traits | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Trait Attack | 0.42\*\*\* | 0.53\*\*\* |  | -0.93\*\*\* | -0.87\*\*\* |  | -0.52\*\* | -0.15 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.11) | (0.11) |  | (0.18) | (0.17) |
| Fem. Trait Attack | -0.81\*\*\* | -0.42\*\*\* |  | -0.04 | -0.14 |  | -0.87\*\*\* | -0.41\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.18) | (0.17) |
| Constant | 0.13^ | -0.04 |  | 0.33\*\*\* | 0.34\*\*\* |  | 4.29\*\*\* | 3.90\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.08) |  | (0.08) | (0.08) |  | (0.13) | (0.12) |
| Observations | 448 | 423 |  | 448 | 423 |  | 443 | 422 |
| *R*2 | 0.27 | 0.15 |  | 0.19 | 0.15 |  | 0.05 | 0.01 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A7b to accompany Figure 3: Candidate Gender x Type of Attack – Issue Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |
|  | Feminine issue competencies | |  | Masculine issue competencies | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Issue Attack | -0.12 | 0.09 |  | -0.29\*\* | -0.48\*\*\* |  | -0.68\*\*\* | -0.77\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.18) | (0.16) |
| Fem. Issue Attack | -0.63\*\*\* | -0.53\*\*\* |  | -0.29\*\* | -0.36\*\*\* |  | -1.02\*\*\* | -0.82\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.18) | (0.16) |
| Constant | 0.25\*\*\* | 0.15\* |  | 0.19\*\* | 0.27\*\*\* |  | 4.23\*\*\* | 4.16\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) |  | (0.07) | (0.07) |  | (0.12) | (0.11) |
| Observations | 411 | 409 |  | 411 | 409 |  | 411 | 410 |
| *R*2 | 0.10 | 0.10 |  | 0.02 | 0.06 |  | 0.08 | 0.07 |

Standard errors in parentheses. ^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A8a to accompany Figure 4: Candidate Gender x Party x Attack (Dem. Candidates) – Trait Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |
|  | Feminine traits | |  | Masculine traits | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Trait Attack | 0.63\*\*\* | 0.62\*\*\* |  | -0.89\*\*\* | -0.90\*\*\* |  | -0.31 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.16) |  | (0.15) | (0.16) |  | (0.24) | (0.25) |
| Fem. Trait Attack | -0.64\*\*\* | -0.31^ |  | -0.20 | -0.06 |  | -0.97\*\*\* | -0.43 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.16) |  | (0.15) | (0.16) |  | (0.23) | (0.26) |
| Constant | 0.04 | -0.13 |  | 0.34\*\* | 0.32\*\* |  | 4.20\*\*\* | 3.80\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.17) | (0.18) |
| Observations | 229 | 211 |  | 229 | 211 |  | 226 | 210 |
| *R*2 | 0.27 | 0.14 |  | 0.15 | 0.17 |  | 0.07 | 0.02 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A8b to accompany Figure 4: Candidate Gender x Party x Attack (Rep. Candidates) – Trait Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |
|  | Feminine traits | |  | Masculine traits | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Trait Attack | 0.21 | 0.44\*\* |  | -0.97\*\*\* | -0.82\*\*\* |  | -0.73\*\* | -0.27 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.15) |  | (0.15) | (0.16) |  | (0.26) | (0.23) |
| Fem. Trait Attack | -1.00\*\*\* | -0.52\*\*\* |  | 0.13 | -0.21 |  | -0.77\*\* | -0.41^ |
|  | (0.14) | (0.15) |  | (0.15) | (0.15) |  | (0.27) | (0.22) |
| Constant | 0.24\* | 0.06 |  | 0.31\*\* | 0.35\*\* |  | 4.40\*\*\* | 4.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |  | (0.11) | (0.11) |  | (0.19) | (0.16) |
| Observations | 219 | 212 |  | 219 | 212 |  | 217 | 212 |
| *R*2 | 0.28 | 0.16 |  | 0.24 | 0.12 |  | 0.05 | 0.02 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A9c to accompany Figure 4: Candidate Gender x Party x Attack (Dem. Candidates) – Issue Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |
|  | Feminine issue competencies | |  | Masculine traits | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Issue Attack | -0.15 | 0.04 |  | -0.18 | -0.43\*\* |  | -0.62\* | -0.98\*\*\* |
|  | (0.13) | (0.14) |  | (0.14) | (0.14) |  | (0.25) | (0.23) |
| Fem. Issue Attack | -0.71\*\*\* | -0.69\*\*\* |  | -0.38\*\* | -0.32\* |  | -1.13\*\*\* | -1.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.13) | (0.13) |  | (0.14) | (0.14) |  | (0.25) | (0.22) |
| Constant | 0.44\*\*\* | 0.30\*\* |  | 0.33\*\*\* | 0.30\*\* |  | 4.34\*\*\* | 4.32\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.09) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.17) | (0.16) |
| Observations | 208 | 207 |  | 208 | 207 |  | 208 | 207 |
| *R*2 | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.04 | 0.05 |  | 0.09 | 0.12 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table A9d to accompany Figure 4: Candidate Gender x Party x Attack (Rep. Candidates) – Issue Attack

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |  | Female Candidate | Male Candidate |
|  | Feminine issue competencies | |  | Masculine issue competencies | |  | Vote | |
| Masc. Issue Attack | -0.10 | 0.16 |  | -0.39\*\* | -0.52\*\*\* |  | -0.74\*\* | -0.55\* |
|  | (0.15) | (0.14) |  | (0.15) | (0.13) |  | (0.25) | (0.23) |
| Fem. Issue Attack | -0.54\*\*\* | -0.36\*\* |  | -0.19 | -0.40\*\* |  | -0.91\*\*\* | -0.61\*\* |
|  | (0.15) | (0.14) |  | (0.15) | (0.13) |  | (0.25) | (0.23) |
| Constant | 0.06 | -0.00 |  | 0.05 | 0.25\*\* |  | 4.12\*\*\* | 3.99\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) |  | (0.10) | (0.09) |  | (0.18) | (0.16) |
| Observations | 203 | 202 |  | 203 | 202 |  | 203 | 203 |
| *R*2 | 0.07 | 0.07 |  | 0.03 | 0.08 |  | 0.07 | 0.04 |

Standard errors in parentheses

^ p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Additional Study Information

**Study 1: Trait Attacks Study**

Experimental Conditions

Hepner Campaign Calls His New Opponent [“Weak and Ineffective”/“Opportunistic and Divisive”]

*Note: Entries are the [masculine - e.g. “Weak and Ineffective” / feminine – e.g. “Opportunistic and Divisive”] trait attack content.*

Associated Press – Within minutes of State Representative [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson ([Democrat/Republican], District 51) announcing [her/his] run for the State Senate office, [her/his] former colleague from the House released a statement accusing Johnson of being [weak and ineffective/opportunistic and divisive].

[Her/his] opponent, [Democrat/Republican] Michael Hepner, questioned [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson’s qualifications and [her/his] integrity. “I recognize [Patricia’s/Patrick’s] service and welcome [her/him] to the race,” said Representative Hepner. “But serving in the State Senate [takes more than a support staff/ all about teamwork]. It takes a [forceful leader/ collaborative spirit]. As we’ve seen in the past, [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson [is not assertive or a strong enough leader for our district’s needs/ does not play well with others]. [She/he] has a history of [refusing to stand up for [herself/himself]/ turning on [her/his] employees and colleagues] when [her/his] policies and decisions become unpopular.”

Representative Hepner continued, saying Johnson [didn’t have “enough backbone or independence”/ wasn’t a “team player” and refused to work with others] to get the job done. Noting various issues that arose during the past legislative session, Hepner stated “I will once again put our district first and move us forward with a clear vision for our future. [Patricia /Patrick] Johnson takes us back to the days when it was hard to get anything done because political leaders [wouldn’t stand up, wouldn’t fight for what we need or assert themselves in the necessary discussions”/ work together, wouldn’t help each other out,”] Hepner said.

After current Democratic Senator Richard Watts announced he was not running for re-election, [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson has been more visible than usual, On Tuesday, [she/he] attended a fundraising event for a veterans’ organization. In the keynote address, [she/he] stressed [her /his] accomplishments on several pieces of public health legislation. Hepner expressed skepticism: “How much credit does [she/he] really deserve for passing the legislation?” Hepner asked. “Working with Johnson on this issue was not easy; [she/he] is [not a forceful advocate/ geneally disagreeable and unhelpful]. [She/he] just does not have the [confidence to speak up and pursue [her/his] ideas in policy/ interpersonal skills needed to work with other representatives toward our policy goals.”]

Neither [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson nor any other member of the [Democratic/Republican] Party has yet to respond to Hepner’s attacks, but this early outburst has pundits anticipating a tough fight leading up to the primary.

Control Conditions

State Senate Race Continues

Associated Press – Within minutes of State Representative [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson ([Democrat/Republican], District 51) announcing [her/his] run for the State Senate office, pundits already anticipate a tough fight leading up to the primary. [Her/his] opponent, [Democrat/Republican] Michael Hepner, has been on the campaign trail for several weeks. Both candidates are equally matched in political experience. [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson is currently serving a term in the State House and came to the office as a business owner. Michael Hepner is also serving in the State House, coming to the office from a career in law. Analysts anticipate close poll numbers next week.

|  |
| --- |
| Study 2: Issue Attacks Study |

Experimental Conditions for Study 2

Treatment Conditions

Hepner Campaign Says Opponent [“Fails to Make the Grade” on Education/“Fails to Deliver” on Security and Safety]

*Note: Entries are the [feminine -e.g. “Fails to Make the Grade on Education” / masculine – e.g. “Fails to Deliver on Security and Safety”] trait attack content.*

Associated Press – Within minutes of State Representative [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson ([Democrat/Republican], District 51) announcing [her/his] run for the State Senate office, [her/his] former colleague from the House released a statement accusing Johnson of failing to lead on [education policy/security policy].

[Her/His] opponent, [Democrat/Republican] Michael Hepner, questioned [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson’s qualifications and track record. “I recognize [Patricia’s/Patrick’s] service and welcome her to the race,” said Representative Hepner. “But serving in the State Senate requires legislative skill. You have to work through obstacles to create meaningful policy change. While [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson’s past campaign promises on [improving the state’s public education system/ improving how our state handles domestic terror threats] made a lot of sense, [her/his] words have not been backed up by meaningful action.”

Representative Hepner continued, saying Johnson opposes [expansion of early childhood education programs / increasing protections for potential targets of terrorist attacks in the state] and wants to “drain resources dedicated to [improving our schools/protecting the public].” Noting various problems that arose during the past legislative session, Hepner stated “Johnson included [increasing standards for teachers/ strengthening the state’s Emergency Response Commission] in a host of campaign promises in 2012, most of which never made it over the legislative finish line… [She/He] might say [she/he] is a leader who cares about [educating our children/ protecting our citizens], but [she/he] missed votes for major [education/ security] funding bills several times in the last legislative session.

After current [Democratic/Republican] Senator Richard Watts announced he was not running for re-election, [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson has been more visible than usual. On Tuesday, [she/he] attended a fundraising event for a veterans’ organization. In the keynote address, [she/he] stressed [her/his] accomplishments on several pieces of public health legislation. Hepner expressed skepticism: “The bottom line is, [she/he] ran on a/n [education/security and defense] platform but did not make any policy changes in this area. [She/He] failed [the kids in this district, their parents, and our public schools, / all the citizens of this district] who depended on [her/him] to prioritize [education/their safety].”

Neither [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson nor any other member of the [Democratic/Republican] Party has yet to respond to Hepner’s attacks, but this early outburst has pundits anticipating a tough fight leading up to the primary.

Control Conditions

State Senate Race Continues

Associated Press – Within minutes of State Representative [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson ([Democrat/Republican], District 51) announcing [her/his] run for the State Senate office, pundits already anticipate a tough fight leading up to the primary. [Her/his] opponent, [Democrat/Republican] Michael Hepner has been on the campaign trail for several weeks. Both candidates are equally matched in political experience. [Patricia/Patrick] Johnson is currently serving a term in the State House and came to the office as a business owner. Michael Hepner is also serving in the State House, coming to the office from a career in law. Analysts anticipate close poll numbers next week.

Survey Questions from Study 1

Treatment

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Please take a few minutes to carefully look over a newspaper article about a political campaign for a State Senate office. After reading the newspaper article, please do your best to read directions and answer all of the questions that follow. You may skip any questions for any reason. Your survey responses are anonymous so please answer as honestly as possible.

1. Treatment (Randomly Assigned)

(*candidate name is highlighted to reflect that the experiment manipulates candidate gender)*

1. If you were voting in the election today in the election, how likely would you be to vote for [Patricia/Patrick Johnson] or Michael Hepner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely Likely | Likely | Slightly Likely | Neutral | Slightly Unlikely | Unlikely | Extremely Unlikely |
| Patricia / Patrick Johnson | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Michael Hepner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

1. Next, please rank [Patricia/Patrick Johnson] on the following scales. Please rank based on the first impression that comes to mind. [Randomized Pairs]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strong (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Weak (7) |
| Harsh (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Lenient (7) |
| Hard (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Soft (7) |
| Cold (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Warm (7) |
| Distant (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Caring (7) |

1. Next, please rank Michael Hepner on the following scales. Please rank based on the first impression that comes to mind. [Randomized Pairs]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strong (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Weak (7) |
| Harsh (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Lenient (7) |
| Hard (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Soft (7) |
| Cold (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Warm (7) |
| Distant (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Caring (7) |

1. Based on what you know about Patricia/ Patrick Johnson, how well does each of the following adjectives describe her/him? [Randomized Adjectives]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not Well at All | Not Very Well | Somewhat Well | Very Well |
| Assertive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Tough | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Aggressive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Masculine | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Confident | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Warm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Feminine | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Sensitive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Cautious | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

1. Based on what you know about Michael Hepner, how well does each of the following adjectives describe her/him? [Randomized Adjectives]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not Well at All | Not Very Well | Somewhat Well | Very Well |
| Assertive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Tough | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Aggressive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Masculine | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Active | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Confident | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Warm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Feminine | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Sensitive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Cautious | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

1. Generally speaking, how would you describe your political party preference?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strong Democrat | Weak Democrat | Independent Who Leans Democrat | Pure Independent | Independent Who Leans Republican | Weak Republican | Strong Republican |

1. Please circle the number that best corresponds to your political views.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Extremely Liberal | Liberal | Slightly Liberal | Moderate: Middle of the Road | Slightly Conservative | Conservative | Extremely Conservative |

1. What is your gender? [ ] Male [ ] Female
2. In general, how interested are you in politics?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Not at all interested | Not too interested | Somewhat interested | Very interested | Extremely interested |

1. Are you registered to vote? [ ] Yes [ ] No
2. Did you vote in the 2012 general election? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not eligible
3. Please indicate which race best describes you:

[ ] White

[ ] African American / Black

[ ] Asian or Pacific Islander

[ ] American Indian / Native American

[ ] Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you Hispanic or Latino? [ ] Yes [ ] No

1. Are you a US citizen? [ ] Yes [ ] No
2. What was your household income last year?

[ ] Less than $20,000

[ ] $20,000 to $39,000

[ ] $40,000 to $59,000

[ ] $60,000 to $79,000

[ ] $80,000 to $99,000

[ ] $100,000 or more

1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

[ ] Less than High School

[ ] High School Diploma or Equivalent

[ ] Associates Degree

[ ] Bachelor’s Degree

[ ] Graduate or Professional Degree

1. How critical would you say the tone of the article was?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all Critical | Not too Critical | Somewhat Critical | Very Critical | Extremely Critical |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Survey Questions from Study 2

Treatment

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Please take a few minutes to carefully look over a newspaper article about a political campaign for a State Senate office. After reading the newspaper article, please do your best to read directions and answer all of the questions that follow. You may skip any questions for any reason. Your survey responses are anonymous so please answer as honestly as possible.

1. Treatment (Randomly Assigned)

General Impressions of the Candidate

(*candidate name is highlighted to reflect that the experiment manipulates candidate gender)*

1. If you were voting in the election today in the election, how likely would you be to vote for [Patricia/Patrick Johnson] or Michael Hepner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely Likely | Likely | Slightly Likely | Neutral | Slightly Unlikely | Unlikely | Extremely Unlikely |
| Patricia / Patrick Johnson | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Michael Hepner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

1. Next, please rank [Patricia/Patrick Johnson] on the following scales. Please rank based on the first impression that comes to mind. [Randomized Pairs]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strong (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Weak (7) |
| Harsh (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Lenient (7) |
| Hard (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Soft (7) |
| Cold (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Warm (7) |
| Distant (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Caring (7) |

1. Next, please rank Michael Hepner on the following scales. Please rank based on the first impression that comes to mind. [Randomized Pairs]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strong (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Weak (7) |
| Harsh (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Lenient (7) |
| Hard (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Soft (7) |
| Cold (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Warm (7) |
| Distant (0) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Caring (7) |

1. Based on what you know about Patricia/ Patrick Johnson, how well would the candidate handle each of the following issues? [Randomized Adjectives]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not Well at All | Not Very Well | Somewhat Well | Very Well |
| Education | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| National Security | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Crime | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Welfare | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Transportation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Budgeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Child care | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Tax reform | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Healthcare | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Immigration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

1. What is your gender? [ ] Male [ ] Female
2. Generally speaking, how would you describe your political party preference?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strong Democrat | Weak Democrat | Independent Who Leans Democrat | Pure Independent | Independent Who Leans Republican | Weak Republican | Strong Republican |

1. Please circle the number that best corresponds to your political views.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Extremely Liberal | Liberal | Slightly Liberal | Moderate: Middle of the Road | Slightly Conservative | Conservative | Extremely Conservative |

1. In general, how interested are you in politics?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Not at all interested | Not too interested | Somewhat interested | Very interested | Extremely interested |

1. Are you registered to vote? [ ] Yes [ ] No
2. Did you vote in the 2012 general election? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not eligible
3. Please indicate which race best describes you:

[ ] White

[ ] African American / Black

[ ] Asian or Pacific Islander

[ ] American Indian / Native American

[ ] Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Are you Hispanic or Latino? [ ] Yes [ ] No

1. Are you a US citizen? [ ] Yes [ ] No
2. What was your household income last year?

[ ] Less than $20,000

[ ] $20,000 to $39,000

[ ] $40,000 to $59,000

[ ] $60,000 to $79,000

[ ] $80,000 to $99,000

[ ] $100,000 or more

1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

[ ] Less than High School

[ ] High School Diploma or Equivalent

[ ] Associates Degree

[ ] Bachelor’s Degree

[ ] Graduate or Professional Degree

1. How many children do you have?

[ ] 0

[ ] 1

[ ] 2

[ ] 3

[ ] 4 or more

1. How concerned would you say that you are about the possibility of a terrorist attack in the near future?

[ ] Not concerned at all

[ ] Somewhat concerned

[ ] Concerned

[ ] Very concerned

Finally, please answer a few questions about the article you read earlier in the survey.

1. How critical would you say the tone of the article was?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all Critical | Not too Critical | Somewhat Critical | Very Critical | Extremely Critical |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |