



University of  
Massachusetts  
Amherst

## Fear of Gender Favoritism and Vote Choice during the 2008 Presidential Primaries

Item Type	article
Authors	Goldman, Seth K.
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/697123">/10.1086/697123</a>
Rights	UMass Amherst Open Access Policy
Download date	2025-03-20 15:00:21
Link to Item	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/8436">https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/8436</a>

**Online Appendix A: Demographics of the Panel Survey**

Table A1. Demographics of the July 2008 Current Population Survey and the 2008 National Annenberg Election Study Panel Survey

	2008 CPS	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5
<b>Education</b>						
High school or less	44.2%	31.0%	28.7%	26.6%	25.8%	25.4%
Some college	28.1%	34.8%	34.6%	34.9%	34.6%	34.4%
College graduate	18.2%	21.2%	22.5%	23.6%	24.0%	24.5%
Postgraduate work	9.5%	13.0%	14.2%	14.9%	15.6%	15.7%
<b>Income</b>						
Less than \$25,000	19.7%	19.9%	18.9%	16.9%	16.2%	15.9%
\$25-49,999	26.2%	32.6%	31.8%	29.7%	29.4%	29.5%
\$50-74,999	20.6%	20.8%	20.7%	21.2%	21.2%	21.3%
\$75-99,999	13.4%	13.0%	13.7%	14.9%	15.3%	15.4%
\$100,000 or more	20.1%	13.7%	14.9%	17.2%	17.8%	18.0%
<b>Age</b>						
18-29	20.1%	10.1%	9.6%	9.9%	9.4%	9.1%
30-44	26.5%	27.5%	27.0%	26.8%	26.6%	26.0%
45-59	28.6%	34.7%	35.4%	36.4%	36.8%	37.1%
60+	24.7%	27.6%	28.0%	26.9%	27.1%	27.9%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	47.8%	46.1%	46.2%	43.8%	43.6%	43.9%
Female	52.2%	53.9%	53.8%	56.2%	56.4%	56.1%
<b>Race</b>						
White Non-Hispanic	73.1%	81.2%	80.9%	79.2%	80.1%	80.6%
Black Non-Hispanic	9.3%	8.5%	8.4%	9.5%	9.1%	8.8%
Hispanic	10.9%	5.9%	5.8%	6.4%	6.0%	5.8%
Other, Non-Hispanic	6.7%	4.3%	4.8%	4.9%	4.8%	4.8%
Sample Size	101,618	19,190	17,747	20,052	19,241	19,234

*Note:* Data are unweighted.

## **Online Appendix B: Wording of the Survey Items**

***Perceptions of Gender Favoritism.*** On waves 1 and 3, respondents were asked to: “Please tell us to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Female elected officials are more likely to. . . Favor women for government jobs over male applicants. Promote educational programs targeted at girls at the expense of boys. Support government spending that favors women. Focus on issues that mainly affect women.” (strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree). I combined the four perception items into a reliable scale (Cronbach’s alphas on waves 1 and 3 are .90 and .91) and coded the variable to range from zero to one, where higher values indicate perceiving more favoritism.

***Attitudes about Gender Favoritism.*** On wave 3, immediately following the perceptions of gender favoritism questions, respondents were asked: “Thinking about the statements you just read, would it be good or bad if female elected officials favored women?” (very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, very bad). I coded the variable to range from zero to one, where higher values indicate having more negative attitudes.

***Perceptions of Racial Favoritism.*** On waves 1 and 3, respondents were asked to: “Please tell us to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Black elected officials are more likely to. . . Favor blacks for government jobs over white applicants. Support government spending that favors blacks. Support policies that could cost whites jobs. Give special favors to the black community.” (strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree). I combined the four perception items into a reliable scale (Cronbach’s alphas for waves 1 and 3 are .92 and .94), and coded it to range from zero to one, where higher values indicate perceiving more favoritism.

***Attitudes about Racial Favoritism.*** On wave 3, immediately following the perceptions of racial favoritism questions respondents were asked: “Thinking about the statements you just read, would it be good or bad if black elected officials favored blacks?” (very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, very bad). The measure was coded to range from zero to one, where higher scores indicating having a more negative attitude about favoritism.

***Clinton Vote Choice.*** On wave 1, self-identified Democratic respondents were asked, “If you had to choose this week to for one of the primary candidates to be the presidential nominee for the Democratic party, which candidate would you vote for: Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton, Chris Dodd, John Edwards, Mike Gravel, Dennis Kucinich, Barack Obama, Bill Richardson.” On wave 3, self-identified Democratic respondents were asked, “If you had to choose this week to vote for one of the primary candidates to be the presidential nominee for the Democratic party, which candidate would you vote for: Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama.” The order of the candidates was randomized. Clinton Vote Choice was coded so that 1 equals a preference for Clinton and 0 for another Democratic candidate.

***Hypothetical General Election Match-Up.*** On wave 3, respondents were asked, “If the presidential election were held today and John McCain, the Republican, was running against Hillary Clinton, the Democrat, who would you vote for?” The order of the candidates in the question was randomized. The response options (order also randomized) included “John McCain, the Republican,” “Hillary Clinton, the Democrat,” “Ralph Nader,” “Other [specify],” and “Don’t know.” The variable was coded 1 equals a preference for Clinton and 0 equals a preference for McCain.

***Party Identification.*** On the GfK profile survey that all new GfK panelists receive and in wave 2, party identification was measured using the standard set of branching questions, which

produced a seven-point scale (0=strong Republican, .17=weak Republican, .33=leaning Republican, .50=Independent/undecided/other, .67=leaning Democrat, .83=weak Democrat, and 1=strong Democrat).

***Party Strength.*** Ranges from 0 to 1, where 0=Independent/undecided/other and 1=strong Democrat or Republican.

***Respondent Ideology.*** On the GfK profile survey and wave 2, respondents were asked: "In general, do you think of yourself as . . ." (Extremely liberal, Liberal, Slightly liberal, Moderate, middle of the road, Slightly conservative, Conservative, Extremely Conservative). Responses were coded to range from zero to one (0=extremely conservative, .17=conservative, .33=slightly conservative, .50=moderate, .67=slightly liberal, and .83=liberal, and 1=extremely liberal).

***Perceived Candidate Ideology.*** On waves 1 and 3, respondents were asked: "Using this scale that ranges from extremely liberal to extremely conservative, where would you place each of these candidates on this scale? Just click the box at the far right if you don't know enough about the person to rate him or her." The scale included the following options: extremely liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate, middle of the road, slightly conservative, conservative, and extremely conservative. The candidates asked about included Hillary Clinton, John Edwards, and Barack Obama among the Democrats, as well as John McCain, the Republican nominee.

***Perceived Relative Ideological Proximity.*** For the analyses of Clinton vote choice in the Democratic primary, I first created separate indicators of perceived ideological proximity between each respondent and Clinton, Obama, and Edwards. Then, I created a single indicator of perceived relative ideological proximity by taking the difference between the perceived ideological proximity score with Clinton and either Obama or Edwards (whomever had the score

closest to the respondent's ideology). The final variable ranges from 0 to 1, where 0=ideological proximity closer to Edwards or Obama (on wave 3, only Obama) than Clinton, .5=ideological proximity to Edwards or Obama and Clinton is the same, and 1=perceive ideology as closer to Clinton than Edwards or Obama. For the general election matchup, the perceived relative ideological proximity variable simply compares Clinton to John McCain, where 0=ideological proximity closer to McCain than Clinton, .5=ideological proximity to Clinton and McCain is the same, and 1=ideological proximity closer to Clinton than McCain.

***Race (black)***. Race and ethnicity were assessed on the GfK profile survey. The variable used in this study is dichotomous (1 equals non-Hispanic black and 0 for all others).

***Education (in years)***. On the GfK profile survey, respondents were asked for the highest grade/degree that they have received. These responses were then converted into an indicator of the number of years of education received (ranging from 2.50 – 20), and then re-coded to range from zero to one.

***Income (in dollars)***. On the GfK profile survey, respondents were asked to choose the income category that best represents their household income. The middle value of each category was then used as an indicator of income in dollars. The variable was then coded to range from zero to one.

***Age (in years)***. Measured on the GfK profile survey and then recoded to range from zero to one.

***Gender***. Measured on the GfK profile survey (0=male and 1=female).

***Region of Residence (South)***. Measured on the GfK profile survey (0=non-South and 1=South).

**Campaign Contact.** On waves 1 and 3, respondents were asked: "Has anyone contacted you on behalf of any of the presidential candidates? Select all that apply." The following response options were provided: "Yes, I have received a letter or mailing of some kind from a campaign," "Yes, I have had a face-to-face conversation or contact with someone from a campaign," "Yes, I have received an email from a campaign," "Yes, I have received a phone call or phone message from a campaign," "No, none of the above has happened to me." The campaign contact variable is the sum of the "Yes" answers, recoded to range from 0 to 1.

**Political Interest.** On the profile and wave 3, respondents were asked: "In general, how interested are you in politics and public affairs?" Scores range from 0 to 1, where 0=not at all interested, .33=slightly interested, .67=somewhat interested, and 1=very interested.

**Perceived Viability.** On waves 1 and 3, respondents were asked: "Regardless of who you might vote for, who do you think is most likely to win the Democratic nomination for president?" On wave 1, the response options included the following candidates: Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton, Chris Dodd, John Edwards, Mike Gravel, Dennis Kucinich, Barack Obama, and Bill Richardson. Wave 3 only included Clinton and Obama. The variable is coded 1 if the respondent chose Clinton and 0 if otherwise.

**Perceived Electability.** On waves 1 and 3, respondents were asked: "In your opinion, which of the Democratic candidates would give the Democratic party the best chance of winning the presidency in November?" On wave 1, the list of candidates included the following: Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton, Chris Dodd, John Edwards, Mike Gravel, Dennis Kucinich, Barack Obama, and Bill Richardson. Wave 3 only included Clinton and Obama. The variable is coded 1 if the respondent chose Clinton and 0 if otherwise.

***Perceived Relative Issue Agreement.*** For this variable, I rely on questions about six issues asked about on both waves 1 and 3 pertaining to the candidates' stances on the economy, homeland security, health care, Iraq, immigration, and trade. On the economy, respondents were asked: "Are there any candidates who you think would do a particularly GOOD job of handling the nation's economy? You can pick more than one candidate if you like, or "don't know enough to say" if you don't feel you know enough about them yet." Respondents were then asked the same question, but in terms of whether any candidates would do a particularly BAD job. The same question wording was used to asked about homeland security and the "health care situation." Regarding Iraq, immigration, and trade, the following question wording was used: "Which presidential candidates' views are most like your own when it comes to a plan for Iraq? You can pick more than one candidate if you like, or "Don't know enough to say" if you don't feel you know enough about them yet." Respondents were then asked the same question, but in terms of whether any candidates' views are "UNACCEPTABLE to you." For Clinton, Obama, Edwards, and McCain I first created indicators of the number of issues on which they received positive assessments minus the number of issues on which they received negative assessments. This produced variables tapping perceived issue agreement with each candidate. I then created indicators of perceived relative issue agreement among the Democratic candidates and separately between Clinton and McCain. For the Democratic candidates, the final variable ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates that the respondent rated Obama or Edwards (whomever the respondent rated more positively) more favorably than Clinton, .5 indicates that the respondent rated Obama/Edwards and Clinton equally, and 1 indicates that the respondent rated Clinton more favorably than Obama/Edwards. Note that only Obama and Clinton were asked about on wave



3. For the general election matchup analyses, the perceived relative issue agreement variable was created using the same process but comparing Clinton to McCain.

**Online Appendix C: Predictors of Fear of Gender Favoritism**

Table C1. Predictors of Perceptions and Attitudes about Gender Favoritism (OLS)

	Perceptions of Gender Favoritism (Wave 1)		Perceptions of Gender Favoritism (Wave 3)		Attitudes about Gender Favoritism (Wave 3)	
Gender (male)	.07*** (.00)	.04*** (.00)	.05*** (.00)	.04*** (.00)	.05*** (.01)	.05*** (.00)
Education	-.05*** (.01)	.01* (.01)	-.01 (.01)	.03** (.01)	-.06*** (.01)	.00 (.01)
Income	-.06*** (.01)	-.06*** (.01)	-.07*** (.01)	-.06*** (.01)	.08*** (.01)	.03** (.01)
Race (black)	-.08*** (.01)	.04*** (.01)	-.02** (.01)	.06*** (.01)	-.04*** (.01)	.06*** (.01)
South	.02*** (.00)	-.01*** (.00)	.01 (.01)	-.02*** (.00)	-.00 (.01)	-.03*** (.01)
Age	-.01 (.01)	-.07*** (.01)	-.12*** (.01)	-.10*** (.01)	.22*** (.02)	.07*** (.01)
Party Identification (Republican)		.07*** (.01)		.04*** (.01)		.07*** (.01)
Ideology (Conservative)		.05*** (.01)		.01 (.01)		.06*** (.01)
Campaign Contact		.03*** (.01)		.00 (.01)		-.01 (.01)
Political Interest		-.01* (.01)		-.02** (.01)		.02** (.01)
Perceptions of Racial Favoritism		.48*** (.01)		.43*** (.01)		
Attitudes about Racial Favoritism						.57*** (.01)
Constant	.41*** (.01)	.13*** (.01)	.40*** (.01)	.18*** (.01)	.52*** (.01)	.08*** (.01)
Sample Size	18,663	18,131	9,722	9,505	9,685	9,434
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.03	.35	.02	.30	.03	.36

*Note.* Presents ordinary least squares regression coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. All variables range from 0 to 1. Higher values on the dependent variables indicate perceiving greater gender favoritism and evaluating gender favoritism negatively. \*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05, #p<.10