Leadership, Gender, and Politics: Political Perceptions and Participation of Young Female Voters in a Presidential Primary

Mary Christine Banwart
and Kelly Winfrey

The political arena, where historically women in the United States have been under-represented, provides an important laboratory for examining leadership and gender via the candidacy of now Secretary of State Hilary Rodham Clinton, who in 2008 was the first woman to run competitively for the Democratic presidential nomination.[1] This study sought to better understand if young women differed in their levels of perceived information about and interest in such an election, and if such perceptions influenced their political knowledge, interest, and engagement. For this study, we drew from Campbell and Wolbrecht's (2006) theory of a "role model effect," which proposes that the presence of "visible female role models" (p. 233) increases the likelihood that young women will indicate higher levels of political involvement, which includes both attitudes toward politics and behaviors leading toward political engagement.

The "Role Model Effect" Theory

Scholars argue that the presence of female leadership in the political realm of our society is important in order to maintain a stable, representative, open democratic government and a government which citizens can trust to provide equal opportunities (Atkeson, 2003; Dolan, 2006; Thomas, 1998; Verba, Burns, & Schlozman, 1997). Further, they draw connections between those in representative positions and those whose voices are more likely to be represented in terms of policy, as well as to whom the government is more responsive. In terms of the more specific role of leadership, Atkeson

Mary Christine Banwart is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Kansas. Her area of research focuses on political campaign communication as well as the influence of gender in politics and leadership.

Kelly Winfrey is a doctoral student in the Department of Communications at the University of Kansas. She is an assistant coach of the University of Kansas debate team and has also coached at Missouri State University, helping both universities qualify for the National Debate Tournament

(2003) argued that "the lack of political women leaders sends a cue to women citizens that they are more subjects than citizens, fit to be led, but not to lead, and better ruled, than rulers" (p. 1043).

The lack of gender parity in leadership in the political arena has led scholars to more carefully consider the extent of women voters' participation in the political arena, calling forth new lenses through which to study the phenomenon, such as role model effect theory (Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006), the symbolic representation hypothesis (Dolan, 2006), and the contextual cue theory (Atkeson, 2003). All three seek to determine whether the presence of a female candidate running for office encourages increased political engagement among women.

Depending upon the design of the study, recent research suggests that there is mixed support for the role model effect theory. According to Hansen (1997), the presence of women on a major party ballot correlated with an increase in women voters' political awareness, self-confidence, and proselytizing. Furthermore, this relationship was strongest when the female candidate addressed women's concerns. Atkinson (2003) and Verba et al. (1997) found that the presence of a female candidate in races for higher offices correlated with an increase in political knowledge among women. In these studies, women demonstrated greater knowledge of the candidates, interest in the campaign, and propensity to discuss politics. Campbell and Wolbrecht's (2006) study of adolescent females also offered some support with anticipated political engagement increasing at two points in time, 1985 and 1993, that coincided with Geraldine Ferraro's vice presidential nomination in 1984 and the heralded "Year of the Woman" in 1992. However, in Dolan's 2006 study of the U.S. House and Senate races between 1990 and 2004 that included female candidates, she concluded that among the female candidates' constituents there was no clear pattern of influence across party, level of office, or competitiveness of the race although there were some individual instances of influence.

Until 2008, we were unable to examine the impact of a viable female candidate competing for the nation's most visible office, the presidency.[2] Presidential primaries and elections carry extensive media coverage and hence increase the likelihood of greater information dissemination about a viable female candidate. In 2007, Hillary Rodham Clinton (hereafter referred to as "Clinton") launched her bid for the Democrat party's presidential nomination, and in 2008 she became the first woman to win a major party's presidential primary. Clinton's candidacy lasted through June of 2008 when she suspended her candidacy and Barack Obama secured the necessary number of ballots at the Democrat National Convention.

Method

This section includes two hypothesis and three research questions that guided the study; describes data sources and subjects; explains the survey instruments used in the study; and provides an explanation of the limitations of the study. Using role model effect theory, we sought to explore the political participation of a sample of young female voters, ages 18-33, in 2008 in comparison to that of a sample in 2006, a year that did not feature a woman in the presidential race.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

For interpersonal communication competence, we formulated the following hypothesis:

H1: The 2008 sample of young female voters will be more likely to feel competent to communicate interpersonally about politics during the 2008 primary campaign than subjects in the sample used for the 2006 midterm election.

The role model effect theory asserts that the presence of a viable female candidate seeking a political leadership position would be more likely to engage female citizens. Specifically, the candidate would encourage greater levels of gender identification, particularly in a race where opponents are male. We therefore advanced our second hypothesis:

H2: The 2008 sample of young female voters will be more likely to identify with their gender during the 2008 presidential primary than subjects in the sample used for the 2006 midterm election.

We also sought to measure young female's political participation through their levels of perceived knowledge and interest, and their perceptions of being qualified to participate in politics. As such, we posed the first research question:

RQ1: Will the 2008 sample of young female voters have higher levels of perceptual capability during the 2008 presidential primary than subjects in the sample used for the 2006 midterm election?

Because voter cynicism has been linked to political participatory behaviors (Kaid, McKinney, & Tedesco, 2000) as well as to perceptions of knowledge (Banwart, 2007a), we posed our second research question:

RQ2: Will levels of political cynicism differ between the 2008 and 2006 samples?

In order to inquire as to whether traditional gender-related leadership traits were assigned differently due to a role model effect in the 2008 election, we posed our third research question:

RQ3: Will subjects in the 2008 sample rate Hillary Clinton differently on gender-related leadership traits than her male opponent, Barak Obama?

Data Sources and Subjects

The data analyzed in this study were collected at two points in time from two different samples by means of surveys of female college students in the authors' undergraduate communication and political science courses. The 2006 data were collected from 210 students in October 2006 during the fall midterm election cycle. (See Appendix A for the 2006 survey instrument.) In 2008, data were collected from 170 students in March during the presidential primary election. (See Appendix B for the 2008 survey instrument.)

The median age for participants was 20 years of age in 2006 and 19 and 2008 while the mean was 20 years of age in both samples. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 33 in 2006 and 18 to 28 in 2008. The samples were fairly similar with regard to political party identification. In 2006, the composition of the sample was 36% Democrat, 41% Republican, and 23% independent/other; while in 2008, it was 42% Democrat, 38% Republican, and 21% independent/other. Approximately, three-fourths of participants in each sample identified themselves as registered to vote, specifically 78% in 2006 and 77% in 2008. Sample composition by race/ethnicity was also similar. (See Table 1.)

Table 1
Composition of Samples by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Percentage by Year	
	2006	2008
African American	5.0	5.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.0	5.0
Native American	0.5	0.0
Spanish/Hispanic Origin	2.0	2.0
White (Non-Hispanic)	87.0	87.0
Multiracial	1.0	1.0
n	210	170

Instruments

Both surveys asked participants to provide demographic data and to answer questions concerning their political interpersonal communication; gender identification; perceptual capability; cynicism levels; and political identification. In addition, in the 2008 survey, participants completed questions on leadership image.

Political Interpersonal Communication Competence. To examine participants' perceptions of their competence to engage in interpersonal communication about politics, both surveys began with the 15-item Political Interpersonal Communication (PIC) Index (Banwart, 2007b). (See Part 1 of each survey.) These items measured participants' cognitive engagement, perceived relevance, and perceived knowledge. The index achieved acceptable Cronbach's alpha levels for reliability in 2006 (.87) and 2008 (.84).

Gender Identification. For gender identification, the surveys employed a 4-item measure developed by Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, and Owen (2002). (See Part III of the 2006 survey and Part II of the 2008 survey.) Participants responded to a 7- point scale (1=strongly disagree to 7= strongly agree) with higher scores indicating stronger identification with one's gender group. The scale was reliable for 2006 ($a = .96$) and 2008 ($a = .96$).

Perceptual capability. To measure participants' perceptual capability regarding the political election–that is, how likely were they to feel they were informed, interested, and qualified to participate–the participants self-reported on three items. (See Part IV of the 2006 survey and Part III of the 2008 survey.) A five-point scale accompanied each item. The items were summed and mean scores calculated for the perceptual capability scale. The items achieved acceptable Cronbach's alpha levels for reliability in 2006 (.80) and 2008 (.82).

Cynicism. The eight scale items (a-j) used to measure the cynicism toward politics were adapted from the National Election Survey conducted by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center; this variation has been used in prior research studies examining cynicism during political election cycles (see Kaid et al., 2000; Kaid & Tedesco, 1999; McKinney & Banwart, 2005). (See Part II of the 2006 survey

and Part IV of the 2008 survey.) Items asked participants to rate their belief in their ability to influence politics, trust in politicians, and ability to understand politics, using a five-point scale (1=disagree strongly to 5=strongly agree). The items achieved acceptable Cronbach's alpha levels for reliability in 2006 (.75) and 2008 (.75), similar to that of previous research using the scale (Kaid, 2003; Kaid & Postelnicu, 2004; Tedesco & Kaid, 2003). The scores on the cynicism items were summed to create a mean cynicism score for each participant.

Leadership image evaluations. For the 2008 survey, twelve items were drawn from an instrument employing semantic differential scales to study political candidate image evaluations (see Kaid & Tedesco, 1999; Sanders & Pace, 1977; Tedesco & Kaid, 2003). (See Part V of the 2008 survey.) However, only eight were deemed specific to female and male leadership traits: honest, believable, sincere, friendly, qualified, successful, strong, and active (Bystrom et al., 2004). These eight items are equally representative of feminine leadership traits–honest, believable, sincere, and friendly–and masculine leadership traits–qualified, successful, strong, and active (Bystrom, Banwart, Kaid, & Robertson, 2004). A 7 point scale, indicated by the number of "spaces" on the semantic differential scale on the survey instrument, was used. Both scales produced high reliability for both candidates. Cronbach's alpha for the feminine image trait scale was acceptable for both candidates (Clinton= .91; Obama=.88) as was the masculine image trait scale (Clinton= .88; Obama= .87). The feminine and masculine semantic differential scales were then summed to create two candidate leadership image mean scores for each candidate.

Limitations

The use of the phrase "role model effect" does not suggest that this study was causal. In addition, the study faced four sampling issues: (1) Sampling was not random, and therefore results are not generalizable beyond the participants; (2) A different group of students was sampled in 2006 than in 2008 without use of a matched pairs methodology, limiting the ability to draw conclusions regarding differences in the two groups from statistical results; (3) The sample included political science students who may have had greater interest in elections and politics than a sample of students from other areas of academic study; and (4) The exclusive choice of college students for the samples is not representative of the range of education levels among the population of young female voters. Further, the study did not take into account the potential impact of the presence of the first viable African American candidate on political participation, particularly among younger voters.

Results

Political Interpersonal Communication Competence

A one-way between subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the three dependent variables, cognitive engagement, perceived relevance, and perceived knowledge. Election years served as the independent variables. No statistically significant differences were found. (See Table 2.) Therefore the hypothesis that the young female voters sampled in 2008 would feel more competent to communicate interpersonally about politics during the 2008 presidential primary campaign than those sampled for the 2006 midterm election was rejected.

Table 2
Political Interpersonal Communication Ratings: 2006 and 2008

| Political Interpersonal Communication | Year | | | |
| | 2006 | | 2008 | |
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cognitive engagement	3.06	0.96	3.23	0.84
Perceived relevance	3.85	0.66	3.87	0.63
Perceived knowledge	1.98	0.63	1.94	0.60

Wilk's Λ = .989,
F(3, 376) = 1.41,
p = .24.

Gender Identification

An independent sample t-test was conducted, and no statistically significant differences were found between female voters in 2008 (mean = 6.33, standard deviation = 1.10) and female voters in 2006 (mean = 6.37, standard deviation = 1.07), (t (337) = .380, p = .70). Therefore, the hypothesis that young female voters would be more highly gender-identified during the 2008 presidential primary campaign was rejected.

Perceptual Capability

For the first research question, an independent samples t-test of mean scores was statistically significant. Therefore, we concluded that during the 2008 presidential primaries that survey respondents reported perceiving greater personal capability regarding the election (mean = 3.38, standard deviation = .923) than did respondents in 2006 (mean = 2.77, standard deviation = 1.03), (t (373.99) = 6.07, p < .001).

Cynicism

For the second research question, an independent samples t-test of mean scores was statistically significant. We concluded that during the 2008 presidential primaries survey respondents were less likely to report they were cynical about politics (mean= 3.03, standard deviation = .641) than were females in 2006 (mean = 3.19, standard deviation = .609), (t (378) = -2.46, p = .014).

Candidate Leadership Image Comparisons

For the third research question, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted. The means and standard deviations for each candidate leadership traits are presented in Table 3. The results for the ANOVA indicated a statistically significant result (Wilk's Λ = .54, F(3, 167) = 47.97, p < .001, multivariate $\eta2$ = .46).

Follow-up paired sample t-tests indicated statistically significant results for three of four pairs of leadership trait scores: (1) Clinton's

Table 3
Candidate Leadership Trait Evaluation

Gender Traits	Hillary Clinton		Barak Obama	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Feminine	4.24	1.45	5.08	1.28
Masculine	5.13	1.38	5.28	1.18

masculine leadership trait scores compared to feminine leadership trait scores; (2) Obama's masculine leadership trait scores compared to feminine leadership trait scores; (3) Obama's feminine leadership trait scores compared to those of Clinton; and (4) Obama's masculine leadership trait scores compared to those of Clinton. (See Table 3.) The mean score for Clinton on the masculine leadership trait scale (mean = 5.13, standard deviation = 1.38) was statistically significant and higher than her mean score on the feminine leadership trait scale (mean = 4.24, standard deviation = 1.45) (t(169) = 11.70, $p < .001$). The mean score for Obama on the masculine leadership trait scale (mean = 5.28, standard deviation = 1.18) was also statistically significant and higher than his mean score on the feminine leadership trait scale (mean = 5.08, standard deviation = 1.28) (t(169) = 3.48, $p = .001$). There was no statistically significant difference between their scores on the masculine leadership trait scale. However, the difference on the feminine leadership trait scale where Obama's score was higher than that of Clinton was statistically significant.

Conclusions

Although our findings indicated that young women participants were more engaged in the 2008 primary election, a result not surprising since voter interest in general is higher during presidential cycles than midterm cycles, support for an overall role model effect was mixed. Results did not indicate a statistically significant change in young female voters' assessment of their competence to talk about politics between 2006 and 2008. Because possessing knowledge about politics is strongly connected to engagement and active participation (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996; Kim, Wyatt, & Katz, 1999), and because earlier research has found a connection between a visible and viable female candidate and increased political discussion among young females (Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006), such findings are surprising and may speak to the limitations of the samples. Our second hypothesis, predicting that young female voters would be more gender-identified during the 2008 presidential primary because of Clinton's candidacy, was also rejected. In both 2006 and 2008 the samples reported similar, high levels of gender identification. This mix of findings is intriguing and provides encouragement for future research in women voters' engagement and gender-identification as it relates to women candidates.

On the other hand, results indicated that participants perceived themselves as more knowledgeable, interested, and qualified to participate in the 2008 election. These findings are similar to those in prior research studying the effects of competitive female candidates in senate and gubernatorial races (Atkeson, 2003). Also, participants' cynicism decreased between 2006 and 2008. Interestingly, although

young female voters have a history of voting in greater numbers than their male cohorts (Center for American Women and Politics, 2008b), they also have a history of relatively higher levels of cynicism (Banwart, 2007a) and report in lower percentages that it is important they influence the political structure (Center for American Women and Politics, 2008b).[3] Because cynicism is also linked to a likelihood to feel competent to communicate about politics (Banwart, 2007b), perhaps there are thresholds that need to be met in order for an influence to be evidenced in perceptions of political communicative competencies.

Since masculine traits historically have been considered by voters (in general) to be important for presidential candidates (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993a; Lawless, 2004; Rosenwasser & Dean, 1989; Rosenwasser & Seale, 1988), it is interesting to note that there were no statistically significant differences between Clinton and Obama on how strongly they were perceived to exhibit masculine traits such as qualified, successful, strong, and active. However, Obama was perceived to possess higher levels of feminine leadership traits, such as honesty, believability, sincerity, and friendliness. These findings contrast with prior literature that suggest voters more often associate feminine traits with female candidates (Lawless, 2004; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993b; Rosenwasser & Seale, 1988) and view them as unimportant. As more women seek to break the presidential glass ceiling, scholars should continue examining where that balance between necessary evidence of feminine traits and required evidence of masculine traits lies in the voters' minds, the role that the level of office plays in the voters' analysis, and to what extent violations of a social role incongruity can ever be overcome. The answers to such questions promise to offer important insights into the dynamic of gender, politics, and leadership.

References

Atkeson, L.R. (2003). Not all cues are created equal: The conditional impact of female candidates on political engagement. *The Journal of Politics*, 65(4), 1040-1061.

Banwart, M.C. (2007a). Gender and young voters in 2004: The influence of perceived knowledge and interest. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50, 1152-1168.

Banwart, M.C. (2007b). *The Political Interpersonal Communication Index: Developing a measure for understanding why we talk politics*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Bennett, S.E. (1997). Knowledge of politics and sense of subjective political competence. *American Politics Quarterly*, 25, 230-240.

Bystrom, D.G., Banwart, M.C., Kaid, L.L., & Robertson, T.A. (2004). *Gender and political candidate communication: Videostyle, webstyle, and newsstyle*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, D.E., & Wolbrecht, C. (2006). See Jane run: Women politicians as role models for adolescents. *The Journal of Politics*, 68, 233-247.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2008a). *Fast facts: Information by level of office*. Retrieved November 15, 2008, from www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/congress.php.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2008b). *Young women and politics*. Retrieved January 30, 2009 from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/voters/documents/young.pdf.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2009a). *Facts on women in state legislatures*. Retrieved January 30, 2009, from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/StateLeg-CurrentFacts.php.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2009b). *Women in elective office 2009*. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/documents/elective.pdf.

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

Dolan, K. (2006). Symbolic mobilization?: The impact of candidate sex in American elections. *American Politics Research*, 34, 687-704.

Hansen, S.B. (1997). Talking about politics: Gender and contextual effects on political proselytizing. *The Journal of Politics*, 59(1), 73-103.

Heith, D.J. (2001). Footwear, lipstick, and an Orthodox Sabbath: Media coverage of nontraditional candidates. *White House Studies*, 1, 335-349.

Heldman, C., Carroll, S.J., & Olson, S. (2005). "She brought only a skirt": Print media coverage of Elizabeth Dole's bid for the Republican presidential nomination. *Political Communication*, 22, 315-335.

Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N.S. (1993a). The consequences of gender stereotypes for women candidates at different levels and types of office. *Political Research Quarterly*, 46, 503-525.

Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N.S. (1993b). Gender stereotypes and the perception of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37, 119-147.

Kaid, L.L. (2003). Effects of political information in the 2000 presidential campaign: Comparing traditional television and internet exposure. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46, 677-691.

Kaid, L.L., & Tedesco, J. (1999). Presidential candidate presentation: Videostyle in the 1996 presidential spots. In L.L. Kaid & D.G. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election* (pp. 209-222). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kaid, L.L., McKinney, M.S., & Tedesco, J.C. (2000). *Civic dialogue in the 1996 presidential campaign: Candidate, media, and public voices*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Kaid, L.L., & Postelnicu, M. (2004). Political advertising in the 2004 election: Comparison of traditional television and Internet messages. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 265-278.

Kim, J., Wyatt, R.O., & Katz, E. (1999). News, talk, opinion, participation: The part played by conversation in deliberative democracy. *Political Communication*, 16, 361-385.

Lawless, J.L. (2004). Women, war, and winning elections: Gender stereotyping in the post-September 11th era. *Political Research Quarterly*, 57, 479-490.

McKinney, M.S., & Banwart, M.C. (2005). Rocking the youth vote through debate: Examining the effects of a citizen versus journalist controlled debate on civic engagement. *Journalism Studies*, 6, 153-163.

Rosenwasser, S.M., & Dean, N.G. (1989). Gender role and political office: Effects of perceived masculinity/femininity of candidate and political office. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13, 77-85.

Rosenwasser, S.M., & Seale, J. (1988). Attitudes toward a hypothetical male or female presidential candidate—A research note. *Political Psychology*, 9, 591-598.

Sanders, K., & Pace, T. (1977). The influence of speech communication on the image of a political candidate: "Limited effects" revisited. In B.D. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication yearbook I* (pp. 465-474). New Brunswick, NH: Transaction Books.

Schmitt, M.T., Branscombe, N.R., Kobrynowicz, D., & Owen, S. (2002). Perceiving discrimination against one's gender group has different implications for well-being in women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 197-210.

Seelye, K.Q. (1999, October 21). The Dole candidacy: The overview. *New York Times*, p. A1.

Tedesco, J.C., & Kaid, L.L. (2003). Style and effects of the Bush and Gore spots. In L.L. Kaid, J.C. Tedesco, D.G. Bystrom, & M S. McKinney (Eds.), *The Millennium Election: Communication in the 2000 Campaign* (pp. 5-16). New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Thomas, S. (1998). Introduction: Women and elective office: Past, present, and future. In S. Thomas & C. Wilcox (Eds.), *Women and elective office* (pp. 1-14). New York: Oxford University Press.

Verba, S., Burns, N., & Scholzman, K.L. (1997). Knowing and caring about politics: Gender and political engagement. *The Journal of Politics,* 59(4), 1051-1072.

Endnotes

[1] To date, all presidents serving the United States have been male, and only 2% of those serving in the U.S. Congress since 1789 have been women (Center for American Women and Politics, 2008a). Granted, there has been a steady increase of women elected to Congressional seats over the past three decades, from 3% in 1979 to 23.9% in 2009 (Center for American Women and Politics, 2009b). Currently, eight women are state governors, and 29.3% of state legislators are female (Center for American Women and Politics, 2009a). Yet, these levels remain far below gender parity.

[2] We acknowledge Elizabeth Dole's short run for the Republican presidential nomination has been noted as the first time that a woman was considered to be a viable presidential candidate (Heith, 2001; Heldman, Carroll, & Olson, 2005; Seelye, 1999). However, she relinquished her bid in the fall of 1999, well before the presidential primaries began.

[3] It should be noted that voting is not the only political engagement activity to which cynicism has been linked. Political cynicism in general has been linked to political efficacy (Verba et al., 1997), feeling less able to understand politics (Bennett, 1997; Bystrom et al., 2004), and perceived levels of knowledge (Banwart, 2007a).

Survey ID Number (below, place the **first 2 letters of your last name**, and **last 4 digits of your student ID #**):

_____   _____   _____ _____ _____ _____   _____

(first 2 letters of last name)   *(last 4 digits of your student ID #)*   *(dial#)*

I. The following statements concern your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I stay up to date on current politcal topics and issues.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have developed opinions on political issues and topics.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am comfortable starting a discussion about political issues with my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I know enough information about politics and political issues to talk about them with people I don't know very well.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I enjoy talking about political issues and topics with others who don't think like me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I have a good understanding about politics and political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I do not understand how politics and political issues relate to me.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Before participating in a conversation about politics I should be knowledgeable about the issue.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I am interested in politics and political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Politics and political issues are just about conflict and disagreement.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Politics and political issues have a direct influence in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I would not discuss political affairs with someone unless I knew something about the issue.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Politics and political issues just don't impact me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I am likely to take an equal share in the conversation when discussing politics and political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
15. It is important that I obtain news about a political topic from several sources before I will talk about it with others.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix A continued

II. Following are some feelings about politics and politicians. For each one, please circle whether you strongly agree, agree somewhat, have no opinion, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly.

a. Whether I vote or not has no influence on what politicians do.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

b. One never knows what politicians really think.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

c. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

d. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

e. One can be confident that politicians will always do the right thing.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

f. Politicians often quickly forget their election promises after a political campaign is over.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

g. Politicians are more interested in power than in what the people think.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

h. One cannot always trust what politicians say.

     Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

III. Using a scale of I– (I=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree), please circle the number that corresponds to your response to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
a. I value being a member of my gender group.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. I am proud to be a member of my gender group.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. I like being a member of my gender group.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. I believe that being a member of my gender group is a positive experience.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7

IV. How informed do you think you are about the upcoming election? (please mark an "x" the space on the scale below that most closely represents your response)

Very well informed   5:____:____:____:____:____:I   **Very uninformed**

How interested would you say you are in the upcoming election?

Very interested   5:____:____:____:____:____:I   **Not interested at all**

I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics.

Strongly Agree   5:____:____:____:____:____:I   **Strongly Disagree**

V. Now we'd like to get a little information about you:
Please mark one:

_____ male   _____ female

Age _____

Which of the following best represents your ethnic background (circle one):

(1) Asian or Pacific Islander   (2) Non-Hispanic White (Caucasian)   (3) African-American

(4) Spanish or Hispanic origin   (5) Multi-racial or mixed race   (6) Native American

(7) Other (*name*): _____

Are you registered to vote? (circle one)   (1) YES   (2) NO

When thinking about politics and government, do you consider yourself to be (please circle):

| *very conservative* | *somewhat conservative* | *moderate* | *somewhat liberal* | *very liberal* |

Which of the following best represents your political party affiliation? Check ONLY ONE of the following:

(1) _____ Democrat   (2) _____ Republican   (3) _____ Independent/Unaffiliated

(4) _____ Other (*name*): _____

Thinking of the party affiliation that you have just identified, what is the strength of your affiliation?

strong :____:____:____:____:____: weak

Thank you.
The survey is now complete.
Please check with one of the group facilitators to check out.

Survey ID Number (below, place the ***first 2 letters of your last name***, and ***last 4 digits of your student ID #***):

_____   _____   _____ _____ _____ _____

(first 2 letters of last name)   *(last 4 digits of your student ID #)*

I. The following statements concern your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

I. I stay up to date on current politcal topics and issues.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. I have developed opinions on political issues and topics.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3. I am comfortable starting a discussion about political issues with my friends.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. I know enough information about politics and political issues to talk about them with people I don't know very well.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. I enjoy talking about political issues and topics with others who don't think like me.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. I have a good understanding about politics and political issues.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. I do not understand how politics and political issues relate to me.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Before participating in a conversation about politics I should be knowledgeable about the issue.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
9. I am interested in politics and political issues.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I0. Politics and political issues are just about conflict and disagreement.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
II. Politics and political issues have a direct influence in my life.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I2. I would not discuss political affairs with someone unless I knew something about the issue.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I3. Politics and political issues just don't impact me.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I4. I am likely to take an equal share in the conversation when discussing politics and political issues.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I5. It is important that I obtain news about a political topic from several sources before I will talk about it with others.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

II. Using a scale of 1– (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree), please circle the number that corresponds to your response to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
a. I value being a member of my gender group.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. I am proud to be a member of my gender group.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. I like being a member of my gender group.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. I believe that being a member of my gender group is a positive experience.	I	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please respond to each of the questions below regarding your perception of the upcoming election and participation:

III. How informed do you think you are about the upcoming election? (*please mark an "x" the space on the scale below that most closely represents your response*)

Very well informed   5:____:____:____:____:____:I   **Very uninformed**

How interested would you say you are in the upcoming election?

Very interested   5:____:____:____:____:____:I   **Not interested at all**

I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics.

Strongly Agree   5:____:____:____:____:____:I   **Strongly Disagree**

IV. Now, following are some feelings about politics and politicians. For each one, please circle whether you strongly agree, agree somewhat, have no opinion, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly.

a. Whether I vote or not has no influence on what politicians do.

   Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

b. One never knows what politicians really think.

   Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

c. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

   Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

d. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

   Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

e. One can be confident that politicians will always do the right thing.

      Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

f. Politicians often quickly forget their election promises after a political campaign is over.

      Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

g. Politicians are more interested in power than in what the people think.

      Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

h. One cannot always trust what politicians say.

      Strongly Agree   Agree Somewhat   Have no Opinion   Disagree Somewhat   Disagree Strongly

V. Next, please evaluate the candidates on each of the scales below. For example, if you think the candidate is very pleasant you would check the UNPLEASANT-PLEASANT scale as follows:

UNPLEASANT: _____:____:____:____:____:____:__X__: PLEASANT

On the other hand, if you think a candidate is very unpleasant, you would rate them as follows:

UNPLEASANT: __X__:____:____:____:____:____:____: PLEASANT

If you think the candidate is somewhere between the two extremes, check the space that best represents your reaction on the scale. If you feel you have no reaction to a particular candidate on any one scale or if you're unfamiliar with the candidate, check the middle space on the scale (as illustrated) to indicate your neutrality.

: ____:____:____:__X__:____:____:____:

Barack Obama

UNQUALIFIED: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: QUALIFIED

UNSOPHISTICATED: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SOPHISTICATED

DISHONEST: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: HONEST

BELIEVABLE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNBELIEVABLE

UNSUCCESSFUL: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SUCCESSFUL

ATTRACTIVE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNATTRACTIVE

UNFRIENDLY: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: FRIENDLY

INSINCERE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SINCERE

CALM: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: EXCITABLE

AGGRESSIVE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNAGGRESSIVE

STRONG: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: WEAK

INACTIVE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: ACTIVE

Hillary Clinton

UNQUALIFIED: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: QUALIFIED

UNSOPHISTICATED: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SOPHISTICATED

DISHONEST: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: HONEST

BELIEVABLE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNBELIEVABLE

UNSUCCESSFUL: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SUCCESSFUL

ATTRACTIVE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNATTRACTIVE

UNFRIENDLY: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: FRIENDLY

INSINCERE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SINCERE

CALM: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: EXCITABLE

AGGRESSIVE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNAGGRESSIVE

STRONG: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: WEAK

INACTIVE: _____:____:____:____:____:____:____: ACTIVE

VI. If the election for this race were held today, based on what you have seen for whom would you vote?

[rotate]

Hillary Clinton _____

Barack Obama _____

VII. Now we have just a few more questions about you:
Please mark one:

_____ male   _____ female

Age _____

Which of the following best represents your ethnic background (circle one):

(1) Asian or Pacific Islander   (2) Non-Hispanic White (Caucasian)   (3) African-American

(4) Spanish or Hispanic origin   (5) Multi-racial or mixed race   (6) Native American

(7) Other (*name*): _____

Are you registered to vote? (*circle one*)   (1) YES   (2) NO

When thinking about politics and government, do you consider yourself to be (please circle):

very *conservative*	*somewhat* *conservative*	*moderate*	*somewhat* *liberal*	*very* *liberal*

Appendix B continued

Which of the following best represents your political party affiliation? Check ONLY ONE of the following:

(I) _____ Democrat   (2) _____ Republican   (3) _____ Independent/Unaffiliated

(4) _____ Other (*name*): _____

Thank you.
The survey is now complete.
Please check with one of the group facilitators to check out.

[1] Copyright, University of Kansas.