**More Money, Less Credit? Legislator Gender and the Effectiveness of Congressional Credit Claiming**

**Appendix**

**Table A1: Demographics of Survey Sample**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Ideology** |
| 53% Women | 69% White | 10% Very liberal |
| 47% Men | 11% Black | 13% Liberal |
|  | 7% Latino | 9% Slightly liberal |
|  | 6% Mixed | 37% Moderate |
|  | 4% Asian | 9% Slightly conservative |
|  | 2% Other | 13% Conservative |
|  |  | 9% Very conservative |
| **Party** | **Region** | **Religious Attendance** |
| 37% Democrats | 37% South | 40% Never |
| 31% Republicans | 23% West | 26% Few times a year |
| 31% Independents | 20% Northeast | 8% Once or twice a month |
|  | 19% Midwest | 8% Almost every week |
|  |  | 17% Every week |
| **Income** | **Age** | **Education** |
| Median: $40,000-$49,999 | Median: 45 | 3% Less than high school diploma |
|  |  | 27% High school graduate |
|  |  | 22% Some college |
|  |  | 7% 2-year degree |
|  |  | 24% 4-year degree |
|  |  | 16% Post-graduate education |

**Table A2: MC Gender Treatment Balance**
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NOTE: The table shows a balance test of MC Gender assignment.

**Table A3: Message Treatment Balance**
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NOTE: The table shows a balance test of MC message assignment.

**Pre-treatment questionnaire**

Which racial group(s) do you consider yourself to be a part of? (Mark all that apply)

Asian American (1)

Black or African American (2)

Hispanic or Latino (3)

Native American or American Indian (4)

White (5)

Other (6)

In general, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?

Very Liberal (0)

Liberal (1)

Slightly Liberal (2)

Moderate (3)

Slightly Conservative (4)

Conservative (5)

Very Conservative (6)

How often do you attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals?

Every week (4)

Almost every week (3)

Once or twice a month (2)

A few times a year (1)

Never (0)

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

▼ Less than high school diploma (0) ... Post-graduate education (5)

What is your annual household income for all members of your family? This figure should include salaries, wages, pensions, dividends, interest, and all other income.

▼ Under $10,000 (0) ... Over $200,000 (11)

The Supreme Court is currently deciding on a number of important cases. We would like to know whether people actually read survey questions. Please answer "slightly interested" to show us that you read this question.

Extremely interested (1)

Very interested (2)

Moderately interested (3)

Slightly interested (4)

Not interested at all (5)

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a...?

Strong Republican (0)

Not very strong Republican (1)

Independent (2)

Not very strong Democrat (3)

Strong Democrat (4)

If you had to choose, do you think of yourself as more similar to Republicans or Democrats?

More similar to Republicans than Democrats (0)

More similar to Democrats than Republicans (1)

**Treatment Messages**

**Control**

*Please read the following news*excerpt*about a member of Congress. After which, you will be asked to evaluate the member.*

|  |
| --- |
| **{Congresswoman/Congresswoman} Anderson Announces Winner of Art Competition**    Today, Congresswoman/Congressman Madeline/Matthew Anderson (D/R | MN) announced that 17-year-old Nate Beyer won first place in the annual congressional district art competition. Nate's winning entry, "Sunsets," was created using colored pencils and will now be displayed in the U.S. Capitol with other winning entries. More than 30 students competed is this year's art competition. |
|  |

**Credit Claim**

*Please read the following news*excerpt*about a member of Congress. After which, you will be asked to evaluate the member.*

|  |
| --- |
| **{Congresswoman/Congresswoman} Anderson Secures $44 Million for Local Road and Highway Projects**    Today, Congresswoman/Congressman Madeline/Matthew Anderson (D/R | MN)) released the following statement after securing more than $44 million in funding within the Fiscal Year 2023 appropriations bill for local road and highway projects in her district.  "I am proud of our efforts to secure this funding, which will play a critical role in uplifting our people and unlocking our region's full potential," said Congresswoman Anderson. "The millions of dollars coming home will support good-paying jobs, revitalize neighborhoods, and drive our economy forward." |
|  |

**Credit Claim with Spending Critique**

*Please read the following news*excerpt*about a member of Congress. After which, you will be asked to evaluate the member.*

|  |
| --- |
| **{Congresswoman/Congresswoman} Anderson Secures $44 Million for Local Road and Highway Projects**    Today, Congresswoman/Congressman Madeline/Matthew Anderson (D/R | MN) released the following statement after securing more than $44 million in funding within the Fiscal Year 2023 appropriations bill for local road and highway projects in her district.  "I am proud of our efforts to secure this funding, which will play a critical role in uplifting our people and unlocking our region's full potential," said Congresswoman Anderson. "The millions of dollars coming home will support good-paying jobs, revitalize neighborhoods, and drive our economy forward."  The nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget reported that the appropriations bill is wasteful and contributes to the growing federal deficit. "Given that the national debt has grown by $1.1 trillion since January, lawmakers' decision to add more spending and borrowing in this appropriations package is a tremendous mistake. The full spending package is estimated to cost $1.6 trillion and makes our debt and inflationary problems worse." |
|  |

**Post-treatment questionnaire**

How pleased would you be if Madeline/Matthew Anderson was your representative in Congress?

Very Pleased (6)

Pleased (5)

Slightly Pleased (4)

Neither Pleased Nor Displeased (3)

Slightly Displeased (2)

Displeased (1)

Very Displeased (0)

How effective do you think Madeline/Matthew Anderson is at passing legislation that helps his community?

Very Effective (6)

Effective (5)

Slightly Effective (4)

Neither Effective Nor Ineffective (3)

Slightly Ineffective (2)

Ineffective (1)

Very Ineffective (0)

How responsible do you think Madeline/Matthew Anderson is when it comes to governmental spending?

Very Responsible (6)

Responsible (5)

Slightly Responsible (4)

Neither Responsible Nor Irresponsible (3)

Slightly Irresponsible (2)

Irresponsible (1)

Very Irresponsible (0)

If you lived in Madeline/Matthew Anderson's congressional district, would you approve or disapprove of his performance in office?

Approve (1)

Disapprove (0)

How would you rate Madeline/Matthew Anderson's political ideology?

Very liberal (6)

Liberal (5)

Somewhat liberal (4)

Middle of the road (3)

Somewhat conservative (2)

Conservative (1)

Very conservative (0)

If you lived in Madeline/Matthew Anderson's congressional district, how likely would you be to vote for him?

Very Likely (6)

Likely (5)

Slightly Likely (4)

Neither Likely Nor Unlikely (3)

Slightly Unlikely (2)

Unlikely (1)

Very Unlikely (0)

How would you rate Madeline/Matthew Anderson's political ideology?

Very Liberal (6)

Liberal (5)

Somewhat Liberal (4)

Middle of the Road (3)

Somewhat Conservative (2)

Conservative (1)

Very Conservative (0)

**General Support Analysis:**

**Table A4: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: General Support**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control | 4.802 | 5.012 | -0.210 | 0.047 | **\*\*** |
| Credit Claim | 5.302 | 5.393 | -0.090 | 0.354 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.542 | 4.601 | -0.059 | 0.635 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC General Support (1-7).

**Table A5: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: General Support (Woman MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.380 | 0.001 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.792 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Control / Woman | -0.411 | 0.001 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC General Support (1-7).

**Table A6: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: General Support (Man MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Man - Claim / Man | -0.500 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Man - Claim / Man | -0.760 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Man - Control / Man | -0.260 | 0.040 | **\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC General Support (1-7).

**Table A7: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: General Support**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Woman - Control / Man | 0.210 | 0.385 |  |
| Claim / Woman - Claim / Man | 0.090 | 0.963 |  |
| Critique / Woman - Critique / Man | 0.059 | 0.995 |  |
| Control / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.380 | 0.007 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Control / Woman | -0.411 | 0.004 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.792 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Control / Man - Claim / Man | -0.500 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Man - Control / Man | -0.260 | 0.135 |  |
| Critique / Man - Claim / Man | -0.760 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Comparisons that vary on both substance condition and MC gender were included in the analysis but removed from the table for interpretation clarity. Dependent variable = MC General Support (1-7).

**Table A8: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: General Support (Partisan Subsets)**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Republican MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.864 | 5.075 | -0.210 | 0.315 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.460 | 5.429 | 0.032 | 0.852 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.623 | 4.534 | 0.089 | 0.728 |  |
| **Republican MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.565 | 5.114 | -0.549 | 0.025 | **\*\*** |
| Credit Claim | 5.138 | 5.267 | -0.129 | 0.499 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.347 | 4.841 | -0.494 | 0.052 | **\*** |
| **Democratic MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 5.178 | 5.167 | 0.012 | 0.949 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.657 | 5.633 | 0.024 | 0.900 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 5.011 | 4.912 | 0.099 | 0.631 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.590 | 4.658 | -0.068 | 0.741 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.861 | 5.225 | -0.364 | 0.101 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.245 | 4.030 | 0.215 | 0.429 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC General Support (1-7).

**Effectiveness Measure Analysis:**

**Table A9: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Effectiveness**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control | 4.642 | 4.727 | -0.085 | 0.373 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.321 | 5.451 | -0.130 | 0.166 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Effectiveness (1-7).

**Table A10: Difference of Means Test of Message: Effectiveness (Woman MC Subset)**

| Credit Claim | Control | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.451 | 4.727 | 0.724 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Effectiveness (1-7).

**Table A11: Difference of Means Test of Message: Effectiveness (Man MC Subset)**

| Credit Claim | Control | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.321 | 4.642 | 0.679 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Effectiveness (1-7).

**Table A12:** **ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: MC Effectiveness**

| Contrast | | Diff. of Means | | Adjusted P-value | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Claim / Woman - Claim / Man | 0.130 | | 0.519 | |  | | |
| Control / Woman - Control / Man | 0.085 | | 0.803 | |  | | |
| Control / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.724 | | 0.000 | | **\*\*\*** | | |
| Control / Man - Claim / Man | -0.679 | | 0.000 | | **\*\*\*** | | |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Comparisons that vary on both substance condition and MC gender were included in the analysis but removed from the table for interpretation clarity. Dependent variable = MC Effectiveness (1-7).

**Figure A1: Mean MC Effectiveness Across Treatment Group and Party Affiliation**
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**Table A13: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: MC Effectiveness (Partisan Subsets)**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Republican MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.630 | 4.791 | -0.161 | 0.371 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.460 | 5.459 | 0.001 | 0.995 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 5.091 | 5.125 | -0.034 | 0.877 |  |
| **Republican MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.543 | 4.848 | -0.305 | 0.149 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.046 | 5.324 | -0.278 | 0.120 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.941 | 5.058 | -0.117 | 0.621 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.921 | 4.854 | 0.067 | 0.687 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.598 | 5.633 | -0.035 | 0.847 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 5.319 | 5.341 | -0.022 | 0.909 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.460 | 4.392 | 0.068 | 0.737 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.139 | 5.394 | -0.255 | 0.239 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.857 | 4.612 | 0.245 | 0.316 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Effectiveness (1-7).

**Fiscal Responsibility Measure Analysis**

**Table A14: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Fiscal Responsibility**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Credit Claim | 5.009 | 5.168 | -0.158 | 0.109 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.420 | 4.513 | -0.093 | 0.470 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Fiscal Responsibility (1-7).

**Table A15: Difference of Means Test of Message: Responsibility (Woman MC Subset)**

| Credit Claim | Credit Claim with Critique | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.168 | 4.513 | 0.655 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Fiscal Responsibility (1-7).

**Table A16: Difference of Means Test of Message: Responsibility (Man MC Subset)**

| Credit Claim | Credit Claim with Critique | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.009 | 4.420 | 0.590 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Fiscal Responsibility (1-7).

**Table A17:** **ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: MC Fiscal Responsibility**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Critique Woman - Critique Man | 0.093 | 0.848 |  |
| Claim Woman - Claim Man | 0.158 | 0.506 |  |
| Critique Woman - Claim Woman | -0.655 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique Man - Claim Man | -0.590 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Comparisons that vary on both substance condition and MC gender were included in the analysis but removed from the table for interpretation clarity. Dependent variable = MC Fiscal Responsibility (1-7).

**Figure A2: Mean MC Fiscal Responsibility Across Treatment Group and Party Affiliation**
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**Table A18: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Responsibility (Partisan Subsets)**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Republican MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.556 | 4.701 | -0.146 | 0.412 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.000 | 5.092 | -0.092 | 0.625 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.455 | 4.386 | 0.068 | 0.790 |  |
| **Republican MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.533 | 4.684 | -0.151 | 0.469 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.989 | 5.133 | -0.145 | 0.403 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.337 | 4.681 | -0.345 | 0.198 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.802 | 4.802 | -0.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.284 | 5.478 | -0.193 | 0.317 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.857 | 4.978 | -0.121 | 0.578 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.450 | 4.304 | 0.146 | 0.445 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.653 | 4.930 | -0.277 | 0.238 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.071 | 3.881 | 0.191 | 0.502 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Fiscal Responsibility (1-7).

**Perceived Ideology Analysis**

**Figure A3: Mean MC Effectiveness Ratings**
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**Table A19: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Perceived Ideology**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control | 4.316 | 4.307 | 0.008 | 0.935 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.269 | 4.302 | -0.034 | 0.731 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.497 | 4.668 | -0.170 | 0.107 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Ideology (1-7).

**Table A20: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: Perceived Ideology (Woman MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Woman - Claim / Woman | 0.005 | 0.998 |  |
| Critique / Woman - Claim / Woman | 0.366 | 0.001 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Control / Woman | 0.360 | 0.002 | **\*\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Ideology (1-7).

**Table A21: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: Perceived Ideology (Man MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Man - Claim / Man | 0.047 | 0.886 |  |
| Critique / Man - Claim / Man | 0.229 | 0.060 | **\*** |
| Critique / Man - Control / Man | 0.182 | 0.146 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Ideology (1-7).

**Figure A4: Mean MC Perceived Ideology Across Treatment Group and Party Affiliation**
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**Table A22: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Perceived Ideology (Partisan Subsets)**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Republican MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 3.951 | 3.940 | 0.010 | 0.958 |  |
| Credit Claim | 3.857 | 3.867 | -0.010 | 0.961 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.247 | 4.443 | -0.196 | 0.357 |  |
| **Republican MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.000 | 4.063 | -0.063 | 0.783 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.103 | 4.286 | -0.182 | 0.324 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.356 | 4.493 | -0.136 | 0.556 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.653 | 4.469 | 0.185 | 0.246 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.627 | 4.656 | -0.028 | 0.873 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.667 | 4.846 | -0.179 | 0.316 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.560 | 4.658 | -0.098 | 0.607 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.319 | 4.479 | -0.159 | 0.462 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.684 | 4.910 | -0.227 | 0.318 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Ideology (1-7).

To explore whether MC perceived ideology mediates the press release message (control vs. critique) or MC gender (man vs. woman) treatments on general MC support, I conduct mediation analysis using the “mediate” package (Tingley et al. 2014). The substantively small and statistically insignificant mediate results shown below (ACME) indicate that perceived MC ideology is not a causal pathway for the experimental treatments on MC favorability.

**Table A23: Perceived Ideology Mediation Analysis**

|  | Message Mediation | MC Gender Mediation |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ACME | 0.004 | 0.000 |
|  | [-0.013, 0.022] | [-0.007, 0.007] |
| ADE | -0.335\*\*\* | 0.138 |
|  | [-0.495, -0.176] | [-0.023, 0.296] |
| Total Effect | -0.331\*\*\* | 0.138 |
|  | [-0.486, -0.170] | [-0.023, 0.297] |
| Prop. Mediated | -0.010 | 0.000 |
|  | [-0.074, 0.043] | [-0.090, 0.139] |
| \* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01  NOTE: Dependent variable = MC General Support (1-7). | | |

**Vote Intention Analysis**

**Figure A5: Mean MC Vote Intention Ratings**
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**Table A24: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Vote Intention**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control | 4.626 | 4.655 | -0.030 | 0.804 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.028 | 5.137 | -0.110 | 0.338 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.540 | 4.674 | -0.135 | 0.325 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Vote Intention (1-7).

**Table A25: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: Vote Intention (Woman MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.482 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.463 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Control / Woman | 0.019 | 0.988 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Vote Intention (1-7).

**Table A26: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: Vote Intention (Man MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Man - Claim / Man | -0.402 | 0.004 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Man - Claim / Man | -0.488 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Man - Control / Man | -0.086 | 0.758 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Vote Intention (1-7).

**Figure A6: Mean Vote Intention Across Treatment Group and Party Affiliation**
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**Table A27: Difference of Means Tests of MC Gender: Vote Intention (Partisan Subsets)**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | Diff. of Means | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Republican MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.889 | 4.821 | 0.068 | 0.746 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.317 | 5.204 | 0.113 | 0.595 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.831 | 4.648 | 0.183 | 0.496 |  |
| **Republican MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.207 | 4.519 | -0.312 | 0.240 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.770 | 4.895 | -0.125 | 0.569 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 4.337 | 4.739 | -0.402 | 0.162 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 5.129 | 5.104 | 0.025 | 0.903 |  |
| Credit Claim | 5.382 | 5.511 | -0.129 | 0.521 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 5.154 | 5.209 | -0.055 | 0.802 |  |
| **Democratic MC / Non-copartisan** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 4.290 | 4.101 | 0.189 | 0.442 |  |
| Credit Claim | 4.583 | 4.930 | -0.346 | 0.206 |  |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 3.949 | 3.955 | -0.006 | 0.983 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Vote Intention (1-7).

**Approval Analysis**

**Figure A7: Mean MC Approval Ratings**

A screenshot of a graph

Description automatically generated with low confidence

**Table A28: Difference of Proportions Tests of MC Gender: Approval**

| Substantive Treatment | Man MC | Woman MC | P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control | 0.773 | 0.761 | 0.780 |
| Credit Claim | 0.824 | 0.860 | 0.236 |
| Credit Claim with Critique | 0.687 | 0.709 | 0.585 |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Approval (0/1).

**Table A29: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: Approval (Woman MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.099 | 0.005 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Claim / Woman | -0.151 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Woman - Control / Woman | -0.052 | 0.245 |  |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Approval (0/1).

**Table A30: ANOVA with Tukey Comparisons: Approval (Man MC Subset)**

| Contrast | Diff. of Means | Adjusted P-value |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Control / Man - Claim / Man | -0.051 | 0.249 |  |
| Critique / Man - Claim / Man | -0.137 | 0.000 | **\*\*\*** |
| Critique / Man - Control / Man | -0.086 | 0.016 | **\*\*** |

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

NOTE: Dependent variable = MC Approval (0/1).

**Figure A8: Mean Approval Across Treatment Group and Party Affiliation**
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**Alternative Regression Modeling Strategies:**

I remove the critique message observations from the Effective model and control message observations from the Fiscal Responsibility model for an alternative test of Hypothesis 1 and 2. Results do not meaningfully change from those presented in Table 1.

**Table A31:** **Regression with MC gender and message treatment interaction**

|  | General Support | Effectiveness | Fiscal Responsibility |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Message: Claim | 0.517\*\*\* | 0.718\*\*\* |  |
|  | (0.107) | (0.093) |  |
| Message: Critique | -0.228\*\* |  | -0.565\*\*\* |
|  | (0.104) |  | (0.112) |
| MC Gender: Woman | 0.199\* | 0.089 | 0.154 |
|  | (0.107) | (0.093) | (0.112) |
| Partisan Match | 0.191\*\*\* | 0.131\*\*\* | 0.184\*\*\* |
|  | (0.038) | (0.039) | (0.048) |
| Resp. Gender: Woman | -0.007 | 0.040 | -0.031 |
|  | (0.062) | (0.066) | (0.080) |
| Resp. Party: Ind | -0.498\*\*\* | -0.512\*\*\* | -0.581\*\*\* |
|  | (0.076) | (0.079) | (0.096) |
| Resp. Party: Rep | -0.358\*\*\* | -0.113 | -0.514\*\*\* |
|  | (0.075) | (0.079) | (0.097) |
| Credit Claim X Woman MC | -0.118 | 0.014 |  |
|  | (0.152) | (0.132) |  |
| Critique X Woman MC | -0.174 |  | -0.092 |
|  | (0.153) |  | (0.159) |
| Constant | 5.062\*\*\* | 4.798\*\*\* | 5.368\*\*\* |
|  | (0.090) | (0.083) | (0.106) |
| Num.Obs. | 2064 | 1382 | 1369 |
| R2 | 0.083 | 0.114 | 0.085 |
| \* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01  NOTE: Ordinary least squares models. Dependent variable = MC ratings. Standard errors in parentheses. | | | |

I control for demographic variables in the regressions below. Results do not meaningfully change from those presented in Table 1.

**Table A32:** **Regression with Demographic Variables**

|  | General Support | Effectiveness | Fiscal Responsibility |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Message: Claim | 0.524\*\*\* | 0.720\*\*\* | 0.458\*\*\* |
|  | (0.107) | (0.098) | (0.105) |
| Message: Critique | -0.238\*\* | 0.431\*\*\* | -0.124 |
|  | (0.104) | (0.095) | (0.101) |
| MC Gender: Woman | 0.194\* | 0.101 | 0.049 |
|  | (0.107) | (0.098) | (0.105) |
| Partisan Match | 0.194\*\*\* | 0.144\*\*\* | 0.144\*\*\* |
|  | (0.038) | (0.034) | (0.037) |
| Respondent Gender: Woman | 0.015 | -0.006 | 0.017 |
|  | (0.063) | (0.058) | (0.062) |
| Respondent Party: Ind | -0.458\*\*\* | -0.412\*\*\* | -0.508\*\*\* |
|  | (0.078) | (0.071) | (0.076) |
| Respondent Party: Rep | -0.339\*\*\* | -0.157\*\* | -0.310\*\*\* |
|  | (0.078) | (0.071) | (0.076) |
| Credit Claim X Woman MC | -0.134 | -0.009 | 0.084 |
|  | (0.153) | (0.139) | (0.149) |
| Critique X Woman MC | -0.156 | -0.102 | 0.019 |
|  | (0.154) | (0.140) | (0.149) |
| Education | 0.018 | 0.024 | 0.023 |
|  | (0.023) | (0.021) | (0.022) |
| Age | 0.001 | 0.002 | -0.007\*\*\* |
|  | (0.002) | (0.002) | (0.002) |
| Respondent Race: Asian | -0.014 | 0.101 | 0.206 |
|  | (0.158) | (0.144) | (0.153) |
| Respondent Race: Black | 0.205\* | 0.252\*\*\* | 0.444\*\*\* |
|  | (0.106) | (0.097) | (0.103) |
| Respondent Race: Latino | -0.118 | 0.023 | 0.255\*\* |
|  | (0.132) | (0.120) | (0.128) |
| Respondent Race: Mixed | 0.045 | -0.033 | 0.146 |
|  | (0.132) | (0.120) | (0.128) |
| Respondent Race: Other | -0.321 | -0.260 | -0.155 |
|  | (0.217) | (0.198) | (0.211) |
| Income | 0.022\* | 0.033\*\*\* | 0.014 |
|  | (0.011) | (0.010) | (0.011) |
| Constant | 4.789\*\*\* | 4.464\*\*\* | 4.879\*\*\* |
|  | (0.156) | (0.143) | (0.152) |
| Num.Obs. | 2053 | 2053 | 2053 |
| R2 | 0.091 | 0.089 | 0.093 |
| \* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01  NOTE: Ordinary least squares models. Dependent variable = MC ratings. Standard errors in parentheses. | | | |

**Power Analysis**

As referenced in endnote ix, I conduct a power analysis with the “pwrss” package (Bulus and Polat 2023) to assess the ability of the experimental design to distinguish gender differences. Assuming a small effect (0.30 gender difference) for the general support measure, the difference of means tests are well powered (0.89) to distinguish this effect.
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**Examples of Attacks on Grants as Irresponsible Spending**

**Comprehensive Attacks on Congressional Grants**
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* <https://www.cagw.org/reporting/pig-book>

A picture containing text, font, screenshot, white
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* <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/house/gop-omnibus-opponents-secured-billions-pet-projects-districts-funding>

**Attacks on Specific Members of Congress for Irresponsible Grants**

A picture containing text, screenshot, font, logo

Description automatically generated

* <https://1819news.com/news/item/former-u-s-sen-shelby-named-porker-of-the-month-by-citizens-against-government-waste>

A screenshot of a computer
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* [https://finance.yahoo.com/news/citizens-against-government-waste-names-160600689.html](https://finance.yahoo.com/news/citizens-against-government-waste-names-160600689.html?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAIX5M2sGKC1bmOPqu84xjuk2tUFHWNwNo2cuC2v18I9iTSMFT5tIO1TAwKnZ_oN4FaPg0TPLK-NYOV4dAjon4JfrvcU_x2sxxS6qyK8bSXvmXwmYWG55fmW9cSEzdrecR6ZSAN-A_vRc-eL5imOJjBrRkn2GnC1FMniMDn86B8_r)

**Attacks on Specific Grants**

A picture containing text, screenshot, font, line
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* <https://www.newsweek.com/michelle-obama-trail-funding-omnibus-bill-republican-fury-1768635>
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* <https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2023/02/08/congress_spends_36m_on_michelle_obama_trail_in_ga_879685.html>
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* <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/commission-led-sen-manchins-wife-set-receive-millions-more-manchin-backed-omnibus>
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* <https://www.realclearpolicy.com/articles/2023/02/01/maine_irish_heritage_center_gets_3m_for_renovations_878321.html>

**References**

Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., Hirose, K., Keele, L. and Imai, K., 2014. “Mediation: R package for causal mediation analysis.”

Bulus, M. and Polat, C., 2023. “Statistical Power Analysis with pwrss R Package.”