Appendix 1 (Implicit Association Test)

While the analyses in the main text explored agreement with explicit stereotypes about women’s capacity for politics, the possibility exists that, in addition to explicit stereotypes, individuals may rely on subconscious, implicit associations between gender and political work. Following the work of Greenwald and Banaji (1995) and Mo (2015), we also examined if an automatic and unconscious implicit association exists between names commonly associated with men and political jobs (Perez 2013). We test this using a new IAT written for this study, based on the method described by Greenwald and colleagues (Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz 1998; Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji 2003). We programmed and constructed scores for the IAT in Qualtrics using IATGEN (Carpenter et al. 2017).[[1]](#footnote-1)

The IAT works by asking respondents to categorize names and occupations as feminine/masculine or political/non-political. While the participant does this, the program records the time that elapses between the time the name or occupation appears on the screen and the time the respondent correctly categorizes the word. Respondents are presented with both stereotype-consistent pairings (masculine names and political jobs) and stereotype-inconsistent pairings (feminine names and political jobs). By measuring the time it takes to categorize items in these two conditions and subtracting the stereotype-inconsistent time from the stereotype-consistent time, researchers produce a time difference (d-score) which indicates either an implicit association between the stereotype-consistent pairings (a positive d-score), an association between the stereotype-inconsistent pairings (a negative d-score), or no association (a d-score of 0).[[2]](#footnote-2) We consciously selected names and occupations that translated easily to French, as well as occupations that did not carry a gendered translation in French, as the survey would be available in both official languages. We vary both the status and the type of position (elected vs appointed) to generalize across various political roles. The stimuli of the IAT are presented in Table A1.

*IAT Characteristics*

The Gender and Political Jobs IAT was embedded in the same survey detailed in Study 1. Of the 1043 participants who successfully completed the IAT, 17 (1.6%) were dropped because of excessively fast trials, as recommended by Greenwald et al. (2003), leaving us with 1026 responses. The reliability of the IAT is strong, with an internal consistency coefficient of 0.719.

*Results*

 In short, implicit associations appear to play a limited role, if any, in the stereotyping process. We find that participants exhibit a small but statistically significant implicit association between masculine names and political jobs (d-score=0.06, s.e.=0.01). This evidence shows participants are quicker to associate men’s names with political work. However, contrary to expectations, this is driven almost exclusively by women, not men. The mean d-score for women shows a delay in associating feminine names with political work (d-score = 0.09); for men, it is 0.01 and statistically insignificant. Thus, this IAT produced a gender gap of 0.07 (p<0.001), with women being significantly more likely than men to hesitate in associating feminine names with political jobs. Moreover, these effect sizes are quite small for IATs, suggesting a very weak average association between gender and political work.

A standard interpretation of this result is that women are more unconsciously biased against women and politics than are men. We think an alternative interpretation is more plausible: this IAT measures the degree to which individuals have internalized women’s presence in politics. As the privileged gender in politics, men may simply be less likely to notice the gendered dynamics of political work. Through this lens, it is not surprising that women may be quicker to associate men with politics, as they may be looking for, but considerably less likely to see, other women doing political work.

In addition to gender, we also tested whether implicit associations differed by age, education, race, party identification, left-right ideological positions, and explicitly sexist views. These results appear in Table A2. All other things being equal, and contrary to expectations, only two factors meaningfully affect participants’ implicit association between political jobs and gendered names: participant gender and age. This confirms that, even taking all these factors into account, women are still significantly more likely than men to hesitate in associating feminine names with political jobs, especially if they are older. In contrast, women under 35 are significantly less likely to associate political jobs with masculine names more quickly than feminine names.

What is perhaps more striking about these findings is the list of factors that do not meaningfully affect implicit associations between politics and gender. Men do not show much implicit bias against women and political work. Similarly, factors like partisanship and ideology are not meaningful predictors of implicit bias against women and politics. We draw two conclusions from our implicit association study’s results. First, explicit stereotypes about women and politics are very different from implicit associations of gendered names and political work. This bolsters the idea that explicit stereotyping and implicit associations are different processes. Second, women’s greater implicit association between masculine names and politics may well reflect the ‘underdog’ character of women in politics, or at least women’s greater awareness of it. This finding deserves significantly more investigation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Table A1: Names and Occupations (French and English) for Gender and Political Jobs IAT |
| **Feminine Names** | Jessica | Jessica | **Political Jobs** | Prime Minister | Premier ministre |
|  | Molly | Sylvie |  | City Councilor | Membre du Conseil municipal |
|  | Sophia | Sophie |  | Member of Parliament | Parlementaire |
|  | Mary | Catherine |  | Elected Official | Attaché politique |
|  | Jennifer | Caroline |  | Diplomat | Diplomate |
|  | Sarah | Sarah |  | Lobbyist | Lobbyiste |
|  | Angela | Andréanne |  | Cabinet Minister | Ministre |
| **Masculine Names** | John | Louis | **Non-Political Jobs**  | Store Manager | Responsable de l’équipe des ventes |
|  | Brian | Philippe |  | Machinist | Machiniste |
|  | Todd | Thomas |  | Administrative Assistant | Réceptionniste |
|  | David | David |  | Bartender/Server | Aide en cuisine |
|  | Mark | Marc |  | Accountant | Comptable |
|  | William | William |  | Bank Clerk | Commis de banque |
|  | Joe | Sébastien |  | Market Researcher | Recherchiste en marketing |

|  |
| --- |
| Table A2: Implicit Gender Association Regression Analysis |
| Female | 0.07\* |
|  | (0.02) |
|  |  |
| Age (Under 35) | -0.08\* |
|  | (0.03) |
|  |  |
| Age (Over 55) | 0.00 |
|  | (0.03) |
|  |  |
| Education | -0.00 |
|  | (0.05) |
|  |  |
| White | -0.02 |
|  | (0.04) |
|  |  |
| Ideology (Left) | -0.02 |
|  | (0.03) |
|  |  |
| Ideology (Right) | -0.03 |
|  | (0.03) |
|  |  |
| Party (Liberal) | 0.02 |
|  | (0.03) |
|  |  |
| Party (Conservative) | 0.02 |
|  | (0.03) |
|  |  |
| Party (NDP) | 0.01 |
|  | (0.04) |
|  |  |
| Explicit Sexism | -0.00 |
|  | (0.00) |
|  |  |
| Constant | 0.06 |
|  | (0.06) |
| *N* | 967 |
| *R*2 | 0.022 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\*p<0.05

Appendix 2: Additional Model Specifications and Results

|  |
| --- |
| Table A3: Blair and Imai (2012) Test for Design Effects |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Naturally Better | Too Emotional | Too Nice |
| Canadian Respondents | 0.71 | 0.99 | 0.55 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Note: Values are alpha levels from Bonferroni-corrected p-values as specified in Blair and Imai (2012). These alpha levels assess the null hypothesis of no design effects. Therefore, a significant alpha level (<0.05) would lead us to reject the null hypothesis of no design effects. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table A4: Demographic and Political Predictors of Stereotype Agreement, Direct Questioning |
|  | Naturally Better | Too Emotional | Too Nice |
| Female | -0.14\* | -0.11\* | -0.06\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Education | -0.08 | -0.07 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Age | -0.00\* | -0.00\* | -0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Ideology | 0.25\* | 0.28\* | 0.22\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Party (Liberal) | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Party (Conservative) | 0.03 | 0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Party (NDP) | -0.04 | -0.08\* | -0.08\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Religious Importance | 0.09\* | 0.09\* | 0.09\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.39\* | 0.26\* | 0.21\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| *N* | 987 | 987 | 984 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.05

|  |
| --- |
| Table A5: Demographic and Political Predictors of Stereotype Agreement, List Experiment |
|  | Naturally Better | Too Emotional | Too Nice | Control Items |
| Women | -0.18 | -0.04 | -0.08 | 0.15 |
| (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.09) |
| Some College | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.18 | -0.14 |
| (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.17) | (0.11) |
| BA or Higher | -0.07 | 0.28 | 0.47\* | -0.39\* |
| (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.12) |
| Over 50 | 0.08 | 0.36\* | 0.35\* | 0.01 |
| (0.16) | (0.16) | (0.16) | (0.11) |
| Ideology (Left) | -0.08 | 0.10 | -0.10 | 0.13 |
| (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.17) | (0.11) |
| Ideology (Right) | -0.05 | -0.07 | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| (0.19) | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.12) |
| Party (Liberal) | -0.24 | -0.28 | -0.03 | 0.29\* |
| (0.20) | (0.18) | (0.19) | (0.12) |
| Party (Conservative) | -0.01 | -0.16 | 0.05 | -0.06 |
| (0.25) | (0.22) | (0.24) | (0.17) |
| Party (NDP) | 0.07 | -0.29 | -0.03 | 0.10 |
| (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.22) | (0.15) |
| Voted | -0.18 | -0.18 | 0.03 | 0.21 |
| (0.20) | (0.18) | (0.19) | (0.13) |
| Constant | 0.51\* | 0.29 | -0.10 | 1.56\* |
| (0.24) | (0.20) | (0.19) | (0.13) |

Standard errors in parentheses

\*p<0.05

|  |
| --- |
| Table A6: Demographic and Political Predictors of Stereotype Agreement, Direct Questioning(Weighted Results) |
|  | Naturally Better | Too Emotional | Too Nice |
| Female | -0.14\* | -0.10\* | -0.05\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Education | -0.07 | -0.08 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Age | -0.00\* | -0.00 | -0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Ideology | 0.25\* | 0.27\* | 0.22\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Party (Liberal) | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Party (Conservative) | 0.03 | 0.03 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Party (NDP) | -0.03 | -0.05\* | -0.06\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Religious Importance | 0.09\* | 0.08\* | 0.09\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.36\* | 0.24\* | 0.18\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| *N* | 987 | 987 | 984 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.05

Figure A1: Demographics Variable Distribution, Direct Questioning



Figure A2: Outcome Variable Distribution, Direct Questioning



Figure A3: Province and Language Distribution, Direct Questioning



Figure A4: Religious Importance and Race Distribution, Direct Questioning



Figure A5: Demographics Variable Distribution, List Experiment  Figure A6: Province, Language, and Race Distribution, List Experiment



1. We would like to thank Sanne Rijkhoff for their help in programming the IAT. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. We conduct the IAT and construct the d-score according to the updated procedures outlined in Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji, 2003. Additionally, we require respondents to correct mistakes, therefore, no error penalty is added when creating the scores. D-scores were obtained using IATGEN’s online analysis tool and exported back to the original data source. D-scores have a maximal range from -2 to 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)