**Supplementary Material**

**Appendix A**

**Table 1. Average Number of Mentions for Top Traits**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Overall |  | Republican | Democrat |
| **Agentic Traits** | 5.95 |  | 3.33 | 6.93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Aggressive, tough fighter | 3.75 |  | 2.19 | 4.34 |
| Ambitious, courageous,Charismatic, strong leader | 2.19 |  | 1.14 | 2.59 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Communal Traits** | 6.92 |  | 6.58 | 7.05 |
| Advocate, champion,serve | 5.18 |  | 4.85 | 5.30 |
| Talkative, good orActive listener, work with | 1.12 |  | 1.33 | 1.04 |
| Care, compassionate | 0.62 |  | 0.38 | 0.71 |

**Appendix B**

**Table 1. Mturk Sample Demographics (Wave 2)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | MTurk Sample |
| % Women | 53.85% |
| % Democrats | 55.07% |
| % Republicans | 40.48.% |
| % Independents | 4.45% |
| % Whites | 79.60% |
| % Single | 47.78% |
| Education (high school and above) | 96.87% |
| % Catholic | 16.28% |
| N | 897 |

*Note.* Leaners are considered as either Democrats or Republicans

**Table 2a. Between-gender Difference in Evaluations of Traits**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Agentic Attributes | Communal Attributes |
| Feminine Strategy | 0.04 | -0.47\*\*\* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Masculine Strategy  | 0.15\* | -0.59\*\*\* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.09) |

*Note.* Each entry contains the difference from man to woman candidates for each type of strategy, with standard errors in parentheses. *\*p < .1; \*\*p < .05; \*\*\*p < .01*. All dependent variables are coded on a five-point scale.

**Table 2b. Between-gender Difference in Evaluations of Leadership, Knowledge, and Issue Competence**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strong Leadership | Knowledge | Masculine Issues | Feminine Issues |
| Feminine Strategy | -0.08 | 0.09 | 1.74\*\*\* | -1.83\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.16) | (0.09) |
| Masculine Strategy  | -0.09 | -0.17 | 1.90\*\*\* | 2.18\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.16) | (0.15) |

*Note.* Each entry contains the difference from man to woman candidates for each type of strategies, with standard errors in parentheses. *\*p < .1; \*\*p < .05; \*\*\*p < .01*. All dependent variables are coded on a five-point scale.

**Table 2c. Between-gender Difference in Overall Evaluations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Likability | Warmth | Voting |
| Feminine Strategy | -4.57\*\* | 0.39 | 0.17\* |
|  | (1.87) | (2.06) | (0.10) |
| Masculine Strategy  | 4.34\* | 5.65\*\* | 0.21\* |
|  | (2.43) | (2.54) | (0.12) |

*Note.* Each entry contains the difference from man to woman candidates for each type of strategy, with standard errors in parentheses. *\*p < .1; \*\*p < .05; \*\*\*p < .01*. Voting variable is coded on a five-point scale, whereas likability and warmth are on a 100-point scale.

**Appendix C**

**Table 1. Moderation Effect on Agentic Traits Evaluation, by Levels of Hostile Sexism**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Agentic Trait Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.030 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.162) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.640 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.167)\*\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 0.889 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.229)\*\*\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.187 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.216) |
| Hostile Sexism | -0.007 | -0.007 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | (0.039) | (0.040) | (0.062) | (0.060) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | -0.036 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.056) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | -0.028 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.058) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | -0.041 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.085) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | -0.061 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.081) |
| Constant | 2.785 | 2.785 | 2.706 | 2.706 |
|  | (0.111)\*\*\* | (0.115)\*\*\* | (0.164)\*\*\* | (0.157)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 263 | 264 |
| R2 | 0.006 | 0.157 | 0.191 | 0.005 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.004 | 0.149 | 0.181 | -0.006 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.642 (df = 303) | 0.665 (df = 310) | 0.819 (df = 259) | 0.788 (df = 260) |
| F Statistic | 0.637 (df = 3; 303) | 19.274\*\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 20.323\*\*\* (df = 3; 259) | 0.434 (df = 3; 260) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.851 | 0.756 | 0.841 | 0.956 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

**Table 2. Moderation Effect on Communal Traits Evaluation, by Levels of Hostile Sexism**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Communal Trait Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.389 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.182)\*\* |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | -0.437 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.202)\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.593 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.209)\*\*\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.179 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.179) |
| Hostile Sexism | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
|  | (0.044) | (0.049) | (0.057) | (0.049) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | 0.009 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.063) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | 0.060 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.070) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | -0.003 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.078) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | 0.022 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.067) |
| Constant | 3.034 | 3.034 | 2.710 | 2.710 |
|  | (0.126)\*\*\* | (0.140)\*\*\* | (0.149)\*\*\* | (0.130)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 303 | 308 | 268 | 266 |
| R2 | 0.078 | 0.036 | 0.140 | 0.035 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.069 | 0.026 | 0.130 | 0.024 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.718 (df = 299) | 0.800 (df = 304) | 0.746 (df = 264) | 0.651 (df = 262) |
| F Statistic | 8.410\*\*\* (df = 3; 299) | 3.759\*\* (df = 3; 304) | 14.311\*\*\* (df = 3; 264) | 3.189\*\* (df = 3; 262) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.293 | 0.976 | 0.115 | 0.568 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 3. Moderation Effect on Leadership Evaluation, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Leadership Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.124 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.216) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.551 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.217)\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 0.532 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.261)\*\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.123 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.259) |
| Hostile Sexism | -0.103 | -0.103 | -0.038 | -0.038 |
|  | (0.052)\*\* | (0.052)\* | (0.072) | (0.072) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | -0.050 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.075) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | -0.035 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.076) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | -0.068 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.097) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | -0.104 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.097) |
| Constant | 3.895 | 3.895 | 3.751 | 3.751 |
|  | (0.148)\*\*\* | (0.149)\*\*\* | (0.188)\*\*\* | (0.189)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 272 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.038 | 0.093 | 0.045 | 0.023 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.028 | 0.085 | 0.034 | 0.012 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.858 (df = 303) | 0.864 (df = 310) | 0.944 (df = 268) | 0.948 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 3.944\*\*\* (df = 3; 303) | 10.647\*\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 4.222\*\*\* (df = 3; 268) | 2.083 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.947 | 0.849 | 0.976 | 0.998 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 4. Moderation Effect on Knowledge Evaluation, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Knowledge Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.039 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.227) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.212 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.228) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 0.127 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.280) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.170 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.261) |
| Hostile Sexism | -0.124 | -0.124 | -0.080 | -0.080 |
|  | (0.055)\*\* | (0.055)\*\* | (0.077) | (0.073) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | -0.015 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.079) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | 0.020 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.080) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | 0.003 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.104) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | -0.031 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.098) |
| Constant | 4.062 | 4.062 | 3.914 | 3.914 |
|  | (0.155)\*\*\* | (0.157)\*\*\* | (0.202)\*\*\* | (0.191)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 272 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.035 | 0.045 | 0.012 | 0.017 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.026 | 0.035 | 0.001 | 0.006 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.900 (df = 303) | 0.911 (df = 310) | 1.010 (df = 268) | 0.955 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 3.692\*\* (df = 3; 303) | 4.826\*\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 1.111 (df = 3; 268) | 1.567 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.466 | 0.601 | 0.116 | 0.730 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 5. Moderation Effect on Masculine Issue Competence Evaluation, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Masculine Issue Competence Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | -0.176 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.220) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | -0.166 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.225) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.071 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.227) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -0.087 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.200) |
| Hostile Sexism | -0.160 | -0.160 | -0.096 | -0.096 |
|  | (0.053)\*\*\* | (0.054)\*\*\* | (0.062) | (0.056)\* |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | 0.038 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.076) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | 0.180 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.078)\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | 0.104 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.085) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | 0.033 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.075) |
| Constant | 3.533 | 3.533 | 3.461 | 3.461 |
|  | (0.151)\*\*\* | (0.155)\*\*\* | (0.164)\*\*\* | (0.146)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 303 | 312 | 272 | 266 |
| R2 | 0.047 | 0.052 | 0.020 | 0.017 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.037 | 0.043 | 0.009 | 0.006 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.866 (df = 299) | 0.893 (df = 308) | 0.820 (df = 268) | 0.731 (df = 262) |
| F Statistic | 4.918\*\*\* (df = 3; 299) | 5.672\*\*\* (df = 3; 308) | 1.814 (df = 3; 268) | 1.532 (df = 3; 262) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.866 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.755 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 6. Moderation Effect on Feminine Issue Competence Evaluation, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Feminine Issue Competence Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | -0.130 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.199) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | -0.342 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.227) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.144 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.226) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.345 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.191)\* |
| Hostile Sexism | -0.174 | -0.174 | -0.070 | -0.070 |
|  | (0.047)\*\*\* | (0.055)\*\*\* | (0.062) | (0.053) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | 0.072 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.069) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | 0.123 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.080) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | 0.031 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.084) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | -0.022 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.072) |
| Constant | 4.017 | 4.017 | 3.439 | 3.439 |
|  | (0.135)\*\*\* | (0.157)\*\*\* | (0.162)\*\*\* | (0.139)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 303 | 314 | 268 | 266 |
| R2 | 0.057 | 0.034 | 0.009 | 0.060 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.047 | 0.025 | -0.002 | 0.049 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.779 (df = 299) | 0.907 (df = 310) | 0.812 (df = 264) | 0.698 (df = 262) |
| F Statistic | 5.997\*\*\* (df = 3; 299) | 3.652\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 0.791 (df = 3; 264) | 5.575\*\*\* (df = 3; 262) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.991 | 1.000 | 0.730 | 0.568 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 7. Moderation Effect on Likability, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Likability |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 5.224 |  |  |  |
|  | (4.627) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 8.754 |  |  |
|  |  | (5.128)\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 10.100 |  |
|  |  |  | (5.484)\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -1.311 |
|  |  |  |  | (4.457) |
| Hostile Sexism | 3.258 | 3.258 | 3.197 | 3.197 |
|  | (1.113)\*\*\* | (1.239)\*\*\* | (1.505)\*\* | (1.241)\*\* |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | -1.281 |  |  |  |
|  | (1.613) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | -3.328 |  |  |
|  |  | (1.793)\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | -3.228 |  |
|  |  |  | (2.044) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | -1.412 |
|  |  |  |  | (1.675) |
| Constant | 62.572 | 62.572 | 65.599 | 65.599 |
|  | (3.173)\*\*\* | (3.533)\*\*\* | (3.952)\*\*\* | (3.258)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 272 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.039 | 0.022 | 0.020 | 0.051 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.030 | 0.012 | 0.009 | 0.041 |
| Residual Std. Error | 18.376 (df = 303) | 20.458 (df = 310) | 19.812 (df = 268) | 16.334 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 4.149\*\*\* (df = 3; 303) | 2.312\* (df = 3; 310) | 1.865 (df = 3; 268) | 4.765\*\*\* (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 8. Moderation Effect on Warmth, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Warmth |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 1.599 |  |  |  |
|  | (4.546) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 13.515 |  |  |
|  |  | (5.039)\*\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 5.897 |  |
|  |  |  | (5.716) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -5.215 |
|  |  |  |  | (4.795) |
| Hostile Sexism | 2.821 | 2.821 | 2.311 | 2.311 |
|  | (1.094)\*\* | (1.218)\*\* | (1.569) | (1.335)\* |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | -0.728 |  |  |  |
|  | (1.585) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | -4.133 |  |  |
|  |  | (1.762)\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | -0.845 |  |
|  |  |  | (2.131) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | 0.277 |
|  |  |  |  | (1.802) |
| Constant | 62.336 | 62.336 | 68.825 | 68.825 |
|  | (3.118)\*\*\* | (3.472)\*\*\* | (4.120)\*\*\* | (3.505)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 272 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.032 | 0.026 | 0.021 | 0.043 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.022 | 0.016 | 0.010 | 0.032 |
| Residual Std. Error | 18.056 (df = 303) | 20.103 (df = 310) | 20.651 (df = 268) | 17.572 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 3.328\*\* (df = 3; 303) | 2.728\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 1.953 (df = 3; 268) | 3.927\*\*\* (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 9. Moderation Effect on Vote Likelihood, by Levels of Hostile Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Vote Likelihood |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | -0.184 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.225) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | -0.552 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.249)\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.383 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.270) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.063 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.253) |
| Hostile Sexism | -0.130 | -0.130 | -0.085 | -0.085 |
|  | (0.054)\*\* | (0.060)\*\* | (0.074) | (0.070) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism | 0.048 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.079) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  | 0.244 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.087)\*\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  | 0.129 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.101) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Hostile Sexism |  |  |  | 0.045 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.095) |
| Constant | 3.705 | 3.705 | 3.516 | 3.516 |
|  | (0.155)\*\*\* | (0.172)\*\*\* | (0.194)\*\*\* | (0.185)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 272 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.008 | 0.015 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.017 | 0.017 | -0.003 | 0.004 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.895 (df = 303) | 0.993 (df = 310) | 0.974 (df = 268) | 0.927 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 2.722\*\* (df = 3; 303) | 2.789\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 0.710 (df = 3; 268) | 1.348 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.938 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.881 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 10. Moderation Effect on Agentic Traits Evaluation, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Agentic Trait Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.030 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.162) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.640 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.167)\*\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 0.889 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.229)\*\*\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.187 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.216) |
| Benevolent Sexism | -0.007 | -0.007 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | (0.039) | (0.040) | (0.062) | (0.060) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | -0.036 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.056) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | -0.028 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.058) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | -0.041 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.085) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | -0.061 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.081) |
| Constant | 2.785 | 2.785 | 2.706 | 2.706 |
|  | (0.111)\*\*\* | (0.115)\*\*\* | (0.164)\*\*\* | (0.157)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 263 | 264 |
| R2 | 0.006 | 0.157 | 0.191 | 0.005 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.004 | 0.149 | 0.181 | -0.006 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.642 (df = 303) | 0.665 (df = 310) | 0.819 (df = 259) | 0.788 (df = 260) |
| F Statistic | 0.637 (df = 3; 303) | 19.274\*\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 20.323\*\*\* (df = 3; 259) | 0.434 (df = 3; 260) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.851 | 0.756 | 0.841 | 0.956 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 11. Moderation Effect on Communal Traits Evaluation, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Communal Trait Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.169 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.255) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | -0.707 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.272)\*\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.601 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.282)\*\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.537 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.236)\*\* |
| Benevolent Sexism | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.069 | 0.069 |
|  | (0.056) | (0.063) | (0.065) | (0.057) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | 0.080 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.081) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | 0.142 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.086)\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | -0.006 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.088) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | -0.104 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.076) |
| Constant | 2.945 | 2.945 | 2.556 | 2.556 |
|  | (0.177)\*\*\* | (0.196)\*\*\* | (0.199)\*\*\* | (0.173)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 303 | 308 | 267 | 266 |
| R2 | 0.091 | 0.059 | 0.147 | 0.039 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.082 | 0.050 | 0.138 | 0.028 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.713 (df = 299) | 0.790 (df = 304) | 0.744 (df = 263) | 0.650 (df = 262) |
| F Statistic | 9.951\*\*\* (df = 3; 299) | 6.356\*\*\* (df = 3; 304) | 15.159\*\*\* (df = 3; 263) | 3.520\*\* (df = 3; 262) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.995 | 1.000 | 0.186 | 0.998 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 12. Moderation Effect on Leadership Evaluation, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Leadership Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.368 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.310) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.981 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.297)\*\*\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 0.437 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.356) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.038 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.344) |
| Benevolent Sexism | 0.023 | 0.023 | -0.018 | -0.018 |
|  | (0.068) | (0.068) | (0.083) | (0.083) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | -0.126 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.098) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | -0.176 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.094)\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | -0.023 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.112) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | -0.057 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.111) |
| Constant | 3.567 | 3.567 | 3.714 | 3.714 |
|  | (0.215)\*\*\* | (0.215)\*\*\* | (0.254)\*\*\* | (0.255)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 271 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.008 | 0.081 | 0.036 | 0.009 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.002 | 0.072 | 0.025 | -0.003 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.871 (df = 303) | 0.870 (df = 310) | 0.950 (df = 267) | 0.955 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 0.766 (df = 3; 303) | 9.053\*\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 3.337\*\* (df = 3; 267) | 0.775 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.596 | 0.945 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 13. Moderation Effect on Knowledge Evaluation, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Knowledge Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.163 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.326) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.613 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.313)\* |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.130 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.379) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -0.098 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.344) |
| Benevolent Sexism | -0.016 | -0.016 | -0.126 | -0.126 |
|  | (0.072) | (0.072) | (0.088) | (0.084) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | -0.056 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.103) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | -0.119 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.099) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | 0.093 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.119) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | 0.066 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.112) |
| Constant | 3.798 | 3.798 | 4.088 | 4.088 |
|  | (0.226)\*\*\* | (0.226)\*\*\* | (0.270)\*\*\* | (0.255)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 271 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.003 | 0.032 | 0.012 | 0.013 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.006 | 0.022 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.914 (df = 303) | 0.917 (df = 310) | 1.011 (df = 267) | 0.957 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 0.342 (df = 3; 303) | 3.376\*\* (df = 3; 310) | 1.110 (df = 3; 267) | 1.181 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.967 | 1.000 | 0.996 | 0.971 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 14. Moderation Effect on Masculine Issue Competence Evaluation, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Masculine Issue Competence Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | -0.245 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.320) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.068 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.311) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.383 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.306) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -0.234 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.266) |
| Benevolent Sexism | -0.068 | -0.068 | -0.069 | -0.069 |
|  | (0.070) | (0.072) | (0.071) | (0.064) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | 0.054 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.101) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | 0.074 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.098) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | 0.181 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.096)\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | 0.076 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.086) |
| Constant | 3.330 | 3.330 | 3.433 | 3.433 |
|  | (0.221)\*\*\* | (0.226)\*\*\* | (0.218)\*\*\* | (0.196)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 303 | 312 | 271 | 266 |
| R2 | 0.006 | 0.028 | 0.025 | 0.005 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.004 | 0.019 | 0.014 | -0.007 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.885 (df = 299) | 0.904 (df = 308) | 0.818 (df = 267) | 0.736 (df = 262) |
| F Statistic | 0.560 (df = 3; 299) | 2.978\*\* (df = 3; 308) | 2.277\* (df = 3; 267) | 0.400 (df = 3; 262) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.959 | 0.993 | 1.000 | 0.985 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 15. Moderation Effect on Feminine Issue Competence Evaluation, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Feminine Issue Competence Evaluation |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.051 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.289) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 0.169 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.315) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.413 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.306) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.315 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.254) |
| Benevolent Sexism | 0.029 | 0.029 | -0.029 | -0.029 |
|  | (0.063) | (0.072) | (0.071) | (0.061) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | -0.003 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.091) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | -0.068 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.099) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | 0.109 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.096) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | -0.009 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.082) |
| Constant | 3.489 | 3.489 | 3.357 | 3.357 |
|  | (0.198)\*\*\* | (0.228)\*\*\* | (0.217)\*\*\* | (0.188)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 303 | 314 | 267 | 266 |
| R2 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.009 | 0.043 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.008 | -0.008 | -0.003 | 0.032 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.802 (df = 299) | 0.922 (df = 310) | 0.813 (df = 263) | 0.704 (df = 262) |
| F Statistic | 0.200 (df = 3; 299) | 0.197 (df = 3; 310) | 0.763 (df = 3; 263) | 3.945\*\*\* (df = 3; 262) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 0.124 | 0.989 | 0.999 | 0.261 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 16. Moderation Effect on Likability, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Likability |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 5.321 |  |  |  |
|  | (6.663) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 2.999 |  |  |
|  |  | (7.057) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 12.332 |  |
|  |  |  | (7.457)\* |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -0.698 |
|  |  |  |  | (5.954) |
| Benevolent Sexism | 0.936 | 0.936 | 2.028 | 2.028 |
|  | (1.465) | (1.619) | (1.738) | (1.443) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | -1.076 |  |  |  |
|  | (2.100) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | -0.891 |  |  |
|  |  | (2.227) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | -3.251 |  |
|  |  |  | (2.338) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | -1.339 |
|  |  |  |  | (1.928) |
| Constant | 68.010 | 68.010 | 67.267 | 67.267 |
|  | (4.618)\*\*\* | (5.104)\*\*\* | (5.316)\*\*\* | (4.415)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 271 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.005 | 0.001 | 0.012 | 0.027 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.005 | -0.009 | 0.0005 | 0.016 |
| Residual Std. Error | 18.707 (df = 303) | 20.674 (df = 310) | 19.922 (df = 267) | 16.544 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 0.463 (df = 3; 303) | 0.119 (df = 3; 310) | 1.042 (df = 3; 267) | 2.425\* (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 17. Moderation Effect on Warmth, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Warmth |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | 0.956 |  |  |  |
|  | (6.533) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | 5.287 |  |  |
|  |  | (6.931) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | 5.007 |  |
|  |  |  | (7.790) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | -6.785 |
|  |  |  |  | (6.408) |
| Benevolent Sexism | 0.701 | 0.701 | 0.167 | 0.167 |
|  | (1.436) | (1.590) | (1.816) | (1.553) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | -0.365 |  |  |  |
|  | (2.059) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | -0.764 |  |  |
|  |  | (2.188) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | -0.298 |  |
|  |  |  | (2.443) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | 0.806 |
|  |  |  |  | (2.075) |
| Constant | 67.371 | 67.371 | 73.777 | 73.777 |
|  | (4.528)\*\*\* | (5.013)\*\*\* | (5.554)\*\*\* | (4.751)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 271 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.010 | 0.017 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.009 | -0.003 | -0.001 | 0.006 |
| Residual Std. Error | 18.343 (df = 303) | 20.304 (df = 310) | 20.812 (df = 267) | 17.805 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 0.098 (df = 3; 303) | 0.639 (df = 3; 310) | 0.882 (df = 3; 267) | 1.541 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |

### Table 18. Moderation Effect on Vote Likelihood, by Levels of Benevolent Sexism

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Dependent variable: |
|  |  |
|  | Vote Likelihood |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  |
| Woman Stereotype | -0.411 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.322) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype |  | -0.197 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.343) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype |  |  | -0.422 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.365) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype |  |  |  | 0.050 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.335) |
| Benevolent Sexism | -0.041 | -0.041 | -0.019 | -0.019 |
|  | (0.071) | (0.079) | (0.085) | (0.081) |
| Woman Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism | 0.114 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.102) |  |  |  |
| Woman Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  | 0.090 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.108) |  |  |
| Man Stereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  | 0.110 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.114) |  |
| Man Counterstereotype \* Benevolent Sexism |  |  |  | 0.040 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.108) |
| Constant | 3.502 | 3.502 | 3.369 | 3.369 |
|  | (0.223)\*\*\* | (0.248)\*\*\* | (0.260)\*\*\* | (0.248)\*\*\* |
|  |
| Observations | 307 | 314 | 271 | 268 |
| R2 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.007 | 0.009 |
| Adjusted R2 | -0.004 | -0.006 | -0.004 | -0.003 |
| Residual Std. Error | 0.905 (df = 303) | 1.005 (df = 310) | 0.975 (df = 267) | 0.930 (df = 264) |
| F Statistic | 0.587 (df = 3; 303) | 0.364 (df = 3; 310) | 0.635 (df = 3; 267) | 0.768 (df = 3; 264) |
| Power for Interaction Term | 1.000 | 0.999 | 1.000 | 0.839 |
|  |
| Note: | \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 |