**Table A1: Comparison of the Sample to Weighted NES Samples on Key Variables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Present Study Sample** | **2016 NES\*** | **2019 NES Pilot\*** |
| **Hostile Sexism** | 10.0a  (4.22) | 9.95  (.13) |  |
| **Modern Sexism** | 2.67  (1.05) | 2.78  (.04) |  |
| **Racial Resentment** | 10.15  (4.07) | 10.5  (.15) | 9.21  (.13) |
| **Ideology** | 5.21b  (1.41) | 4.87c  (.04) | 3.72d  (.03) |
| **Black** | 17.22 | 18.9 | 19.6 |
| **Latina/o/x** | 12.57 | 10.6e | 13.3f |
| **White** | 70.29 | 58.0 | 62.7 |
| **Woman** | 62.68 | 56.6 | 53.5 |
| **Age** | 52.28  (17.5) | 46.3  (.58) | 48.3  (.57) |
| **Education** | 4.05  (1.42) | 3.51  (.05) | 3.51  (.05) |
| **Biden – first choice of candidate for primary** | 37.8 |  | 27.5 |
| **Booker – first choice of candidate for primary** | 3.3 |  | 2.3 |
| **Harris – first choice of candidate for primary** | 6.7 |  |  |
| **Warren – first choice of candidate for primary** | 21.7 |  | 19.4 |
| **Electability most important consideration** | 56.0g |  | 53.9h |

\*The SEs in the NES samples are linearized SEs.

a In order to make comparison possible, this mean is calculated to reflect the four-item hostile sexism scale included in the 2016 NES (instead of all six items included in the present survey.)

bCorresponds to “slightly liberal” option

c Corresponds to the liberal side of moderate, or almost “slightly liberal” on a seven-point scale.

dCorresponds to the liberal side of “moderate”

e This represents those who answered “yes” to the questions “Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?”

f NES categorizes as “Hispanic”

g The present survey asks respondents to rank their considerations in choosing their most preferred candidate from the list of all candidates. Candidates were offered the options of “Electability (i.e., who has the best chance of beating Trump);” “Likability;” “Stances on policy positions;” and “Feeling represented.” This cell represents the proportion of respondents who chose “Electability (i.e., who has the best chance of beating Trump).”

h 2019 NES asks respondents “Which of the following is more important to your primary/caucus vote choice: that the candidate shares your positions on the issues or that the candidate has the best chance of defeating Donald Trump?

**Table A2. Pair-wise correlations between independent variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Modern Sexism | Racial Resent | Policy Liberalism | Ideology | Age | Education | Party Strength |
| Hostile Sexism | .14\*\* | .43\*\* | -.58\*\* | -.24\*\* | -.24\*\* | -.16\*\* | .04 |
| Modern Sexism |  | .31\*\* | -.18\*\* | -.18\*\* | .08\*\* | .02 | -.18\*\* |
| Racial Resent |  |  | -.40\*\* | -.37\*\* | -.03 | -.17\*\* | -.19\*\* |
| Policy Liberalism |  |  |  | .30\*\* | .28\*\* | .15\*\* | .15\*\* |
| Ideology |  |  |  |  | -.04 | .17\*\* | .31\*\* |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  | .12\*\* | .01 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |  | .07\*\* |

**\*\*** p<.05

**Table A3. Logit Coefficients Predicting the Choice of Each Candidate Across Four Criteria (See Figure 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Biden, electable | Booker, electable | Harris, electable | Warren, electable | Biden, policy | Booker, policy | Harris, policy | Warren, policy |
| Hostile sexism | -.02  (.01) | .04  (.03) | .04\*  (.02) | -.01  (.01) | .01  (.01) | .03  (.03) | .01  (.02) | -.03\*  (.01) |
| Modern sexism | .15\*\*  (.06) | -.03  (.14) | -.22\*\*  (.11) | -.06  (.07) | .09  (.06) | -.01  (.12) | -.12  (.09) | -.03  (.07) |
| Liberal policy | .03  (.02) | -.09\*\*  (.03) | -.08\*\*  (.03) | .03  (.02) | -.03\*  (.02) | -.02  (.03) | -.03  (.02) | .06\*\*  (.02) |
| Racial Resentment | .05\*\*  (.02) | -.01  (.05) | -.10\*\*  (.04) | -.02  (.02) | .08\*\*  (.02) | .01  (.04) | -.08\*\*  (.03) | -.04\*\*  (.02) |
| Ideology | -.08  (.05) | -.004  (.10) | -.12  (.08) | .12\*  (.06) | -.10\*\*  (.05) | .03  (.10) | -.07  (.07) | .13\*\*  (.05) |
| Black | .60\*\*  (.18) | .22  (.34) | -.60+  (.31) | -.61\*  (.21) | .62\*\*  (.17) | .11  (.34) | .10  (.23) | -.83\*\*  (.20) |
| Latino/a/x | .28  (.19) | -.61  (.46) | -.83\*\*  (.39) | .11  (.20) | .46\*\*  (.19) | -.06  (.37) | -.52\*  (.30) | -.21  (.20) |
| Gender | -.05  (.13) | -.22  (.30) | .15  (.24) | .06  (.14) | -.21  (.13) | .08  (.26) | -.12  (.19) | .26\*  (.14) |
| Age | .02\*\*  (.004) | -.01  (.01) | -.02\*\*  (.01) | -.01\*  (.004) | .01\*\*  (.004) | -.003  (.007) | -.01\*\*  (.01) | -.003  (.004) |
| Education | .04  (.04) | -.04  (.10) | -.19\*\*  (.08) | .02  (.05) | .01  (.04) | -.07  (.09) | -.07  (.07) | .04  (.05) |
| Party Strength | -.10  (.12) | .09  (.30) | .06  (.24) | -.04  (.14) | -.23\*  (.12) | -.40\*  (.23) | -.14  (.18) | .44\*\*  (.13) |
| Constant | -.63  (.58) | -.14  (1.25) | 1.22  (1.04) | -2.08\*\*  (.65) | 1.15\*\*  (.58) | -1.09  (1.09) | .60  (.83) | -4.07\*\*  (.64) |
| LR Chi-2 | 60.67\*\* | 37.91\*\* | 52.20\*\* | 47.92\*\* | 106.54\*\* | 14.31 | 29.24\*\* | 147.90\*\* |
| N | 1,240 | 1,240 | 1,240 | 1,240 | 1,227 | 1,227 | 1,227 | 1,227 |

\*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.1

**Table A3. Cont’d**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Biden, represent | Booker, represent | Harris, represent | Warren, represent | Biden, likable | Booker, likable | Harris, likable | Warren, likable |
| Hostile sexism | .01  (.01) | .04  (.02) | .02  (.02) | -.04\*\*  (.01) | .02  (.01) | .03  (.02) | -.01  (.02) | -.03\*  (.01) |
| Modern sexism | .09  (.06) | -.07  (.12) | -.03  (.09) | -.06  (.07) | .08  (.06) | -.04  (.10) | -.05  (.08) | -.04  (.07) |
| Liberal policy | -.03\*  (.02) | -.01  (.03) | -.003  (.02) | .04\*\*  (.02) | -.03  (.02) | -.02  (.03) | .01  (.02) | .03  (.02) |
| Racial Resentment | .05\*\*  (.02) | .01  (.04) | -.07\*\*  (.03) | -.02  (.02) | .07\*\*  (.02) | -.05\*  (.03) | -.07\*\*  (.03) | -.004  (.02) |
| Ideology | -.15\*\*  (.05) | .05  (.09) | -.04  (.07) | .18\*\*  (.06) | -.18\*\*  (.05) | .08  (.08) | -.05  (.07) | .21\*\*  (.06) |
| Black | .38\*\*  (.17) | .34  (.31) | .28  (.22) | -.81\*\*  (.20) | .58\*\*  (.17) | -.27  (.29) | .03  (.23) | -.54\*\*  (.20) |
| Latino/a/x | .16  (.19) | -.38  (.40) | -.71\*\*  (.32) | .27  (.19) | .25  (.19) | -.51  (.36) | -.11  (.26) | -.02  (.20) |
| Gender | .08  (.13) | -.03  (.25) | -.29  (.19) | .07  (.14) | -.02  (.13) | -.12  (.21) | .07  (.17) | .02  (.14) |
| Age | .01\*\*  (.004) | -.004  (.007) | -.004  (.005) | -.005  (.004) | .01\*  (.004) | .003  (.006) | -.004  (.005) | -.01  (.004) |
| Education | -.02  (.04) | -.04  (.09) | -.12\*  (.06) | .09\*\*  (.05) | -.09\*\*  (.05) | -.02  (.07) | -.01  (.06) | .11\*\*  (.05) |
| Party Strength | -.10  (.12) | -.06  (.24) | -.12  (.17) | .17  (.13) | -.13  (.12) | -.03  (.21) | -.07  (.16) | .18  (.13) |
| Constant | 1.01\*  (.57) | -2.19\*\*  (1.10) | -.23  (.83) | -3.21\*\*  (.63) | 1.47\*\*  (.58) | -2.13\*\*  (.95) | -1.26  (.78) | -3.22\*\*  (.63) |
| LR Chi-2 | 88.99\*\* | 11.71 | 26.89\*\* | 131.38\*\* | 125.40\*\* | 9.07 | 17.27 | 90.42\*\* |
| N | 1,243 | 1,243 | 1,243 | 1,243 | 1,237 | 1,237 | 1,237 | 1,237 |

\*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.1

**Table A4. Logit Coefficients Predicting the Choice of White or Male Candidates Across Four Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | White, electable | Man, electable | White, policy | Man, policy | White, represent | Man, represent | White, likable | Man, likable |
| Hostile sexism | -.05\*\*  (.02) | -.01  (.01) | -.02  (.02) | .02  (.01) | -.03\*\*  (.02) | .02\*  (.01) | -.01  (.01) | .03\*\*  (.01) |
| Modern sexism | .17\*  (.09) | .14\*\*  (.06) | .09  (.08) | .09  (.06) | .05  (.07) | .07  (.06) | .05  (.07) | .06  (.06) |
| Liberal policy | .09\*\*  (.02) | .002  (.02) | .03  (.02) | -.04\*\*  (.02) | .01  (.02) | -.03\*\*  (.02) | .002  (.02) | -.03\*  (.02) |
| Racial Resentment | .07\*\*  (.03) | .05\*\*  (.02) | .05\*\*  (.02) | .08\*\*  (.02) | .05\*\*  (.02) | .06\*\*  (.02) | .08\*\*  (.02) | .04\*\*  (.02) |
| Ideology | .07  (.07) | -.07  (.05) | .04  (.06) | -.09\*  (.05) | .007  (.06) | -.13\*\*  (.05) | -.005\*\*  (.06) | -.15\*\*  (.05) |
| Black | .28  (.24) | .70\*\*  (.19) | -.12  (.20) | .65\*\*  (.18) | -.35\*  (.19) | .49\*\*  (.17) | .14  (.19) | .47\*\*  (.17) |
| Latino/a/x | .83\*\*  (.31) | .16  (.19) | .38  (.24) | .45\*\*  (.19) | .65\*\*  (.26) | .06  (.19) | .29  (.22) | .08  (.19) |
| Gender | .001  (.20) | -.09  (.13) | .06  (.16) | -.18  (.13) | .22  (.16) | .07  (.13) | .01  (.14) | -.06  (.13) |
| Age | .02\*\*  (.01) | .01\*\*  (.004) | .01\*\*  (.004) | .01\*\*  (.004) | .005  (.005) | .01\*  (.003) | .002  (.004) | .008\*\*  (.004) |
| Education | .14\*\*  (.07) | .04  (.05) | .08  (.06) | -.001  (.04) | .10\*  (.05) | -.03  (.04) | .02  (.05) | -.09\*\*  (.04) |
| Party Strength | -.08  (.19) | -.07  (.13) | .26\*  (.15) | -.34\*\*  (.12) | .11  (.15) | -.10  (.12) | .06  (.14) | -.13  (.12) |
| Constant | -1.83\*\*  (.85) | .27  (.59) | -1.02  (.70) | 1.89\*\*  (.58) | .005  (.70) | 1.46\*\*  (.57) | .71  (.65) | 1.93\*\*  (.58) |
| LR Chi-2 | 88.28\*\* | 52.32\*\* | 32.50\*\* | 127.61\*\* | 125.40\*\* | 104.23\*\* | 20.39\*\* | 109.64\*\* |
| N | 1,240 | 1,240 | 1,227 | 1,227 | 1,243 | 1,243 | 1,237 | 1,237 |

\*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Electability* |  | **Biden** | **Booker** | **Harris** | **Warren** |
| Hostile Sexism | White Respondents | -.0002  (.003)  [-.007, .007] | .002  (.002)  [-.001, .005] | .003  (.002)  [-.001, .006] | -.004  (.003)  [.01, .002] |
| Respondents of Color | -.008  (.004)  [-.02, -.0002] | .004  (.002)  [.0001, .007] | .004  (.002)  [-.001, .008] | .001  (.004)  [-.01, .01] |
| Modern Sexism | White Respondents | .05  (.02)  [.01, .08] | -.004  (.007)  [-.02, .01] | -.01  (.01)  [-.03, .004] | -.03  (.02)  [-.06, -.0002] |
| Respondents of Color | .002  (.02)  [-.04, .05] | -.002  (.01)  [-.02, .02] | -.02  (.01)  [-.04, .01] | .02  (.02)  [-.02, .06] |
| Racial Resentment | White Respondents | .01  (.005)  [.01, .02] | -.001  (.002)  [-.005, .003] | -.01  (.002)  [-.01, -.001] | -.01  (.004)  [-.02, .001] |
| Respondents of Color | -.004  (.007)  [-.02, .01] | .0004  (.003  [-.006, .007] | -.01  (.004)  [-.01, .002] | .01  (.01)  [-.004, .02] |

**Table A5. Average Marginal Effects of Interactions between Hostile Sexism/Modern Sexism/Racial Resentment and Race of Respondent[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**(SE)**

**[95% Confidence Interval]**

Shaded cells indicate statistically significant effects at the 95% confidence level

**Table A5. Cont’d**

Shaded cells indicate statistically significant effects at the 95% confidence level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Policy* |  | **Biden** | **Booker** | **Harris** | **Warren** |
| Hostile Sexism | White Respondents | .01  (.003)  [.002, .02] | .001  (.002)  [-.002, .004] | .002  (.002  [-.003, .006] | -.01  (.003)  [-.02, -.005] |
| Respondents of C | -.01  (.004)  [-.02, .0004] | .003  (.002)  [-.001, .007] | .002  (.003)  [-.004, .007] | .003  (.004)  [-.005, .01] |
| Modern Sexism | White Respondents | .03  (.02)  [-.001, .07] | -.003  (.008)  [-.02, .01] | -.01  (.01)  [-.03, .01] | -.02  (.02)  [-.05, .01] |
| Respondents of Color | -.01  (.02)  [-.05, .04] | .003  (.01)  [-.02, .01] | -.01  (.02)  [-.05, .02] | .02  (.02)  [-.03, .06] |
| Racial Resentment | White Respondents | .02  (.005)  [.01, .03] | ~0  (.002)  [-.005, .005] | -.01  (.003)  [-.01, .0002] | -.02  (.004)  [-.02, -.01] |
| Respondents of Color | .003  (.01)  [-.01, .02] | ~0  (.004)  [-.007, .007] | -.01  (.004)  [-.02, -.004] | .01  (.004)  [-.003, .02] |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Likability* |  | **Biden** | **Booker** | **Harris** | **Warren** |
| Hostile Sexism | White Respondents | .01  (.003)  [.002, .02] | .001  (.002)  [-.003, .006] | -.0005  (.003)  [-.006, .005] | -.01  (.003)  [-.02, -.003] |
| Respondents of Color | -.004  (.004)  [-.01, .01] | .005  (.003)  [-.00005, .01] | -.002  (.003)  [-.008, .004] | .001  (.004)  [-.01, .01] |
| Modern Sexism | White Respondents | .03  (.02)  [-.003, .06] | .002  (.01)  [-.02, .02] | -.01  (.01)  [-.04, .01] | -.02  (.02)  [-.05, .01] |
| Respondents of Color | -.01  (.02)  [-.06, .03] | -.01  (.01)  [-.04, .02] | .01  (.02)  [-.02, .04] | .01  (.02)  [-.03, .06] |
| Racial Resentment | White Respondents | .02  (.005)  [.01, .03] | -.004  (.002)  [-.009, .002] | -.01  (.003)  [-.02, -.003] | -.01  (.004)  [-.01, .004] |
| Respondents of Color | .0003  (.007)  [-.01, .01] | -.005  (.004)  [-.01, .003] | -.01  (.01)  [-.02, .002] | .01  (.01)  [-.001, .03] |

**Table A5. Cont’d**

Shaded cells indicate statistically significant effects at the 95% confidence level

**Table A5. Cont’d**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Represent* |  | **Biden** | **Booker** | **Harris** | **Warren** |
| Hostile Sexism | White Respondents | .01  (.003)  [.001, .01] | .003  (.002)  [-.001, .006] | .002  (.002)  [-.002, .007] | -.02  (.003)  [-.02, -.01] |
| Respondents of C | -.01  (.004)  [-.01, .003] | .003  (.002)  [-.001, .007] | .003  (.003)  [-.002, .009] | -.001  (.004)  [-.009, .007] |
| Modern Sexism | White Respondents | .03  (.02)  [-.001, .06] | -.003  (.009)  [-.02, .01] | -.002  (.01)  [-.02, .02] | -.03  (.02)  [-.06, .005] |
| Respondents of Color | .004  (.02)  [-.04, .05] | -.01  (.01)  [-.03, .01] | -.004  (.02)  [-.04, .03] | .01  (.02)  [-.03, .05] |
| Racial Resentment | White Respondents | .02  (.005)  [.01, .03] | .001  (.002)  [-.004, .006] | -.01  (.003)  [-.02, -.003] | -.01  (.004)  [-.02, -.002] |
| Respondents of Color | -.004  (.007)  [-.02, .01] | -.003  (.003)  [-.01, .004] | -.01  (.005)  [-.02, .001] | .02  (.007)  [.003, .03] |

Shaded cells indicate statistically significant effects at the 95% confidence level

**Table A6. Logit Coefficients; Likelihood of Voting for Each Candidate**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Biden | Booker | Harris | Warren |
| Electability | 1.40\*\*  (.22) | 1.80\*\*  (.45) | .90\*\*  (.35) | .44\*\*  (.20) |
| Policy Positions | 1.16\*\*  (.21) | .02  (.50) | 1.20  (.36) | 1.01\*\*  (.26) |
| Likability | .71\*\*  (.22) | .40  (.50) | 1.50\*\*  (.39) | .77\*\*  (.23) |
| Representative | 1.71\*\*  (.22) | 3.51\*\*  (.52) | 2.19\*\*  (.42) | 3.06\*\*  (.34) |
| Constant | -3.44\*\*  (.21) | -4.96\*\*  (.33) | -4.78\*\*  (.30) | -4.42\*\*  (.28) |
| LR Chi-2 | 760.33\*\* | 159.50\*\* | 317.80\*\* | 638.61\*\* |
| n | 1,298 | 1,298 | 1,298 | 1,298 |

\*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.1

**Table A7. Multinomial Logit Coefficients; “Electability Only”=base category**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Never Biden | Always Biden |
| Hostile sexism | .03  (.03) | .06\*\*  (.03) |
| Modern sexism | -.28\*\*  (.11) | -.10  (.12) |
| Liberal policy | -.09\*\*  (.04) | -.13\*\*  (.04) |
| Racial Resentment | .01  (.03) | .09\*\*  (.03) |
| Ideology | .04  (.11) | -.11  (.11) |
| Gender | .55\*\*  (.23) | .19  (.25) |
| Age | -.01  (.01) | .002  (.007) |
| Education | -.05  (.07) | -.11  (.08) |
| Party Strength | -.01  (.21) | -.02  (.22) |
| Constant | 3.96\*\*  (1.44) | 3.33\*\*  (1.45) |
| LR Chi-2 | 142.62\*\* | |
| n | 701 | |

\*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.1

1. Table A5 indicates the average marginal effects for interaction terms in models that include the following independent variables: hostile sexism, modern sexism, racial resentment, liberal policy, ideology, gender, age, education, party strength, and “white,” coded one if the respondent identifies as white and zero otherwise. For each candidate-criterion (i.e., for each column), three regression models were run to estimate the average marginal effects, interacting one independent variable of interest at a time with the variable “white.” While the dependent variable is dichotomous, regression models allows for interpretation of regression effects. Furthermore, if only one model were run for each candidate-criterion, white would have been simultaneously interacted with three variables of interest (hostile sexism, modern sexism, and racial resentment). Such a model would produce significant multicollinearity, leading to inflated standard errors and a bias towards showing insignificant relationships where significant relationships may exist. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)