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Abstract

Many researchers point to gender inequities in party recruitment practices to explain women’s underrepresentation on the ballot. However, there has been little research about how men and women respond to recruitment, so we do not know whether gender-balanced recruitment would actually lead to gender-balanced outcomes. We conduct two studies to address this question. First, in cooperation with a local Republican Party, we identically recruited 5,510 male and 5,506 female highly active party members to attend a free candidate training seminar. Women were half as likely to respond to the invitation as men. Second, we conducted a survey experiment of 3,960 voters on an exit poll in the same state. Men’s level of self-reported political ambition was increased by the prospect of elite recruitment significantly more than women’s, thereby increasing the gender gap. Together, these findings suggest that to fully understand the role recruitment plays in women’s underrepresentation, researchers must understand the ways in which men and women respond to recruitment, not just whether political elites engage in gendered recruitment practices.
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I. Introduction

Why are women so underrepresented in political office? While voter attitudes and the election process may have some influence on the gender gap in representation, scholars believe that the problem begins much earlier: women are much less likely than men to run for office. The dearth of women on the ballot is likely related to inequities in the political party recruitment process. Because party networks tend to be male-dominated, women are less likely to be recruited to run by party leaders. The implication is that if parties alter their recruitment methods to be more gender-balanced, the gender gap in representation will recede. However, this rests on the assumption that men and women react similarly when they are recruited similarly, an assumption that remains largely untested in the literature. Since there is good evidence that women, on average, have lower levels of political ambition and are more likely to doubt their qualifications for office, it is hard to believe that women will respond as enthusiastically to recruitment efforts as men. Indeed, the conventional wisdom among political operatives is that women are much more difficult to recruit than men.

Hence, this paper focuses on a crucial question: how do men and women respond when they are recruited? Though an empirical question, the answer has important theoretical implications. Recruitment is interactive, and its impact depends on both the extent to which political elites engage in it and the extent to which recruits respond positively to elite overtures. Exiting studies have focused on the former and neglected the latter. In other words, if women and men react differently to recruitment, our current understanding of the role recruitment plays in the gender gap in political representation is incomplete.

To test whether gender-balanced recruitment yields gender-balanced responses, we conducted two studies. First, we conducted a field study with the Republican Party in a suburban,
conservative, Republican-dominated county to recruit male and female party activists. We invited 11,016 highly engaged party members (5510 men and 5506 women) to attend a free, party-sponsored “Prospective Candidate Information Seminar.” We tracked 1) who logged on to the event website to find out more information about the seminar, 2) who registered for the seminar, and 3) who attended the seminar. This allowed us to monitor responses to recruitment by both men and women. Second, we partnered with a statewide Exit Poll in the same state to conduct a survey experiment on 3,960 voters. A random subset of voters were asked if they would ever consider running for local office, while others were asked if they would ever consider it “if a party or community leader encouraged them to do so.” We examined the difference-in-difference between men and women’s responses to this question.

In both of these studies, we found highly gendered patterns in participants’ responses. In the first study, we find that women were half as likely to respond to the invitation as men across all of the outcome measures. In our second study, men were significantly more likely to respond affirmatively to the recruitment message than to the control; the women were unchanged by the recruitment message.

To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to compare how men and women respond to recruitment efforts when they are recruited at the same time by the same source with the same messages and same intensity. In two studies with very different outcome measures, we find the same result: women are not as responsive to recruitment as men. This finding points to the importance of exploring how individuals interpret and internalize recruitment efforts, not just the ways in which elites attempt to recruit individuals.
In the remainder of the paper, we discuss the role of recruitment in American politics and the effect of gendered political networks on recruitment. We then describe our two studies and their results. Finally, we discuss the implications of our findings.

II. The Role of Recruitment in American Politics

Although the conventional wisdom suggests that most American political candidates are “self-starters,” the typical candidate emergence process is much more complex. Primary elections and candidate-centered campaigns render American parties less influential than parties in many other countries, but an individual’s decision to run for office is a multifaceted calculation that frequently includes cues from their party. In fact, research suggests that party cues are one of the most influential factors in the decision-making process for both local and national candidates (Huckson and Spencer 1971; Kazee and Thornberry 1990; Moncreief, Squire, and Jewell 2001; Maestas et al 2006; Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, and Walsh 2009; Fox and Lawless 2010; Broockman 2014). It is not surprising, then, that since at least the 1980s, national party organizations have taken an active role in finding promising candidates and encouraging them to run for Congress (Gibson et al 1985; Aldrich 2000; Maestas, Maisel, and Stone 2005).

At the local level, parties also tend to be highly involved in recruitment efforts (Gibson et al 1985; Aldrich 2000; Sanbonmatsu 2006). Crowder-Meyer’s 2008 Survey of County Party Leaders, the most recent and complete data available on this subject, finds that about 80% of county parties reported commonly recruiting candidates for county legislative offices such as county commissioner. They were less involved with other offices—35.5% with mayors and town councils, 64.6% with sheriffs/clerks/treasurers, and 42.1% with legal offices—but these numbers are still fairly high, especially since local offices are often nonpartisan (2011, 120).
Furthermore, when asked whether their county party organization has assisted candidates by contributing money, organizing fundraisers and campaign rallies, writing press releases, producing campaign literature, etc., an overwhelming number of party leaders said that they did (124).

Consequently, among first-time state legislators, only about a third make the decision to run on their own (Moncrief et al 2001). Most are invited and/or encouraged to run by those around them—frequently local or state party officials or current office-holders (39). Sanbonmatsu finds that even though parties do not have full control over candidate selection in the United States, they are generally active recruiters: nominations are “too important to leave to chance” (2006, 38). And even if self-starters self-nominate, party operatives will often “continue to recruit until they believe they have the strongest candidate” (2006, 38).

Furthermore, the role of recruitment is likely even more important for women than for men. In a recent survey of male and female state legislators, Carroll and Sanbonmatsu find that more than half of female state legislators had not seriously considered running for office before a party leader suggested it to them (2013, 49). This leads them to argue that women tend to make decisions about office-holding through a “relationally-embedded” process, rather than the traditional model of self-starting political ambition (61). In short, any analysis of women’s underrepresentation ought to consider the role of political party recruitment.

**III. Gendered Political Networks**

Recruitment plays an important role in candidate emergence, perhaps especially for female candidates. However, recruitment generally takes place within existing social networks,
which can create problems for women’s representation in politics. Existing political networks tend to be male-dominated, making it more difficult for women to access the resources they provide. Male-dominated party networks can limit women’s advancement in politics in several ways; for example, current leaders tend to identify those who are similar to them as the best potential leaders (Niven 1998). Furthermore, male party chairs are much less likely than female chairs to think of female candidates when asked to name potential candidates for upcoming races (Niven 1998; Crowder-Meyer 2013). Sanbonmatsu’s interviews with party leaders, politicians, and activists also highlight that recruiters tend to cull personal networks for potential candidates—and personal networks tend to be gendered (2006, 131-132).

As a result, Lawless and Fox find that 45% of professional women, compared to 52% of professional men, had an electoral gatekeeper suggest that they run for office (2010, 314-315). They were also less likely to have been recruited multiple times or by multiple sources (316). When other factors are held constant, Lawless and Fox found that the gender gap in recruitment actually increased significantly: the “average” professional woman had a .60 predicted probability of being recruited, while the “average” professional man’s predicted probability was .76 (317).

This may explain why places in which political parties are more involved in the recruitment of candidates do not necessarily have more women in office. Sanbonmatsu (2006) and Niven (2006) find either null or negative effects of party involvement in recruitment on women’s representation. However, Crowder-Meyer concludes that whether party recruitment helps or hurts women “depends on the specific characteristics and choices of party leaders” (2013,409). Recruitment that works through party activists and officeholders disadvantages women; female party leaders and those who recruit from local office holders, their personal
networks, and education and child-related groups tend to identify more female candidates to support (406-407).

In summary, there are two important findings in the literature. First, women are more likely than men to need recruitment to be interested in running for office. Second, women are less likely than men to be recruited. Perhaps the solution, then, is to make recruitment more gender-balanced. If parties had more equitable recruitment practices, would the gender gap in representation narrow?

**IV. Responses to Recruitment**

Before we can conclude that gender equitable recruitment practices would narrow the gender gap, we need to examine how men and women respond to recruitment. This is an empirical question with important theoretical implications: researchers tend to focus on political elites’ recruitment efforts without seriously considering how recruits may interpret and internalize these efforts. The effectiveness of recruitment depends both on how political elites act and how political recruits react. The former has been studied much more than the latter.

While existing research does not answer the question of how men and women respond to recruitment, there are several related branches of the literature. First, women tend to have lower levels of political ambition than similarly-qualified men (Lawless and Fox 2010; Kanthak and Woon 2012). Based on structured interviews and survey data, Lawless and Fox conclude that “women rely on a more exhaustive set of criteria when assessing whether they are qualified to run for office” (126). Men are much more likely than women to judge themselves against current real candidates rather than a mythical ideal candidate (128-129). Kanthak and Woon observe a similar tendency in a controlled laboratory setting: “for virtually every level of ability,
men were more likely than women to run for office. Furthermore, these differences were most
dramatic at the highest level of task ability. In other words...women don’t run, but highly
qualified women really don’t run” (2012, 39). Because of these gender differences in political
ambition and perceptions of qualifications, even identical recruitment methods may produce
gendered outcomes.

Elite interviews with party recruiters seem to echo these findings. Party leaders often
observe that “men are much more willing to jump into it than women” (Sanbonmatsu 2006,
126). One leader explained that “one of the most difficult things is convincing women to run or
getting women to run...often times what I hear is, ‘I could never do that,’ ‘I don’t know how,’ ‘I
don’t know enough,’ ‘I’m not smart enough,’ or ‘I’ve never been involved in politics.’ ...I think
that’s the biggest stumbling block to get over” (126). In short, recruiters find that women are
harder to recruit than men.

Yet, Fox and Lawless find that professional women who recall being recruited are just as
likely as men who recall being recruited to consider running for office (2010). The predicted
probability of expressing ambition for public office is 8% for unrecruited women and 12% for
unrecruited men—but it is 20% for recruited women and 18% for recruited men (322). There
may be several explanations for this somewhat surprising finding. Perhaps targeted recruitment
helps women overcome their self-doubts to the point that it erases and even slightly reverses the
gender gap. It is also plausible that a selection effect may be driving results: party leaders focus
on recruiting people—male or female—who are likely to respond positively to recruitment. Or,
since these results rely on self-reported recollections of being recruited, women who are already
interested in running for office may be more likely to remember recruitment efforts or to
perceive conversations with party or community leaders as recruitment efforts.
To untangle these difficult causal questions, we need an objective measure of recruitment that does not rely on individual perceptions or recollections. If one can hold recruitment constant and then measure its effect, it is easier to draw conclusions about how men and women react to it. Hence, in our both of our studies, we track men and women’s responses to the same recruitment messages. To our knowledge, this has not been done before. Experimental or quasi-experimental field studies of recruitment are themselves very novel (Broockman 2014). However, we believe they provide an important addition to the literature. In the following sections of this paper, we discuss the research design, implementation and results for our field study and exit poll survey experiment, respectively.

V. Study 1: “Prospective Candidate Information Seminar” Field Study

A. Research Design and Hypotheses

We partnered with the Republican Party in a conservative, primarily suburban county of a little over 500,000 residents. Women are extremely underrepresented on the ballot in this county. Table 1 reports the gender breakdown of candidates by office in the 2011-2012 election cycle. Overall, women comprised 15.2% of the 243 candidates for all offices for which residents of this county were eligible; they comprised just 12.1% of all non-school board candidates. In short, given this county’s low existing levels of women’s participation in public office, it is an interesting and difficult case for our research.

[Table 1 Here]

With the full cooperation of the party, we organized a free, party-sponsored “Prospective Candidate Information Seminar” (PCIS). We selected 11,016 Republican Party caucus attendees
(5510 men and 5506 women) who were also regular voters and/or current or former party officers to receive a personalized postcard invitation to the recruitment seminar. In households with multiple party members, we randomly assigned one individual to receive an invitation so that no household received more than one invitation. The invitations were addressed to a specific individual and invited him or her to the seminar. The invitation explained that the seminar would cover topics such as increasing name recognition, developing a campaign message, organizing a campaign team, managing campaign logistics, and fundraising. The speakers included local politicians, a campaign strategist, and a family panel to discuss the effects of political involvement on family life. Ten days prior to the seminar, we made reminder phone calls with a pre-recorded voice message by the Party chair to 7,709 of the households that received mailed invitations. We also sent registration reminder emails to the 8,395 recipients for which we had email addresses. Finally, all subjects received a mailed postcard reminder one week before the seminar.

2 We mailed invitations to a total of 6,056 women, but a random subset of these women received a woman-specific message that men did not receive, so we limit our analysis here to the 5,506 women who received identical invitations to the men.

3 As part of a larger field experiment, subjects were randomly assigned to receive one of 11 slightly different invitations in an attempt to see if different messages were more effective in recruiting. However, there were few statistically significant differences between the invitations with regard to who registered for or attended the event, so we have aggregated the results for this paper.

4 The email data appeared to be missing at random, we found no significant differences between subjects with and without available email addresses, based on the information we had.
Each personalized invitation had a unique identification number that allowed the invitee to log on to a gated website where he or she could get further information and to register for the seminar. This allowed us to track 1) who was interested enough to log on to the website for more information, 2) who registered for the event, and 3) who attended. For each individual who registered for the seminar we also collected demographic information including age, gender, education and income level, marital status, family size, occupation, and degree of political involvement.

We used a candidate training seminar as the focus of our field study on recruitment for two reasons. First, it provided a relevant, real-world setting in which we could recruit participants in a non-gendered way. While a research design that included more personal recruitment attempts might better reflect the bulk of recruitment that happens on the ground, it would be difficult to implement in a gender-neutral way, especially on such a large scale. Second, candidate training programs are an increasingly popular recruitment method. Typically these programs are sponsored by interest groups who aim to increase the number of candidates sympathetic to their cause. However, party-sponsored seminars have become increasingly

---

5 Overall, these reminder measures had a statistically insignificant or negative effect on our outcome measures, with the exception of a strongly positive effect of email reminders on PCIS attendance. We find no significant difference in how men and women responded to these measures.

6 Examples include the California Farm Bureau Federation’s Campaign Management Seminar, the Center for Progressive Leadership’s Local Progressive Candidate Trainings, the American Majority’s New Leaders Campaign Training, and the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund’s Candidate and Campaign Training.
common, and there are reasons to believe that these kinds of programs will soon begin to specifically target women. In its *Growth and Opportunities Project* report following the 2012 election, the Republican National Committee urged the Party to “provide training programs for potential female candidates that include fundraising guidance, digital strategy, etc.” (2013, 20-21). Despite their growing prominence as a recruitment tool, academic research on these programs is scant (though see Rozell 2000; Sanbonmatsu forthcoming; Hennings 2011). However, we do know that female state legislators are more likely than their male counterparts to have attended a training program (Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, and Walsh 2009). We believe our research is a good example of how training programs could be used by scholars to study the recruitment process in the future.

**B. Results**

For each of the 11,016 subjects, we collected data from the party database and the state voter file on each individual’s age and their level of political involvement, including their election voting frequency and their current or former party officer status. We also worked with a local marketing firm to confirm the gender and mailing addresses for each individual. We report our data on the full sample by gender in Appendix Table 1. As reported in the table, men in our sample are on average 1.56 years younger than women and are also significantly more likely to have served as a party officer during 2006-2012 period for which we have data. The women in our sample, however, are significantly more likely than the men to vote in both presidential and non-presidential elections.

Our main objective was to identify whether identical recruitment of men and women results in gender-balanced responses to recruitment. Though the existing research points in
conflicting directions, we hypothesize that women will be less likely to respond to the party recruitment efforts than men for all of our dependent variables: logging on to the seminar website, registering for the seminar, and attending the seminar.

Indeed, we find strong evidence that men and women responded to our gender-balanced recruitment in highly gendered ways. Table 2 reports large, statistically significant differences between men and women’s responses for all three of our measures. Overall, about 1.4% of men logged on to our website to find out more information compared to only 0.7% of women. These yields are small for both men and women, reflecting the reality that interest in running for office is rare and that mobilization efforts generally have fairly small effect sizes (Cardy 2005; Gerber and Green 2000; Gerber, Green, and Green 2003; Miller and Krosnick 2004). However, the response rate for men was twice as high as the response rate for women. This pattern also holds with the other dependent variables, such as registering for and attending the seminar. Clearly, gender-balanced recruitment did not yield gender-balanced results.

[Table 2 Here]

Unfortunately, because little demographic information is available for the full sample of subjects, we must be cautious in interpreting these results. Although all subjects are politically active (caucus attendees and regular voters), there are a host of unobserved variables that could account for the gender differences that we found. So, while the results are highly suggestive and have the advantage of being based on behavioral outcomes from real-world recruitment efforts, we turn to a second study to provide a more methodologically rigorous examination of gendered responses to recruitment.

**VI. Study 2: Exit Poll Survey Experiment**
A. Experimental Design and Subject Pool

In this section we report the results of an experiment that we conducted as part of a 2014 election exit poll administered in the same state in which we conducted the first study. The survey consisted of traditional questions found on an exit survey, including candidate choice, important issues, demographics, and voting accessibility. Our experiment was embedded after

The poll was distributed at thirty polling locations in each of the congressional districts in the state, with the exception of one district for which 29 polling locations were sampled. Selection of polling locations was done by way of unequal probability sampling based on estimated voter turnout, which was estimated using cumulative 2010 midterm election turnout data provided by the state. Finally, the exit poll distributor determined sampling intervals for each polling location with the goal of interviewing 100 subjects at each polling-place assuming an expected response rate of 50%. The sample collection was completed evenly throughout the day, with half of voters sampled in the morning and half sampled in the afternoon. If a respondent refused to respond to the poll or was missed by the poll worker, a process was put in place to record demographic data about the respondent. These data include gender, estimated age (18-35, 36-55, 56-75, 76+) and race (White, Hispanic, Other).

In addition to polling-place interviews, surveys were distributed to early-voters across three samples. This was required in two particular counties as well because all voting there was done by mail. Data were obtained from the Lieutenant Governor’s office for early voters with approximately 9,000 observations, 90 percent of which had an associated phone number. The target number of responses was 300 early voters per congressional district. For those that had registered addresses, a postcard was sent that linked the voters to an online survey in Qualtrics.
the traditional exit poll questions and before questions about demographics. Exit poll respondents were randomly assigned into either a control or a treatment condition. The control condition asked respondents “Would you ever consider running for local office?” Respondents could answer yes, probably yes, probably not, or no. The treatment language asked if subjects would ever consider running for local office “if a party or community leader encouraged them to do so” and had the same answer options as in the control condition.

**B. Data and Results**

Our sample consists of 3,960 survey respondents, 1,946 in the control and 2,014 in the treatment. 49.3% of the respondents are female, 91.4% are Caucasian, and the average subject is 50 years old. 15% of our subjects have an annual family income between $50,000 and $75,000, 25% between $75,000 and $125,000, and 8% of the subjects have incomes below $25,000.

This method was supplemented with a phone survey in which callers filled out the survey from information given over the phone. The total number of early voter responses was approximately 2,300 or 26 percent of all responders.

8 Embedded in the survey itself were three different experiments. To ensure that each subject was exposed to a treatment, a Latin Square design was put in place that ensured each subject received one control and two treatment messages. Further, our experiment was the first of the three, so our results should be unaffected by the other treatments.

9 See Appendix 7 for the full survey text. Question [M] contains the experiment question. Note that CD1-1 and CD1-2 contain the treatment question and CD1-3 contains the control question.

10 This is not far from the average age of first-time running for office in the U.S., which is 50.1 years for women and 46.7 for men.
Overall, as reported in Appendix Table 2, the differences in the preexisting characteristics between the subjects in the two treatments are not statistically significant, suggesting that the randomization of treatments was effective.\(^{11}\)

Table 3 reports the breakdown of responses to the exit poll question regarding considering running for office by gender and treatment. In the control condition, 30.2% of the men responded “yes” or “probably yes,” with 69.7% responding “no” or “probably not.” The women were about half as likely to respond positively, with only 14.4% responding “yes” or “probably yes.” Fully 57.3% of the women completely ruled out running for office. The men’s average interest in the control group is 2.07 (out of 4), while the women’s average interest in the control is 1.63.\(^{12}\) So, consistent with our field study results, we find a significant gender gap in political ambition.

How do men and women in the recruitment treatment group respond? 38.9% of the men and 18.1% of the women respond “yes” or “probably yes.” The gender gap remains wide; indeed, Table 3 also provides evidence that the recruitment treatment increases the magnitude of the gender gap observed in the control. It raises men’s average response on the 4-point scale to 2.28 (a 10% increase over the control) while leaving the women’s average response unaffected at

\(^{11}\) In Appendix Table 3, we report the breakdown of summary statistics by treatment and gender. The table shows that there are no statistically significant differences in control and treatment groups within each gender, with the exception of incomes between $100,000 and $125,000 for men and greater than $150,000 for women. We control for these differences in our robustness tests below.

\(^{12}\) Subjects’ responses were coded as 1, 2, 3, or 4, with the numbers corresponding to “No”, “Probably not”, “Probably yes”, and “Yes” respectively.
1.70. Our difference-in-difference results suggest that this increase in the gender gap is marginally significant overall, and highly significant among those who completely rule out running for office. Among this latter group, the gender gap increases by seven percentage points.

[Table 3 Here]

Next, we test whether our treatment effect is robust to the inclusion of additional covariates. Because it is possible that men and women have different backgrounds and qualifications that might influence their propensity to respond to recruitment, this is an important consideration. To test the effect of recruitment on individuals’ political ambition, we performed the following regressions analysis:

\[ PA_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times Treatment_i + \beta_2 \times Female_i + \beta_3 \times Treatment_i \times Female_i + \beta_4 X_i + \epsilon_i \] (1)

In this equation, \( PA_i \) represents one of our three measures of political ambition in our experiment: 1) individual \( i \)’s probability of responding “yes”; 2) individual \( i \)’s probability of responding positively (either “yes” or “probably yes”), or 3) individual \( i \)’s self-reported average propensity to consider running for a political office: a discrete variable between 1-4. \( Treatment \) is a dummy variable for our recruitment treatment, \( Female \) is a dummy variable for female gender, and \( X_i \) is a vector of demographic characteristics and other covariates for each individual \( i \). We included the following demographic information on the subjects: age, gender, education level, employment, income, and political party affiliation\(^\text{13}\).

\(^{13}\text{Since the first two dependent variables are binary variables and the third one is a discrete variable between 1-4, we estimate our model using probit and ordered probit models respectively.}\)
Since our model includes an interaction term between gender and treatment, we expect that the unique effect of recruitment on men ($\beta_1$) should be positive. Our model also allows us to test the effect of the treatment on the gender gap. We define the gender gap as the difference in the average levels of interest of men and women. Given the prior theoretical literature discussed above, we expect that the gender gap in the treatment will be larger than in the control. Since the gender gap in the treatment is given by ($\beta_2 + \beta_3$) and the gender gap in the control is given by $\beta_2$, we expect that $\beta_3 < 0$.

We report the results of our probit regression analysis in Table 4 for six separate specifications. Columns 1-3 of the table correspond to each of our measures of political ambition and do not include demographic variables, while columns 4-6 do include demographic variables. Regression results confirm statistically significant effect of the treatment variable, as well as the interaction term between treatment and gender. The coefficients do not change substantially with the inclusion of covariates, suggesting that factors like education and employment do not seem to be responsible for the gendered responses to recruitment. As reported in Table 4, the recruitment treatment has a positive and statistically significant effect on men for all three of our measures of political ambition. We also observe that the recruitment treatment significantly increases the gender gap in the average willingness to consider a political office as $\beta_3$ is negative and statistically significant. The effect of recruitment on the gender gap in other two measures of political ambition is also negative, as expected, but not statistically significant.

[Table 4 Here]

The results of this analysis suggest that while recruitment by a political party or community leader only marginally increases women’s willingness to consider running for local office, it significantly increases men’s willingness. As we found in the first study,
balanced recruitment efforts do not lead to gender-balanced responses. In fact, the results from our second study suggest that gender-balanced recruitment can actually increase the gender gap in political ambition.

**V. Discussion and Conclusion**

The results of our studies have important implications for research on gender and political representation. In two different studies with different outcome measures, men were significantly more likely than women to respond positively to elite recruitment. Methodologically, these studies complement each other well—the first measures behavioral responses to carefully designed real life recruitment efforts, while the second provides the kind of causal inference that only an experiment can deliver. That both of these studies point in the same direction suggests that gendered responses to party recruitment are an important factor in the underrepresentation of women in political office.

This complicates the existing explanations that center on recruitment as a reason for women’s underrepresentation. No doubt the gendered nature of political networks and recruitment appeals matters a great deal. Our findings show that men do respond to recruitment, and so differentially recruiting them is likely to lead to large gender gaps on the ballot. But, our results indicate that even deliberately gender-balanced recruitment efforts produce highly gendered results. Even-handed approaches to recruitment are unlikely to be enough to close the gender gap, and they may even widen it.

This is a theoretically important finding: the existing literature has focused on cataloging and examining the efforts that party elites make to encourage people to run, but that is only half
of the equation. If we wish to truly understand the role recruitment plays in who ends up on the ballot, we must not only consider what recruitment messages party officials send, but also how individuals interpret and internalize these recruitment messages when they receive them. Recruitment is an interactive process, so the behavior of both the recruiters and recruits matters. When a political elite suggests to a politically engaged citizen that he or she should consider running for office, what does the citizen hear? A platitude? A promise of support? A genuine request? Our research suggests that politically active men and women process these requests differently, though the limitations of our research design make it impossible to understand exactly why or how. Further research that probes the lived experiences of men and women who are recruited is important because effective recruitment depends on how they respond.
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Tables and Figures

Table 1: Candidate Gender by Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates for the 2012 and 2011 State and Municipal General and Primary Elections</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Board</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislator</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Office</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: PCIS Response Rates by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents who logged into the website</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.7%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents who registered for the seminar</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents who attended the seminar</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subjects</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>5506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** indicates statistical significance at the 5 percent level, two tailed. Standard errors are in parentheses
Table 3: Gender differences in political ambition by treatment, Exit Poll experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Difference-in-Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.100**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.37]</td>
<td>[.24]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.058**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.35]</td>
<td>[.28]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.46]</td>
<td>[.45]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.182**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean response</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.08]</td>
<td>[.87]</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Standard errors are in brackets. * indicates statistical significance at the 10 percent level. ** indicates statistical significance at the 5 percent level.
Table 4: Marginal effects at means of treatment and gender, Exit Poll experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Yes</th>
<th>(2) Yes/Probably yes</th>
<th>(3) Mean response&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(4) Yes</th>
<th>(5) Yes/Probably yes</th>
<th>(6) Mean response&lt;sup&gt;p&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.021*</td>
<td>.072**</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.024*</td>
<td>.077**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.109**</td>
<td>-.168**</td>
<td>-.500**</td>
<td>-.089**</td>
<td>-.149**</td>
<td>-.490**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment x Female</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.130*</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.158**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; from Probit model</td>
<td>.0401</td>
<td>.0442</td>
<td>.0274</td>
<td>.0687</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.0603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>3774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. * indicates statistical significance at the 10 percent level. ** indicates statistical significance at the 5 percent level. <sup>D</sup>Demographic variables include age; race/ethnicity; marital status; educational attainment; employment status; and income. <sup>p</sup>Reported results are those of the ordered probit model.
### Appendix 1: Supplementary Analysis

#### Appendix Table 1: Summary Statistics by Gender (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47.91</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>-1.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[13.95]</td>
<td>[14.22]</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of presidential elections attended</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>-.027**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.26]</td>
<td>[.25]</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of off-year elections attended</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>-.037**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.28]</td>
<td>[.28]</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate status</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.015**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.09]</td>
<td>[.06]</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>5506</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard deviations are in square brackets. Standard errors are in parentheses. ** indicates statistical significance at the 5 percent level.

#### Appendix Table 2: Summary Statistics by Treatment (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>50.89</td>
<td>50.36</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[16.80]</td>
<td>[16.61]</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.27]</td>
<td>[.26]</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.38]</td>
<td>[.39]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree or higher</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (in U.S. Dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.26]</td>
<td>[.27]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>[.32]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.32]</td>
<td>[.32]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.36]</td>
<td>[.35]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations 1946 2014 --

Notes: Standard deviations are in square brackets. Standard errors are in parentheses. * indicates statistical significance at the 10 percent level. ** indicates statistical significance at the 5 percent level. The number of observations by variable will differ. Number of observations indicates the maximum: number of observations may vary.

### Appendix Table 3: Summary Statistics by treatment and gender (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Female Treatment</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Male Treatment</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>49.99</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>50.72</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[16.52]</td>
<td>[16.55]</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>[17.06]</td>
<td>[16.67]</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnered</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.38]</td>
<td>[.40]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>[.38]</td>
<td>[.38]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree or higher</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>[.46]</td>
<td>[.45]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (in U.S. Dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>[.34]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>[.32]</td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.34]</td>
<td>[.34]</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>[.33]</td>
<td>[.34]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>Mean 1</td>
<td>Mean 2</td>
<td>Mean 3</td>
<td>Mean 4</td>
<td>Mean 5</td>
<td>Mean 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $124,999</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.032**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>[.34]</td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 – $149,999</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$150,000</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.029**</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.33]</td>
<td>[.29]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>[.31]</td>
<td>[.33]</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard deviations are in square brackets. Standard errors are in parentheses. ** indicates statistical significance at the 5 percent level. Number of observations indicates the maximum: individual number of observations may vary.
Appendix 2: Mailed Invitation

Have you considered running for office?

You are cordially invited to join us for a

**Prospective Candidate Information Seminar**

**Saturday, June 8, 2013**

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

Marriott Hotel & Conference Center

Attend this **free** seminar to learn the steps to run for local, state, or federal office.

**Topics covered during the seminar:**

- Increasing name recognition
- Developing the campaign message
- Organizing a campaign team & managing campaign logistics
- Demystifying fundraising and networking

**How to Register:**

To learn more and RSVP, visit our event website at [civicinvolvement.org](http://civicinvolvement.org).

Please log in with this username:

Registration is **free**, but seating is limited so don’t delay! The registration deadline is Friday, May 31, 2013. Participants may bring a guest. Dress is casual.

Refreshments will be provided. We look forward to seeing you at the seminar.
Appendix 3: Exit Poll

Treatment Condition\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Please continue on other side $\rightarrow$}
[Q] Please indicate which office Joe Biden currently holds:
- US Supreme Court Justice
- Vice President of the US
- Speaker of the US House
- US Senate Majority Leader

[R] How much do you support United States intervention in the following:
Don't Support Support Don't know
- Ebola outbreak in Africa 1 2 3 4 5
- ISIS prevention in Syria 1 2 3 4 5
- Democratization of China 1 2 3 4 5
- Military aid to Ukraine 1 2 3 4 5
- Economic aid to poverty-stricken countries 1 2 3 4 5

[S] What percentage vote of the U.S. House and Senate is needed to override a Presidential veto?
- A majority
- Three-fourths
- Two-thirds
- Unanimous

[T] How helpful were the poll workers at your polling place?
- Very helpful
- Somewhat helpful
- Not very helpful
- Not at all helpful
- Don't know

[U] For how many years is a United States Senator elected if he or she is in his or her first term of office for a U.S. Senator?
- 2 years
- 4 years
- 6 years
- 8 years

[V] Are you:  Male  Female

[W] What year were you born?  19  __  ___

[X] Generally speaking do you consider yourself to be a(n):
- Strong Democrat
- Not so strong Democrat
- Independent leaning Democrat
- Independent
- Independent leaning Republican
- Not so strong Republican
- Strong Republican
- Other
- Don't know

[Y] On most political matters do you consider yourself:
- Strongly conservative
- Moderately conservative
- Neither, middle of the road
- Moderately liberal
- Strongly liberal
- Don't know

[Z] What was the last year of school you completed?
- Some high school or less
- College graduate
- High school graduate
- Postgraduate
- Some college

[AA] What, if any, is your religious preference?
- Protestant
- Catholic
- LDS / Mormon
- Jewish
- Other
- No preference / No religious affiliation
- Prefer not to say

[BB] How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religious preference?
- Very active
- Somewhat active
- Not very active
- Not at all active
- Does not apply / Prefer not to say

[CC] What is your current employment status?
- Self-employed
- Homemaker
- Employed by someone else
- Retired
- Unemployed
- Student

[DD] Are you:
- American Indian / Native-American
- Asian
- Black / African American
- Hispanic / Latino
- White / Caucasian
- Pacific Islander
- Other

[EE] Are you presently:
- Married
- Divorced
- Single
- Living with a partner
- Widowed

[FF] What do you expect your 2014 family income to be?
- Under $25,000
- $25,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $59,999
- $60,000 - $69,999
- $70,000 - $79,999
- $80,000 - $89,999
- $90,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 - $249,999
- $250,000 - $299,999
- $300,000 - $349,999
- $400,000 or more

Thank you for your voluntary participation.
**Control Condition**

---

**Exit Poll**

Please give only ONE response for each question unless otherwise directed.

---

[A] In today's election for [ ] did you vote for:

- [ ] [Blank]

[B] In today's election for U.S. House of Representatives, did you vote for:

- [ ] [Blank]

[C] Did you have trouble finding your polling place?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

[D] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about an election in which mail ballots are used for all voters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. An election with mail ballots would encourage fraud.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. I worry that I would cast my ballot early and then hear important information that might change my vote.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Casting a ballot by mail would be more convenient for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle only ONE number per row.

---

[E] Did someone from a political party, campaign, or other group contact you and ask you to vote early or by absentee ballot?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

[F] How did you prepare to vote today? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Watched the news
- [ ] Read the newspaper
- [ ] Listened to the radio
- [ ] Watched a televised debate
- [ ] Accessed resources on the Internet
- [ ] Other
- [ ] No preparation needed

---

[G] There are many ways for people to vote, and some prefer one way over another. If you had the following choices, which would you prefer?

- [ ] Voting in a booth on election day
- [ ] Voting over the internet
- [ ] Voting through the mail
- [ ] Voting early at a voting center
- [ ] Don't know

---

[H] Why did you decide to vote in person today? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] It's convenient
- [ ] It's my duty / tradition
- [ ] I like wearing my "I voted" sticker
- [ ] I gain a sense of unity with the community
- [ ] It's what I've always done

---

[I] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "I feel adequately represented by [____]"

Circle only ONE number per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. State Government</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Congress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[J] Overall, how satisfied are you with your voting experience today?

- [ ] Very satisfied
- [ ] Somewhat satisfied
- [ ] Not at all satisfied
- [ ] Don't Know

---

[K] Did you attend your neighborhood caucus this year?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

[L] Would you ever consider running for local office?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

[M] During this election cycle, did you donate money to a candidate, campaign, or political organization?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

---

[N] Do you think there should be limits on what individuals, corporations, unions, and other organizations can spend in election campaigns or do you think there should be no limits to protect freedom of speech?

- [ ] Yes, there should be limits
- [ ] No, there should not be limits
- [ ] Don't Know

---

[O] As you may know, the federal minimum wage is currently set at $7.25 an hour. A recent report by the Congressional Budget Office says that raising the minimum wage to $10.10 over the next three years would eliminate 500,000 jobs. Knowing this, do you favor or oppose an increase in the federal minimum wage?

- [ ] Favor
- [ ] Oppose
- [ ] Don't Know

---

Please continue on other side →

---
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[Q] Please indicate which office Joe Biden currently holds:
- US Supreme Court Justice
- Vice President of the US
- Speaker of the US House
- US Senate Majority Leader

[R] How much do you support United States intervention in the following:
Circle only ONE number per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Ebola outbreak in Africa</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ISIS prevention in Syria</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Democratization of China</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Military aid to Ukraine</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Economic aid to poverty-stricken countries</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[S] What percentage role of the U.S. House and Senate is needed to override a Presidential veto?
- A majority
- Two-thirds
- Three-quarters
- Unanimous

[T] How helpful were the poll workers at your polling place?
- Very helpful
- Somewhat helpful
- Not very helpful
- Not at all helpful
- Don't know

[U] For how many years is a United States Senator elected - that is how many years are there in one full term of office for a U.S. Senator?
- 2 years
- 4 years
- 6 years
- 8 years

[V] Are you:
- Male
- Female

[W] What year were you born? 19__

[X] Generally speaking, do you consider yourself to be a(n):
- Strong Democrat
- Not so strong Democrat
- Independent leaning Democrat
- Independent
- Independent leaning Republican
- Not so strong Republican
- Strong Republican
- Other
- Don't know

[Y] On most political matters do you consider yourself:
- Strongly conservative
- Moderately conservative
- Neither, middle of the road
- Moderately liberal
- Strongly liberal
- Don't know

[Z] What was the last year of school you completed?
- Some high school or less
- College graduate
- High school graduate
- Postgraduate
- Some college

[AA] What, if any, is your religious preference?
- Protestant
- Catholic
- LDS / Mormon
- Jewish
- Other
- No preference / No religious affiliation
- Prefer not to say

[BB] How active do you consider yourself in the practice of your religious preference?
- Very active
- Somewhat active
- Not very active
- Not active
- Does not apply / Prefer not to say

[CC] What is your current employment status?
- Self-employed
- Homemaker
- Employed by someone else
- Unemployed
- Student

[DD] Are you:
- American Indian / Native American
- Asian
- Black / African American
- Hispanic / Latino
- White / Caucasian
- Pacific Islander
- Other

[EE] Are you presently:
- Married
- Divorced
- Living with a partner
- Widowed

[FF] What do you expect your 2014 family income to be?
- Under $25,000
- $25,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $54,999
- $55,000 - $69,999
- $70,000 - $84,999
- $85,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 - $299,999
- $300,000 - $399,999
- $400,000 - $499,999
- $500,000 - $699,999
- $700,000 - $999,999
- $1,000,000 - $2,000,000
- $2,000,000 - $3,000,000
- $3,000,000 - $4,999,999
- $5,000,000 - $9,999,999
- $10,000,000 or more

Thank you for your voluntary participation.