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(ABSTRACT)

Studies of leadership have examined the independent effects of characteristic prototypicality and level of previous experience on the perceptions of a person's leadership ability. The present study examines the joint influence of characteristic prototypicality and previous experience on the perceptions of leadership ability. Subjects received vignettes describing Presidential "candidates" and rated the candidates' leadership abilities. There was a significant gender by experience by civics knowledge interaction for the subjects' overall impression of the candidate (favorability) and the candidate's likelihood of success as president, and for rating 1 (a composite rating of six specific abilities). In the low experience condition, high knowledge females
rated more leniently than did high knowledge males, while low knowledge females rated more severely than did low knowledge males. There was a significant prototypicality by civics knowledge interaction for favorability and rating 1 and rating 2 (a composite rating of three specific abilities). For favorability, high knowledge subjects rated prototypic and antiprototypic candidates more severely and candidates in the neutral and no prototypicality information more leniently than did low knowledge subjects. Ratings 1 and 2 demonstrated an effect only in the no prototypicality information condition, where high knowledge subjects rated more leniently than did low knowledge subjects. Finally, there was a significant experience by civics knowledge interaction for favorability and likelihood of success. High knowledge subjects rated more leniently in the high experience and more severely in the low experience condition than did low knowledge subjects. Implications of the findings and future research are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The study of leadership has received a great deal of attention in the literature, with most of the early attention focusing on the traits (e.g., Stogdill, 1948), behaviors (e.g., Fleishman, 1953), or situational contingencies (e.g., Fiedler, 1964) which determine leadership. More recently, however, research has examined how leaders come to be perceived as such. What are the characteristics that perceivers note when deciding if a person is a leader? This question is of particular importance to a political leader, who must maintain a "leaderlike" image or risk losing his/her position (Simonton, 1987).

Foti, Lord, and Dambrot (in press) discussed three ways in which a person can come to be perceived as a leader. First, leadership ability can be inferred from participation in a leader relevant task, such as an election or a debate (Davis, 1982). Second, he/she can be perceived as possessing traits that are prototypic for a leader (e.g., Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982). Finally, leadership can be inferred from present or past positions held (Goldbach & Ross, 1980). The present study focuses on the latter two methods for inferring leadership abilities.

Leadership Categorization Theory (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord et al., 1982) states that the perception of a person as a leader involves a relatively simple
comparison of the target person to a "prototype" -- an abstract representation of the most representative features of category members. Categories, and hence prototypes, are formed through the perceiver's experience with category members and nonmembers. If a target person is perceived as being similar to the prototype, then he/she will be labeled a leader.

The effects of being labelled a leader go beyond simply identifying a position. Once labeled a leader, a person tends to be described in terms that are prototypic of a leader and not in terms antiprototypic for a leader (Lord et al., 1982). In addition, labels affect the way information regarding a target leader is processed. For example, evidence indicates that information that is inconsistent with a prototype is not processed as quickly or remembered as well as information that is consistent with the prototype (Fiske & Kinder, 1981; Lord et al., 1984; Phillips, 1984). Hence, these labels tend to be relatively stable once assigned. However, information that is salient, unambiguous, and antiprototypic may cause changes in perceptions if the information cannot be discounted (Crocker, Fiske, & Taylor, 1984). Such is the case when a political leader loses a campaign debate (Davis, 1982) or election (Foti et al., in press).

Although the influence of categorization labels (and, in turn, the prototypicality of the traits and behaviors
associated with a leader) has been well explored in the literature, the effects of a leader's previous experience have not. Goldbach and Ross (1980) indicate that a great deal of the influence a political leader has comes from the experiences and responsibilities associated with an office. Frequently, lower level offices are used as stepping stones to positions of more power and importance. It is through the experience of the less influential offices that a politician gains the abilities necessary to hold higher offices.

Simonton's (1985) study of the problems associated with "accidental" presidents can also be interpreted as support for perceptions based on previous experience. Vice presidents who succeed to the presidency are generally rated lower than presidents who are elected directly to the office. These accidental presidents may be seen as lacking the experience necessary for the presidency, simply because they "settled" for the vice-presidency. Simonton (1988) suggests that vice presidents may not be seen as possessing presidential qualities due to a lack of experience and/or ability. The perceived lack of ability also supports the Lord et al. (1982) categorization model because perceived ability is characteristic of a leader.

The effects of prototypicality of characteristics and previous experience of leaders have been examined separately. In real elections, though, candidates possess
both leadership characteristics and previous experience. Therefore, in order to make inferences about how perceivers use characteristic and experience information, both types of information must be included in the same study. To date no such studies known to the author have examined this problem. The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of orthogonal presentation of information regarding both experience and prototypicality of characteristics on the perceptions of political leaders. Several questions will be addressed. First, what effects does the combined information have on the perceptions and descriptions of political leaders? Specifically, how do subjects deal with information that is incongruent (e.g., high level of experience but low prototypicality/high antiprototypicality)?
LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Categorization Theory

What is the importance of looking at leadership perception in terms of a categorization framework? Rosch (1978) argues that people's perceptions of the world are guided by a system of categories which are organized into a hierarchy which contains both vertical and horizontal dimensions. Along the vertical dimension there are several levels, with the highest, most abstract, and most inclusive level being the "superordinate" level. The next level in the hierarchy is the "basic" level, and the lowest level, the subordinate level, is the most concrete, least abstract level. Examples within vertical levels could include "animal" at the superordinate level, "dog" at the basic level, and "German shepherd" at the subordinate level.

The horizontal dimension of Rosch's (1978) hierarchy occurs in each of the vertical levels, and allows for further differentiation within each vertical level. As in the previous example, categories at the basic level could include "cats", "dogs", and "rats". Members of categories at the same vertical level show a pattern of overlapping similarities possessed by some or, in a few cases, all of the other members at that level. Rosch (1978) terms this concept "family resemblance."

Rosch (1978) notes that categories are formed around naturally occurring and "logical" groupings of attributes.
These categories do not have clear-cut boundaries with lists of member-necessary characteristics. Rather, categories are based on clusters of attributes which take the form of a "prototype." A prototype is an abstract representation of the "clearest cases of category membership" and are formed by people's perceptions of what makes a good category member. However, prototypes do not represent an "all-or-none" condition. Members do not have to possess every characteristics found in the prototype in order to maintain category membership. The level of the target's perceived similarity to the prototype determines whether the target will be perceived as a category member.

Finally, Rosch (1978) identifies the concept of "cue validity." Cue validity is a probabilistic concept regarding the ability a cue has to predict membership in a particular category. Cue validity increases as the frequency with which it is associated with a particular category increases, and decreases when the frequency of association with other categories increases. Therefore, the higher the cue validity, the more likely a category member will possess the characteristic, and the less likely that a nonmember will possess the same characteristic.

Cantor and Mischel (1979) applied the use of categories to person perception. Evidence suggests that people, like objects, are categorized into these meaningful, pre-existing categories, and that the information regarding category
membership is then used in future perceptions. **Leadership categorization theory** (Lord et al., 1982) applies categorization theory to the perceptions of leaders, indicating that people use categories to decide whether a target person is a "leader". The structure of the categories is identical to the model posited by Rosch (1978), and includes both horizontal and vertical dimensions. For example, along the vertical dimension, "leader" may be at the superordinate level, with "political leader" at the basic level, and "conservative political leader" at the subordinate level. Along the horizontal dimension we may have, at the basic level, several different types of leaders (e.g., religious leaders, occupational leaders).

How a person comes to be labelled as a leader, and hence attain category membership, has received a great deal of attention, and the evidence supports the use of categories in the perception of leaders. Foti, Lord, and Dambrot (in press) reviewed leadership categorization theory, which assumes the use of categories to organize behavioral and trait information about the ideal leader. Categorization of a target is a relatively simple comparison process. The perception of a target person as a leader occurs when the target is perceived as being similar to a "prototype", or an abstract representation of the most representative features of category members. This processes
is described as a relatively automatic process; however, controlled and deliberate processing of information may also take place (Lord & Maher, 1990).

Existence of Categories

Evidence for the existence of categories in the perceptions of leaders is abundant. For example, Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) attempted direct tests of leadership categorization theory. In the first of three studies, Lord et al. examined the structure of categories to determine whether the principles outlined for use in the perceptions of objects and persons could be applied to the specific perception of leaders. Cue validity, family resemblance, and prototypicality were all strongly correlated, indicating support for the Lord et al. (1982) model. The remaining two studies further examined the structure and use of the leadership categorization model. Prototypical behaviors were found to be recognized more quickly than nonprototypical, perhaps indicating that prototypical behaviors are more readily accessed in memory. Finally, Lord et al. found that stimulus prototypicality affected both the perceptions and expectations of subjects regarding the "leader" that had been presented. Taken together, these three studies support the model derived from leadership categorization theory.

Foti, Fraser, and Lord (1982) examined the influence of prototypicality of characteristics on the description of
"real-life" political leaders, within a categorization theory framework. Using Gallup Poll data, Foti et al. found different prototypes for the following labels: leader, effective leader, political leader, and effective political leader. In addition, the prototypicality of the leaders' characteristics correlated strongly with the leadership ratings, both within one time period and over time. These results were interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that categories impact on the ratings of real-life political leaders.

Evidence for the use of categories in perceiving political leaders includes a study by Simonton (1986), which suggests the existence of a "great president" prototype. Simonton presented information drawn from the biographies of actual presidents to college students. The following information was included: the number of years the president served in office, whether a scandal or war occurred, whether the president was assassinated and/or a war hero, and the intelligence level of the president. Although the identities of the presidents were unknown to the students, the students were able to reliably reproduce greatness rating assigned to the presidents by expert historians. A second group of students received the same information as the first group, with the addition of fourteen personality traits. The additional information added nothing the students scoring accuracy. This evidence supports the
hypothesis that a "great" president prototype exists, and centers around the type of information presented to the students. These results also support the Foti, Fraser and Lord (1982) findings regarding the existence of different prototypes for "effective political leader" and "political leader" in that the students in Simonton's study, although rating actual presidents (and hence, political leaders) could still reliable differentiate the "effective" presidents.

Kinder, Peters, Abelson, and Fiske (1980) also suggest the existence of presidential prototypes, against which presidents would be judged. Kinder et al. listed several personality traits and behaviors, both positively and negatively associated with what they termed the "ideal" president. Positively associated traits included honest, knowledgeable, open-minded, and intelligent, while negatively associated examples included unstable, weak, prejudiced, reckless and selfish. Positively associated behaviors included "provides strong leadership," "appoints good advisors," and "sticks to his word," while negative examples included "hides things from the public," "breaks the law," and "gets into unnecessary wars." Although the data from the study suggest that the prototype is used only when judging incumbent presidents, it could be argued on the basis of other research (e.g., Simonton, 1986) that, if given limited information, people would use the presidential
prototype that Kinder et al. proposed when rating either current or former presidents.

Simonton (1988) examined the "styles" associated with presidential performance and identified five styles: interpersonal, charismatic, deliberative, creative, and neurotic. Each style revolved around different personality characteristics, and presidents could be reliably categorized as showing one or more style. These may be interpreted in a categorization framework as different levels within the label "political leader."

Fiske and Kinder (1981) examined the perception of political leaders made by both political "novices" and "experts" by presenting both leader prototypic and leader antiprototypic information, and then asking the subjects to rate the leaders. Although the evidence suggests that "novices" and "experts" may organize information differently, the evidence also suggests that both "novices" and "experts" use categories to organize information, thus strengthening the argument for category use.

The effects of rater gender on ratings have been examined in previous research. Thus far, results generally indicate that gender does not affect ratings (e.g., Foti, Lord, & Dambrot, in press; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984). However, a recent study (Luch & Foti, 1990) found that females rated more leniently than did males. Therefore, the effects of rater gender should continue to be examined.
In summary, the use of categories in the perceptions of leadership ability has received support from several sources. These categories appear to include not only information regarding leader prototypical traits (Kinder et al., 1980) and characteristics (Lord et al., 1982) but may also include information regarding certain types of leadership "styles" (Simonton, 1988) and the situational characteristics (Simonton, 1986) associated with a leader.

**Effects of Categorization**

The effects of being labelled a leader go beyond simply applying a label. Once labelled a leader, a person tends to be described in terms prototypical for a leader but not in terms antiprototypical for a leader (Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982). These labels, once applied, tend to be relatively stable over time, and tend not to change even in the presence of incongruent information (Crocker, Fiske, & Taylor, 1984).

When presented with label incongruent information, several possible reactions may occur. First, incongruent information may be remembered differentially as compared to congruent information. Phillips (1984) showed subjects videotapes of group interactions, and manipulated the subjects' perceptions of the type of leader (i.e., indicated that the leader was effective or ineffective). The initial leader label affected the types of behaviors ascribed to the leader, with label consistent behaviors ascribed most
frequently. In addition, with immediate recall, antiprototypical information tended to be recalled more accurately than did prototypical information; however, with an increased temporal delay, recall accuracy fell for antiprototypical but not prototypical information. Hence, the initial label "helped" subjects remember label congruent information better than antiprototypical information over a long time period.

Although evidence indicates that leadership perceptions tend to remain stable once a label is applied to a person, these perceptions do change. For example, the Foti et al. (1982) study of Gallup poll data indicated that, at the beginning of his administration, Carter's prototypicality rating and leadership performance rating were high, but that as the administration progressed, both ratings fell. Foti et al. interpreted this finding to indicate that, at the beginning of an administration, the target person, President Carter, represented an ambiguous stimulus. Therefore, perceivers relied heavily on categorization. However, as actual behavioral evidence became available, the perceptions of Carter were based more on actual behaviors than on behaviors inferred from category membership.

In addition, salient and/or highly incongruent information can cause a reevaluation of categorization. For example, political leaders should win campaign debates and elections (both would be considered prototypical
behaviors). When a political leader loses a debate or election (antiprototypical behaviors), we would predict a decrease in people's perceptions of such a leader's abilities. This prediction received support in studies by Davis (1982) and Foti, Lord, and Dambrot (in press), which examined the results of the 1980 Carter-Reagan debate and a pair of elections (Ohio gubernatorial and Akron mayoral), respectively. In both studies, the winners tended to be seen as more "leaderlike" than did the losers. This finding is particularly interesting, given that the candidates' ratings did not differ immediately prior to the event (i.e., election or debate).

Overall, the effects of being labelled a "leader" are greater than the receipt of a label. Once labelled a leader, this label tends to remain stable over time, and acts to influence further perceptions of the leader (Lord et al., 1982). Incongruent information tends not to change this label (Crocker et al., 1984) except in highly salient, unambiguous situations, such as a loss in a debate or election (Davis, 1980; Foti et al., in press). Hence, a leadership label, once applied, has strong effects on the way a leader is subsequently perceived.

Effects of Experience on Perceptions of Leaders

Unlike the effects of category labels on the descriptions and perceptions of a leader, the effects of the candidate's previous political experience on these
perceptions have not been well examined. However, there are a few studies which directly or indirectly examine the influence of the candidate's previous political experience on perceived leadership ability.

Leadership ability can be inferred from past or present offices held (Goldbach & Ross, 1980). Goldbach & Ross note that, once a political leader is elected, one option available to that leader is to use the office as a "stepping stone" to higher offices. Perhaps it can be inferred that the "lower" offices are perceived as having a lower level of responsibility than "higher" offices. Political leaders may demonstrate leadership ability in the lower offices before being elected into higher offices.

The idea that lower offices may be viewed as "trials" for higher offices is supported in part by the correlational analysis of previous offices held by presidents prior to election to the nation's "highest office" (Simonton, 1987). Research indicates that our presidents are less likely to be military generals, congressmen, or appointed leaders (e.g., cabinet members, ambassadors), and are more likely to be (or have been) state governors. This trend may be due to the similarity of the gubernatorial and presidential responsibilities, differing on the scale on which the two chief offices operate. Interestingly, the majority of the men who have served as vice presidents have never been elected to the presidency, possibly because the vice
presidency is not generally viewed as a high responsibility position, as are both the presidency and state governorships. However, these beliefs are not necessarily present in all cases, as may be indicated by recent election results.

Simonton (1986) found support for the idea that the vice presidency may not be viewed as a high responsibility position. Simonton found that vice presidents who succeed to the presidency following the death or resignation of the president (the so-called "accidental presidents") are judged as performing at a lower level than are duly-elected presidents, particularly with regards to their relations with Congress. Although the experience of the vice presidents did not differ from the experience of the presidents, Congress has generally viewed the "accidental presidents" as having less legitimate power and lower ability than elected presidents (Simonton, 1986, 1987). It is important to note, however, that this idea of the low level of responsibility being associated with the vice presidency is a general one, and may not be applicable in all cases.

The "accidental" president's lack of perceived ability may be explained by research regarding the differences in the perceived leadership ability for appointed versus elected leaders. In group settings, leaders who are appointed tend to be described as less responsive to
followers' needs, less interested in the group task, and less competent that were elected leaders (Ben-Yoav, Hollander, & Carnevale, 1983). The accidental president may be viewed as one type of appointed leader because these presidents were not directly elected to the presidency. Hence, accidental presidents receive lower ratings than do duly elected presidents. The argument that appointed leaders are perceived as less competent than elected leaders should also apply to other appointed offices (e.g. ambassadors, cabinet members) as compared to elected offices.

The effects of experience on the perceptions of political leaders have not received a great deal of attention. However, it appears that previous experience does affect the perception of a political leader's abilities (Goldbach & Ross, 1980). In particular, there seem to be certain offices in which a political leader can "prove" that he/she possesses leadership abilities before moving to higher offices (Simonton, 1987). However, it also appears that, to be perceived as a more competent leader, a person should occupy elected, as opposed to appointed, offices (Ben-Yoav et al., 1983; Simonton, 1987).

**Summary and Hypotheses**

As previously discussed, the effects of categorization (and the prototypicality of a leader's characteristics) on the perceptions and descriptions of political leaders has
been well investigated and have received support from several sources. Less well investigated, yet empirically supported, are the effects of previous experience on the perceptions of political leaders. However, the effects of the two types of information, when presented together, have not been examined in any studies known to the author. Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the relative influence of the prototypicality of characteristics and the effects of previous experience associated with a political leader with regards to the perceptions of the leader's abilities.

Specific hypotheses are as follows:

1). If a target person is perceived as possessing prototypic (and not antiprototypic) characteristics, then the more "leaderlike" the target will be perceived.

2). If the target person is perceived as having a high level of experience, and hence responsibility, then the more "leaderlike" the target will be perceived.

This study is particularly interested in situations in which the information presented to the subjects is incongruent (e.g., high level of experience while possessing highly antiprototypic characteristics), the processing of the information should produce perceptions of the target's ability that will use the information in a way that differs from the use of either piece of information alone.
3). If both the prototypicality of characteristics and level of previous experience are presented to subjects, then there will be an interaction effect of prototypicality by experience. The prototypic characteristics/high experience condition will receive the highest leadership ratings, the antiprototypic/low experience condition will be rated lowest on leadership, and the remaining conditions will fall between these two.

The Kinder and Fiske (1986) study indicated that politically knowledgeable subjects could better remember and process category antiprototypic information than could low knowledgeable subjects. Therefore, the following hypothesis is made regarding the effects of civics knowledge upon the ratings given to the "candidates."

4. If a subject is politically knowledgeable, then he/she will rate candidates in the antiprototypical condition significantly lower on leadership ability than subjects who are low on political knowledge rate the same candidates.

Finally, potential rater gender effects will also be examined. However, due to the disconsensus in the literature regarding these effects, no specific hypotheses will be tested.
METHOD

Subjects

Two hundred thirty-two subjects were selected from volunteers enrolled in the introductory psychology class as VPI & SU. For their participation subjects received 1 (one) extra credit point towards their final grades. Prior to participation, all subjects read and completed a statement of informed consent (Appendix A).

Stimulus Materials

Subjects received vignettes describing "candidates" for the office of U.S. President. The vignettes included information regarding the prototypicality of the characteristics and the level of previous experience associated with each "candidate." Subjects were exposed to four (4) characteristics, embedded within the vignette. These four characteristics were drawn from only one level of prototypicality (i.e., prototypical, neutral or antiprototypical). Information regarding the level of previous experience included either a high level of experience (i.e., elected office) or low level (i.e., appointed office) or no information.

In order to generate data for the vignettes, three pilot studies were run. The first pilot study assessed the levels of responsibility associated with several positions. Subjects were presented a list of several political offices and then asked to rate the offices with respect to the
responsibility associated with the office, and to rank the importance of the position as a "stepping stones" to the presidency (see Appendix B).

Information regarding the prototypicality of the leaders' characteristics has been well researched; therefore, a pilot study assessing these characteristics was not run. Rather, the information was drawn from previous research (Foti, Lord, & Dambrot, in press; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984).

The remainder of the vignettes contained the "filler" information, or the biographical data found to be leader neutral in the second and third pilot studies (Appendix C). This information included variables such as marital status and number of children. All information contained in these vignettes was drawn from the biographies of actual presidents (Armbruster, 1960). The presidents who provide the bases for the vignettes appear in Appendix D. Biographies of "average" presidents, as rated by Bailey (1966) and Schlesinger (1948, 1962), were used to avoid potential effects due to comparisons made between "great" presidents and presidential "failures." The vignettes used in the present study are contained in Appendix E.

Procedure

Testing took place in groups of 20 - 25 subjects. Approximately 17-20 subjects were randomly assigned to each of twelve test cells in the design (described below).
Subjects received the vignette of one candidate, and were then asked to read the vignette and answer a brief questionnaire regarding the candidate's abilities to succeed as president. Subjects also completed a demographics questionnaire and a brief civics quiz. Research assistants used protocol instructions to standardize directions given to subjects across test sessions (Appendix F).

Design and Independent Variables

The design is a 4 (prototypicality of characteristics) x 3 (level of previous experience) fully crossed design, employing 4 levels of prototypicality (prototypical, neutral, antiprototypical, and a no information control condition) and 3 levels of previous experience (high, low and a neutral control with no previous experience cited).

In addition to the manipulations of the prototypicality of the leader's characteristics and the level of previous experience, subject demographics were also assessed. These variables included the subject's age, gender, political affiliation, previous campaign experience, and civic knowledge. The latter variable was assessed via a brief 20 item civics test (see Appendix G). Civics knowledge and previous campaign experience were included as variables because Fiske & Kinder (1981) demonstrated differential processing of information by political experts versus political novices.
Dependent Variables

In order to assess the perceived leadership ability of the candidates, subjects completed a questionnaire which assessed both global perceptions as well as more specific characteristics (see Appendix H).

At the more global level, subjects were asked to give their overall impression of the candidate and the perceived likelihood that the candidate could succeed as president of the United States. These ratings look at both the favorability of the candidate and potential success of the candidate, and are necessary to assess the impact of each on perceived leadership ability. The favorability rating stems from research by Winter (1987) indicating that presidential appeal (favorability) does not equal presidential greatness (success).

Subjects then answered questions regarding specific leadership characteristics. Subjects were presented a list of statements regarding the candidate and then rated how well the statements describe the candidate on a five point Likert-type scale anchored by "not at all descriptive" and "extremely descriptive". These items were drawn from the Gallup Opinion Index (1988) and were used to assess the 1988 Presidential candidates, Bush and Dukakis. These items contain information associated with political leaders; therefore, the candidates scoring higher on these scales
should be the candidates perceived as more "leaderlike", and having a greater chance of success as president.
RESULTS

To assess the relationship between the dependent variables, a correlation matrix was obtained. The correlations, which appear in Table 1, indicate significant positive relationships between most of the dependent variables. This appears to indicate that, to some extent, these variables are measuring the same thing, possibly general leadership ability. However, three items (Item 6 -- "Can bring about changes"; item 8 -- "Is strong and forceful"; item 9 -- "Excites and inspires people") exhibited low correlation with both favorability and likelihood of success ratings. In addition, means for prototypicality for the nine specific items were examined. These means appear in Table 2. Items 6, 8, and 9 (listed above) also exhibited unpredicted patterns with regards to prototypicality--for these items, antiprototypic candidates received higher ratings than did prototypic candidates. It is possible that these items tap specific aspects of leadership, rather than general leadership ability, as was presumed. Therefore, these three items will be considered separately in subsequent analyses.

In addition to the correlation matrix of the dependent variables, mean scores on the civics quiz were also obtained. These means appear in Table 3.

To test the experimental hypotheses, separate 3 (Experience) x 4 (prototypicality of characteristics) x 2
(gender of the subject) analyses of variance (ANOVAs), with civics knowledge as a covariate, were conducted on the favorability and likelihood of success ratings. In addition, the nine items drawn from the Gallup Opinion Index were combined to form two scales. The first scale, called "Rating 1" consisted of items 1-5 and item 7. The second scale, called "Rating 2" consisted of the three remaining items (coefficient alphas were .801 and .795, respectively). These two scales corresponded with the results obtained in the correlation procedure (see above) and were also analyzed using separate 3 (Experience) x 4 (prototypicality of characteristics) x 2 (gender of the subject) ANOVAs, with civics knowledge as covariates. For all analyses, one case was excluded due to missing data. Each of these analyses will be considered separately.

**Favorability Ratings**

Adjusted means for the favorability ratings appear in Table 4. An unexpected three-way subject gender by previous experience by subject civics knowledge interaction was significant ($F(2,213)=3.94$, $p<.05$). Simple interaction effects indicated that the gender by civics knowledge interaction was significant for the low experience condition ($F(1,75)=4.21$, $p<.05$). A graph of this interaction appears in Figure 1. In the low experience condition, high knowledgability males rated candidates more severely than did low knowledgability males. Ratings made by high
knowledgability females, however, did not differ from those ratings made by low knowledgability females. The gender by civics knowledge interaction was non-significant for both the high experience and no experience information conditions (both $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that, if a target person were perceived as possessing more prototypic characteristics, then the more leaderlike the target would be perceived. Therefore, a main effect for prototypicality was predicted. Consistent with the hypothesis, the prototypicality effect was significant for the favorability rating ($F(3, 207) = 8.732, p < .001$), yielding support for hypothesis 1. However, the main effect is qualified by a significant prototypicality by civics knowledge interaction ($F(3, 213) = 8.65, p < .001$). A graph of this interaction appears in Figure 2. Subjects who scored high on civics knowledge rated candidates in the prototypic and antiprototypic conditions more severely than did low knowledgability subjects. The opposite pattern occurred for the no prototypicality information condition, with little differentiation made by high versus low knowledge subjects within the neutral condition.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that if a candidate is perceived as possessing higher levels of experience, then the candidate would be rated as more leaderlike. Consistent with this hypothesis, the experience effect was also significant ($F(2, 207) = 3.459, p < .01$). However, once again
the main effect is qualified by a significant experience by civics knowledge interaction ($F(2,213)=4.80$, $p<.01$). A graph of this interaction appears in Figure 3. In the low experience condition, high knowledgability subjects rated candidates more severely than did low knowledgability subjects. However, low knowledgability subjects rated candidates more severely than did highly knowledgable subjects in both the high experience and no experience information conditions.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that if information regarding prototypicality and previous experience were presented together, then the prototypic characteristics/high experience condition will receive the highest leadership ratings, the antiprototypic/low experience condition would be rated lowest on leadership, and that the remaining conditions would fall between these two. In other words, subjects would combine the two pieces of information in a manner that would yield ratings that could not be predicted by either piece of information alone. However, the prototypicality by experience interaction indicated by hypothesis 3 was non-significant ($p>.05$).

**Likelihood of Success**

Adjusted means for the likelihood of success ratings appear in Table 5. Once again, the three-way gender by experience by civics knowledge interaction was significant ($F(2,213)=4.97$, $p<.01$). Simple interaction effects
indicated that the gender by civics knowledge interaction was significant for the low experience condition \((F(1,75)=13.35, p<.001)\). A graph of this interaction appears in Figure 4. High knowledgability males rated candidates more severely than did low knowledgability males, while high knowledgability females rated candidates at about the same level as did low knowledgability females. The gender by civics knowledge interactions was non-significant for both the high experience and no experience information (both \(p>.05\)).

Contrary to both hypotheses 1 and 3, the ANOVA yielded no significant effect for prototypicality and no significant interaction between prototypicality and experience (both \(p>.05\)).

Consistent with hypothesis 2, the experience main effect was significant \((F(2,207)=3.002, p<.05)\). Once again, however, the experience by civics knowledge interaction was also significant \((F(2,213)=3.69, p<.05)\). A graph of this interaction appears in Figure 5. Within the high experience condition, highly knowledgable subjects rated candidates more leniently than did subjects with low knowledge. However, for the low experience and no experience conditions, high knowledgability subjects rated candidates more severely than did low knowledgability subjects.
Specific behavior/trait items (Variables 1 - 9)

Prior to scale formation, scores on these items were recoded to eliminate negative scores. The bipolar scale was recoded so that the anchor of -3 was scored as a one (1) and the anchor of +3 was scored as a seven (7). As described previously, two scales were formed. Rating 1 was formed from items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7; rating 2 was formed from items 6, 8, and 9. Results pertaining to each scale will be discussed in turn.

Rating 1

Adjusted means for these analyses appear in Table 6. Once again, the three-way experience by gender by civics knowledge interaction was significant ($F(2,214)=2.97; p<.05$). Simple interaction effects indicated that the civics by gender interaction was significant in the low experience condition ($F(1,75)=6.45, p<.02$). A graph of this interaction appears in Figure 6. High knowledgability female subjects rated candidates more leniently than did low knowledgability females. However, males ratings of the candidates did not differ, regardless of the subjects’ levels of civics knowledge. The gender by civics interaction was non-significant for both the high experience and no experience information conditions.

Consistent with hypothesis 1, the main effect for prototypicality was significant ($F(3,207)=4.89, p<.01$). However, once again, this main effect was qualified by a
significant prototypicality by civics knowledge interaction 
\( F(3,214)= 4.34, p<.005 \). A graph of this interaction 
appears in Figure 7. High civics knowledgability subjects 
rated candidates in the no characteristics information more 
leniently than low knowledgability subjects. High knowledge 
subjects rated candidates in the prototypic and 
antiprototypic conditions more severely than did low 
knowledge subjects. High knowledge subjects did not rate 
candidates differently than did low knowledge subjects for 
the antiprototypic condition.

Contrary to hypotheses 2 and 3, the experience effect 
and the prototypicality by experience interactions were both 
non-significant for the first rating scale. No additional 
effects were significant.

**Rating 2**

Adjusted means for these analyses appear in Table 7. 
Consistent with hypothesis 1, there was a significant 
prototypicality main effect \( F(3,206)=19.08, p<.001 \). 
Again, however, this main effect is qualified by the 
significant prototypicality by civics knowledge interaction 
\( F(3,213)=19.56, p<.001 \). A graph of this interaction 
appears in Figure 8. In the no prototypicality information 
condition, low civics knowledgability subjects rated 
candidates more severely than high knowledgability subjects 
rated the same candidates. However, in the remaining 
conditions (ie., prototypic, neutral and antiprototypic),
high knowledgability subjects did not give candidates ratings which differed greatly from the ratings given by low knowledgability subjects.

Contrary to hypotheses 2 and 3, the experience main effect and prototypicality by experience interaction were non-significant. No other effects were significant.

**Hypothesis 4: Effects of Civics Knowledge**

Hypothesis 4 predicted that, in the antiprototypic condition, highly politically knowledgeable subjects would rate candidates significantly lower than would subjects low on political knowledge. This hypothesis was not supported. However, the number of interaction effects which included civics knowledge (described in previous sections) do indicate that civics knowledge has an effect on the ratings given to the candidates through interactions with the predicted main effects. Several general findings regarding the effects of civics knowledge were evident in these findings. First, the gender by experience by civics knowledge interaction occurred for three of the four analyses (i.e., the favorability and likelihood of success ratings, and rating 1). In each case, the simple interaction effects demonstrated the same pattern—the gender by civics knowledge interaction was significant in the low experience condition. In each case, high knowledge females rated more leniently than did high knowledge males,
and low knowledge females rated more severely than did low knowledge males.

Second, the prototypicality by civics knowledge interaction was significant for the favorability rating, rating 1 and rating 2. For rating 1 and rating 2, within the no prototypicality information condition, low knowledge subjects rated more severely than did high knowledge subjects. The effects of civics knowledge were not apparent in the prototypic, neutral and antiprototypic conditions. For the favorability rating, high knowledge subjects rated more severely in the prototypic and antiprototypic conditions, and more leniently in the neutral and antiprototypic conditions than did low knowledge subjects.

Finally, the experience by civics knowledge interaction was significant for both the favorability and likelihood of success ratings. In both cases, within the high experience condition, high knowledge subjects rated more leniently than did low knowledge subjects. Within the low experience condition, high knowledge subjects rated more severely than did low knowledge subjects. There were no differences between the ratings of low and high knowledge subjects in the no experience information condition.
DISCUSSION

Overall, support for the experimental hypotheses was mixed. Each of the effects will be discussed in turn.

Prototypicality of a leader’s characteristics were shown to have an effect on the perceptions of leadership ability, as demonstrated by the significant effects on the favorability rating, rating 1 and rating 2. However, this main effect is qualified by a significant prototypicality by civics knowledge interaction. For the favorability rating, high knowledge subjects rated prototypic and antiprototypic candidates more severely than did low knowledge subjects; however, high knowledge subjects rated candidates in the neutral and no prototypicality conditions more leniently than did low knowledge subjects. For rating 1 and rating 2, however, differences between the ratings made by high versus low knowledge subjects occurred only in the no prototypicality information condition, in which high knowledge subjects rated more leniently than did low knowledge subjects.

It is interesting to note that the examination of prototypicality means for rating 2 (and for the three items which comprise rating 2) showed antiprototypic candidates were rated higher than prototypic candidates, which was unexpected. These three variables ("can bring about changes", "is strong and forceful," and "excites and inspires people") may have shown this pattern for one of 2
reasons. First, these items may have been associated by subjects with the characteristics that were selected for the antiprototypic condition more than with the characteristics chosen for the prototypic and neutral conditions. For example, the antiprototypic characteristic "manipulative" may have allowed subjects to infer the ability "Is strong and forceful" (item 8). Second, these particular items had a lower correlation with the dependent measure of favorability than did the items demonstrating the expected pattern. This pattern may indicate problems with these items, perhaps indicating that the items measure something other than general leadership ability.

The lack of a significant prototypicality effect for the likelihood of success rating was surprising. The type of rating, and the judgement required of subjects may have made them unwilling to make a rating to one extreme or the other for these candidates, given the limited information that was available. It is interesting to note that the means for all groups fall around the midpoint of the scale, indicating "some likelihood of success" as president.

Previous political experience, too, has an effect on the perceptions of a leader's abilities, as indicated by significant experience effects for both the favorability and likelihood of success ratings. However, there was also a significant experience by civics knowledge interaction. For both of the two ratings, high knowledge subjects rated the
candidates more leniently when the candidates had high previous experience and more severely when the candidates had low previous experience, as compared to ratings made by the low knowledge subjects. Hence it appears that the high knowledge subjects may have been better able to use the experience information to form ratings of favorability and likelihood of success than were the low knowledge subjects.

The prototypicality by experience interaction predicted by hypothesis 3 was non-significant for the favorability and likelihood of success ratings, as well as for rating 1 and rating 2. However, the lack of a significant prototypicality by experience interaction does seem to indicate one important piece of information -- ratings of political leaders abilities, based on the limited information given, could be predicted to some extent, by either piece of information alone.

The gender by experience by civics knowledge interactions for the likelihood of success and favorability ratings and rating 1 were surprising, as no gender effects were expected. Most research in this area (e.g., Foti, Lord, and Dambrot, 1989; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984) has found no differences between the ratings made by males and females. In the current study, the civics by gender interactions were all significant in the low experience condition only. For all three of the ratings listed above, high knowledge females rated candidates more leniently than
did high knowledge males; however, low knowledge females rated more severely than did low knowledge males. Although most of the research has found no differences between males’ and females’ ratings, other studies have found differences. For example, Bartol and Butterfield (1976) found that females generally rate more leniently than do males, as was the case for the present study’s high knowledge subjects. However, a study by Luch and Foti (1990) found that females rated candidates more severely than did males, as occurred for the present study’s low knowledge subjects. The lack of agreement regarding gender effects in ratings such as these used indicates the need for further research to determine when and what type of effects could be expected.

Finally, the prediction that civics knowledge would affect processing of information specifically in the antiprototypic condition was not supported by this study. Rather, civics knowledge appears to have a more extensive effect, as evidenced by the interactions with prototypicality and experience, and the gender by experience by civics knowledge interaction.

Taken as a whole, what do these results indicate about the processing of information regarding political leaders? It appears that, given information as limited as that presented in the vignettes, subjects did not categorize candidates and then make judgments based on these categorizations. Rather, it appears that subjects processed
the information given, and formed ratings based directly upon the given information. This conclusion accounts for several of the unexpected findings, including the non-significant prototypicality by experience interaction which would have signalled the categorization effects. In addition, this conclusion also explains the unexpected pattern of scores exhibited by rating 2. These items, which may have been directly associated with the antiprototypic characteristics presented to subjects, would have led to the inference of those particular abilities, and hence, higher scores for the antiprototypic candidates rather than the prototypic candidates.

Civics knowledge appears to impact the processing of certain types of information, as evidenced by the differential ratings given to the low experience candidates by high versus low knowledge subjects; here, it appears that only the high knowledge subjects are able to recognize and use the information that indicates that the candidate does not have a high level of experience necessary for a U.S. President. In addition, civics knowledge does interact with gender; however, as stated previously, more research is necessary to determine how and when this interaction will occur.

**Future Research**

This study contributes to current knowledge in that it is the first study known to the author which has addressed
the joint influence of both characteristic prototypicality and previous political experience on the perceptions of a leader's abilities. The presentation of more than one type of information is more along the lines of what happens in real elections, where candidates make public almost any type of information in order to be elected. What effects the exposure to more than one piece of information (i.e., characteristic prototypicality) has on voters' decisions has yet to be determined. Therefore, it is clear that more research needs to be done to identify both factors which influence voters' perceptions as well as the effects of combined information on these perceptions.

Where else should future research go? First, the gender by experience interaction within the low experience conditions of the favorability and likelihood ratings and rating 1, which found females rating both more severely and more leniently than males, brings forward the question of gender differences in rating. As stated, the literature is divided with regards to the effects of rater gender. Therefore, more research is necessary to determine the effects of gender on these types of ratings.

Second, the conclusion that categorization may not have taken place poses the question of how to arrange conditions to allow for categorization effects in future research. The simplicity of the information presented in this study allows for thorough processing of the information. Therefore, it
is suggested that future studies attempt to increase processing demands to induce categorization. This may be possible by increasing the amount of information presented to subjects or by increasing the time between the presentation of the vignette and ratings of the candidates. In addition, a task between the presentation of stimulus materials and the rating task may serve the same purpose.

In addition to these two areas of future research, two concerns must be addressed. First is the issue of generalizability. College students often make up the samples with which research is completed. Although students may make up a sub-population which differs from the population at large, I do not feel any hesitancy in using students for this study. College students represent part of the voting population, and as such are suitable subjects. However, future research should compare voters at different ages (and, supposedly, different levels of voting experience) to determine if different groups are influenced by the same types of information.

A second concern is the issue of the use of "paper people" and the effects of these paper people on obtained results. Drawing from the performance appraisal literature, Murphy, Herr, Lockhart, and Maguire (1986) found that the use of paper people over more "realistic" observation techniques (e.g. videotapes) may have three effects. First, the rater's task of accurately observing, encoding and
recalling performance is lost. Second, paper people tend to demonstrate less ambiguous behavior. And finally, raters are exposed to less irrelevant information when rating paper people. What effect does this difference between the paper and "realistic" people have on the obtained results? Murphy et al. (1986) found that the effect sizes may be overestimated when using paper people. Since ratings of political leaders appears to be highly similar to performance appraisal, these arguments cannot be ignored in the current situation. The use of paper people in the current experiment allowed for control over both prototypicality and the type of filler information which could not have been readily obtained using the more "realistic" techniques outlined by Murphy et al. (1986). The use of paper people in this study, however, is realistic because voters do get information about politicians from written media, such as newspapers, as well as from television. However, future research may wish to address potential differences caused by presentation via different media through videotapes, which may be rated by expert raters prior to the administration of the tapes to subjects.

In conclusion, the current study has shed some light on the effects of prototypicality and previous experience on the perceptions of leaders' abilities. Future research directions were suggested.
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APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

You will be asked to read a description of a candidate for the office of U.S. President and then complete a brief questionnaire regarding the candidate. You will also complete a brief questionnaire regarding your knowledge of government. The experiment will take approximately one (1) hour to complete.

If you wish to participate in this experiment, please note the following:

1. You will receive one (1) point towards your total extra credit points for Introductory Psychology 2004 for participating in the project.

2. You may cease participation at any time without penalty.

3. You may have a copy of this form if you would like one.

4. If you are interested in the results, they will be available from the researchers after the spring semester. However, because all data are anonymous and will be analyzed as such, you will not have access to information regarding any individual responses. Only summary data will be available.

5. This research project has been approved by the Human Subjects Committee and the Institutional Review Board. Any questions that you may have about the project should be directed to:

   Carissa Luch        Researcher        231-7066
   Dr. Roseanne Foti   Research Director 231-5814
   Dr. Helen Crawford  Chair, Human Subjects 231-6520
   Ernest Stout        IRB               231-5281

If you wish to participate, please PRINT YOUR NAME BELOW. Thank you.

NAME (Please Print): __________________________________________
Student I.D. Number: __________________________________________
Signature: ____________________________________________________
Date: __________________________
APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY -- PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE
PILOT STUDY ONE -- QUESTIONNAIRE

Listed below are several political offices. Please rate these positions with regards to the importance of each position as providing necessary previous experience for the president of the United States. Please consider each office carefully and rate the offices on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Governor
U.S. Senator
Secretary of State
U.S. Attorney General
CIA Director
State Treasurer
Secretary of Defense
Mayor of a small town
U.S. Secretary of the Treasury
Vice President
State Senator
U.S. Speaker of the House
City Councilman
U.S. Senate Majority Leader
Army General
State Attorney General
Mayor of a large city
U.S. House of Representatives
Ambassador to a foreign country
U.S. House Minority Leader
State House of Representatives
State Lieutenant Governor

From the list above, please rank, from highest to lowest, the five positions with the greatest amount of leadership responsibility.

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________
5. ________________________________
APPENDIX C

PILOT STUDIES -- FILLER INFORMATION
PILOT STUDY TWO -- QUESTIONNAIRE

Below is a list of sixteen characteristics. For each characteristic, please indicate how well it describes a political leader.

Answer each item using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill in the appropriate number for each item in the space next to the item.

Married
High school graduate
Has four children
Frail
College graduate
Impatient
Quiet
Sympathetic
Ambitious
Tall
Controversial
Unprincipled
Inconspicuous
Active
Child of immigrants  
Diplomatic
PILOT STUDY THREE - QUESTIONNAIRE

Below is a list of several characteristics. For each characteristic, please indicate how well it describes a political leader.

Answer each item using the following scale:

1  2  3  4  5
not at all somewhat moderately very extremely
descriptive descriptive descriptive descriptive descriptive

Please fill in the appropriate number for each item in the space next to the item.

Born in a small town   
Has two children        
Enlisted in the Army   
Worked his way through college 
Manager in a large company 
Officer in the armed forces 
Born in Ohio           
Enlisted in the Navy   
Born in a large city   
Born to 2nd generation American citizens 
Participated in ROTC in college   
Enlisted in the Air Force 
Born in Illinois       
Worked for a large multinational corporation 
Manager in a small company 
Born the second of four children 
Enlisted in the Marine Corps 
Works for a large national corporation 
Spent time abroad      
Grew up in a small town
Member of a close-knit family
Worked for a small company
Worked to earn money for college
Active in civic affairs
Worked as an independent consultant

Below is a list of college majors. For each major, please indicate how well each describes a political leader. Please use the same scale used for the previous section.

Chemical Engineering
Architecture
Biology
Electrical Engineering
History
Computer Science
Industrial Engineering
Management
Business Administration
Communications
APPENDIX D

PRESIDENTS USED IN VIGNETTES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypical</td>
<td>VanBuren</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiprototypical</td>
<td>A. Jackson</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>B. Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries noted as "**" indicate variations of information found in the Hayes biography.
Prototypic characteristics--High previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being fair and disciplined in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was honest and open-minded in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state governor. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Neutral characteristics—High previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being studious and happy in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was sensitive and flexible in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state governor. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Antiprototypic characteristics--High previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being verbose as well as manipulative in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was impatient and tough in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state governor. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
No information/characteristics—High previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state governor. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Prototypic characteristics—Low previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being fair and disciplined in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was honest and open-minded in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state attorney general. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Neutral characteristics--Low previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being studious and happy in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was sensitive and flexible in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state attorney general. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Antiprototypic characteristics—Low previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being verbose as well as manipulative in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was impatient and tough in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state attorney general. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
No information/characteristics--Low previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years.

The candidate has previous political experience, with the highest office previously held being state attorney general. The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Prototypic characteristics--No information/previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being fair and disciplined in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was honest and open-minded in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Neutral characteristics--No information/previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being studious and happy in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was sensitive and flexible in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
Antiprototypic characteristics--No information/previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. Co-workers and fellow students described him as being verbose as well as manipulative in both school and work-related activities. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years. He was impatient and tough in carrying out his responsibilities.

The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
No information/characteristics—No information/previous experience

This candidate was born in a large city, and grew up in a close-knit family. He attended the local high school, and after graduation he entered college. The candidate majored in history, and worked while in school to earn money to cover his expenses. After completing his degree, the candidate married and now has two children.

Following graduation from college, the candidate went to work for a large national corporation. He remained employed at this company for several years.

The candidate is now interested in running for president of the United States.
APPENDIX F

PROTOCOL INSTRUCTIONS
PROTOCOL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Handout Statement of Informed Consent and one opscan. Instruct the students to fill out their names, ID numbers and the date on the opscan form. Collect both forms (non-Intro students do not have to turn in the opscan).

2. Handout, one by one, beginning on one side of the room, the questionnaire packets. Tell students not to begin until they receive further instructions.

3. Read the following directions to the students:

   On the following page you will find a description for a candidate for President of the United States. Please read this description carefully, and then answer the questions that follow. At the bottom of the third page is a note which tells you to stop and wait for further instructions. Do not continue until I give these instructions. You may begin.

4. Wait for students to complete the first part. When they are done, read the following instructions:

   I am going to hand out a new opscan form. On the front page of your packet is a number written in red. Please code this number under the ID number on the opscan, starting at the first digit on the form. When you are done with this, I will give instructions for the questionnaire. Please wait for these instructions.

5. Handout opscan. When students have completed the ID number, read the following:

   The next section consists of a brief civics questionnaire. Please read each question carefully, and answer both on the questionnaire as well as on the opscan form. When you are done, please put the form inside of your questionnaire and close the questionnaire. I will pick it up. Please remain in your seats until everyone is finished so that I can debrief you as a group. You may begin.

6. Allow for students to complete the questionnaire. Pick them up as students finish, and be sure that the opscan is with the questionnaire.

7. Thank subjects for their participation.

8. Leave.
APPENDIX G

CIVICS TEST
CIVICS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following is not a branch of the Federal Government?
   a. Executive          c. Legislative
   b. Military           d. none of the above

2. The Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court is:
   a. Joseph Wallace
   b. Sandra O'Conner
   c. William Rehnquist
   d. none of the above

3. The President of the United States must be
   a. 35 years old, or older
   b. a natural-born citizen
   c. both a & b
   d. none of the above

4. The current governor of Virginia is
   a. James Blanchard
   b. Marshall Colemann
   c. Douglas Wilder
   d. Stephan Wilder

5. How many U.S. Senators are there?
   a. 100
   b. 50
   c. 102
   d. 75

6. What is the length of a term for a member of the U.S.
   House of Representatives?
   a. 2 years
   b. 4 years
   c. 6 years
   d. 8 years

7. What is the length of term for a member of the U.S.
   Senate?
   a. 2 years
   b. 4 years
   c. 6 years
   d. 8 years

8. The ___th Amendment to the Constitution gave women
   the right to vote.
   a. 10
   b. 16
   c. 20
   d. 19
9. The first ten Amendments to the Constitution are called the
   a. Articles of Confederation
   b. Articles of Union
   c. Bill of Rights
   d. Articles of the Rights

10. If the President and Vice President of the United
    States are unable to perform the duties of president,
    then who assumes these duties?
    a. Speaker of the House
    b. Secretary of State
    c. Secretary of Defense
    d. President pro tempore of the Senate

11. Which of the following is not a duty of the U.S.
    President?
    a. head of his political party
    b. director of foreign policy
    c. legislative planner
    d. none of the above, they are all presidential duties

12. The Department of State is part of the
    a. Senate
    b. Cabinet
    c. Judicial branch
    d. none of the above, it is an independent agency

13. To override a presidential veto, both houses of
    Congress must pass the bill with a _____ vote.
    a. simple majority (more than half)
    b. 2/3 majority
    c. 3/4 majority
    d. unanimous

14. Each state sends how many representatives to the U.S.
    House of Representatives?
    a. 2
    b. 4
    c. 10
    d. it depends upon the population of the state

15. A person who commits a crime against the United States
    or a crime involving more than one state will be sought
    by the
    a. CIA
    b. U.S. Secret Service
    c. FBI
    d. none of the above
16. Which Constitutional Amendment prohibits the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic beverages within the U.S. and its territories?
   a. 16   c. 14
   b. 20   d. 18

17. With regards to presidential succession, if the Vice President is number 1 in line to the presidency, then who is number 5?
   a. Secretary of War
   b. Secretary of the Treasury
   c. Speaker of the House
   d. Secretary of State

18. If the President fails to sign a bill that is sent to him within 10 days, and the Congress is still in session at that time, what happens to the bill?
   a. it is returned to Congress for another vote
   b. it "dies" due to the President’s pocket veto
   c. it becomes a law
   d. the president holds the bill over until the next session of Congress starts and then may sign or veto it

19. Amendments submitted to the States for ratification must receive the support of ___ of the state legislatures or conventions to pass.
   a. a majority
   b. 2/3
   c. 3/4
   d. none of the above

20. The process of amendment ratification by states was followed for every amendment except one, which repealed prohibition. This was the ___th Amendment.
   a. 11
   b. 19
   c. 20
   d. none of the above
APPENDIX H

MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
On the following page you will find a description of a candidate for President of the United States. Please read this description carefully, and then answer the questions that follow.

Please STOP when you are told to do so. DO NOT CONTINUE until you receive further instructions.

**VIGNETTE PRESENTED HERE**

1. What is your overall opinion of this candidate?
   - [ ] Very favorable
   - [ ] Mostly favorable
   - [ ] Mostly unfavorable
   - [ ] Very unfavorable

2. What is the likelihood that this candidate could succeed as president of the United States?
   - [ ] Little/No likelihood
   - [ ] Some likelihood
   - [ ] Moderate likelihood
   - [ ] High likelihood
   - [ ] Almost certain likelihood
3. Below is a list of statements. On the scales provided, please indicate how well each statement describes the candidate presented. Consider each carefully, and note that the scales do change.

a. He has the record and experience to be president.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>__</th>
<th>__</th>
<th>__</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>extremely descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. He is honest and ethical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>__</th>
<th>__</th>
<th>__</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>extremely descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. His judgement would be good in a crisis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. He can get things done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. He understands the concerns of the people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. He can bring about changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. He is steady and dependable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. He is strong and forceful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. He excites and inspires people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions about yourself.

Age: ____

Sex: ____

What is your political affiliation:

_____ Democratic

_____ Republican

_____ Independent or other

Have you ever actively participated in a political campaign?

_____ Yes

_____ No
APPENDIX I

TABLES
Table 1
**Correlation Matrix of the Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V5</th>
<th>V6</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V8</th>
<th>V9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

FA= Favorability
LI= Likelihood of success
V1= Has record and experience
V2= Is honest and ethical
V3= Good judgement in crisis
V4= Gets things done
V5= Understands concerns
V6= Can bring about changes
V7= Is steady and dependable
V8= Is strong and forceful
V9= Excites and inspires people
### Table 2

**Means for Prototypicality Effects by Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.018a</td>
<td>3.633a</td>
<td>3.932a</td>
<td>3.368a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.721)</td>
<td>(1.785)</td>
<td>(1.639)</td>
<td>(1.739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.393a</td>
<td>4.917a</td>
<td>3.237b</td>
<td>3.526b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.485)</td>
<td>(1.650)</td>
<td>(1.291)</td>
<td>(1.891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.304a</td>
<td>3.683a</td>
<td>3.678a</td>
<td>3.544a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.987)</td>
<td>(1.864)</td>
<td>(1.665)</td>
<td>(1.803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.786ac</td>
<td>5.017a</td>
<td>5.339a</td>
<td>4.211bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.626)</td>
<td>(1.420)</td>
<td>(1.347)</td>
<td>(1.740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.536b</td>
<td>4.433a</td>
<td>3.305b</td>
<td>3.246b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.799)</td>
<td>(1.588)</td>
<td>(1.277)</td>
<td>(1.607)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.071b</td>
<td>3.233b</td>
<td>4.593a</td>
<td>3.175b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.616)</td>
<td>(1.651)</td>
<td>(1.533)</td>
<td>(1.627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.321a</td>
<td>5.367a</td>
<td>4.271bc</td>
<td>4.561c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.491)</td>
<td>(1.377)</td>
<td>(1.388)</td>
<td>(1.763)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.250b</td>
<td>3.283b</td>
<td>5.797a</td>
<td>3.579b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.610)</td>
<td>(1.427)</td>
<td>(1.186)</td>
<td>(1.752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.018b</td>
<td>3.317bc</td>
<td>3.915ac</td>
<td>2.982b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.543)</td>
<td>(1.479)</td>
<td>(1.601)</td>
<td>(1.520)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=56  N=60  N=59  N=57**

**Note:** Means are followed by standard deviations in parentheses. Cell sizes appear at the bottom of each column. Means with common superscripts do not differ from one another at the .05 level.

**Variable 1** - Has the record and experience to be president  
**Variable 2** - Is honest and ethical  
**Variable 3** - Judgement would be good in crisis  
**Variable 4** - Can get things done  
**Variable 5** - Understands the concerns of the people  
**Variable 6** - Can bring about changes  
**Variable 7** - Is steady and dependable  
**Variable 8** - Is strong and forceful  
**Variable 9** - Excites and inspires people
Table 3

Civics Quiz Scores by Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Condition</th>
<th>High (Mean)</th>
<th>Low (SD)</th>
<th>No Info (Mean)</th>
<th>ROW MEANS (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypic</td>
<td>12.50 (2.52)</td>
<td>12.05 (1.72)</td>
<td>12.89 (2.40)</td>
<td>12.47 (2.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13.00 (2.27)</td>
<td>12.00 (2.68)</td>
<td>12.85 (2.28)</td>
<td>12.62 (2.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiprototypic</td>
<td>12.55 (2.24)</td>
<td>13.45 (1.99)</td>
<td>12.32 (2.00)</td>
<td>12.78 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>11.74 (2.00)</td>
<td>12.42 (1.71)</td>
<td>12.42 (1.72)</td>
<td>12.19 (1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN MEANS</td>
<td>12.46 (2.27)</td>
<td>12.42 (2.11)</td>
<td>12.62 (2.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND MEAN</td>
<td>12.52 (2.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means for civics quiz appear in the top, with standard deviations in parentheses. Row and column means are labelled as such.
Table 4

**Adjusted Means for the Favorability Rating with Civics Knowledge as a Covariate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypic</td>
<td>3.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiprototypic</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>2.946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>2.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Gender</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td>2.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>2.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>2.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Adjusted Means for the Likelihood of Success Rating with Civics Knowledge as a Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypic</td>
<td>3.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiprototypic</td>
<td>2.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>2.705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>2.789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>2.790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Adjusted Means for Rating1 with Civics Knowledge as a Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypic</td>
<td>25.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiprototypic</td>
<td>23.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>22.663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>23.622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24.297</td>
<td>25.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24.269</td>
<td>25.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>24.273</td>
<td>25.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The range for Rating1 is 3 to 42.
Table 7

Adjusted Means for Rating2 with Civics Knowledge as a Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypic</td>
<td>9.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiprototypic</td>
<td>14.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>9.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>10.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Gender</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10.547</td>
<td>11.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10.533</td>
<td>11.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>10.534</td>
<td>11.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The range for Rating2 is 3 to 21.
APPENDIX J

FIGURES
Figure 1. Gender by Civics Knowledge Interaction for the Low Experience Condition of the Favorability Rating.
Figure 2. Prototypicality by Civics Knowledge

Interaction for the Favorability Rating.
Figure 3. Experience by Civics Knowledge Interaction for the Favorability Rating.
Figure 4. Gender by Civics Knowledge Interaction for the Low Experience Condition of the Likelihood of Success Rating.
Figure 5. Experience by Civics Knowledge Interaction for the Likelihood of Success Rating.
Figure 6. Gender by Civics Knowledge Interaction for the Low Experience Condition of Rating 1. Note: The scale for Rating 1 ranges from 6 to 42.
Figure 7. Prototypicality by Civics Knowledge Interaction for Rating 1. Note: The scale for Rating 1 ranges from 6 to 42.
Figure 8. Prototypicality by Civics Knowledge Interaction for Rating 2. Note: The scale for Rating 2 ranges from 3 to 21.
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