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ABSTRACT

Joseph Murphy III: The Effects of Spousal Cues on Candidate Religious and Ideological Perceptions (Under the direction of Dr. Conor Dowling)

The importance of religion, or lack thereof, in determining vote choice has seen a growing body of literature in the last few decades, especially in Europe and the United States. Given the way religion has been ingrained in American society since its inception, it is not surprising that political candidates would use language cues as a way to signal that they share certain beliefs with their voters. These cues do not always have to be uttered by the political candidates themselves as, for example, the spouses of political candidates are often deployed as surrogates for the candidate. The experiment I use is a vignette-style survey experiment that presents participants with one of three scenarios: (1) a brief introduction paragraph to a candidate, (2) the same introduction to a candidate, but with a non-religious quote from a spouse, (3) the same candidate introduction with a religious quote from the spouse. The results of this survey indicate that spousal religious cues can have an effect on ideological and religious perceptions of political candidates, leading to the conclusion that spouses are perceived as extensions of the candidates themselves.
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The Effects of Spousal Cues on Religious and Ideological Perceptions of Political Candidates

The importance of religion, or lack thereof, in determining vote choice has seen a growing body of literature in the last few decades, especially in Europe and the United States. According to recent studies, religious beliefs are beginning to vary greatly by partisanship, with group cohesion becoming one explanation for the sudden shift in belief (see Margolis 2018, Manza and Brooks 1997, Campbell et al. 2018). This notion of social cohesion is the primary motivation for this thesis, as it focuses on assessing whether religious language cues can moderate a voter’s partisan lens and perhaps influence the way political candidates view the use of religion on the campaign trail.

Given the way religion has been ingrained in American society since its inception, it is not surprising that political candidates would use language cues as a way to signal that they share certain beliefs with their voters (Bisgaard and Slothus 2018, McLaughlin and Wise 2014). Whether or not a political candidate is religious (most politicians claim to be, see Pew Research Center, 2019) is irrelevant in the grand scheme of things, but it is important to note the benefits of at the very least being perceived as somewhat religious (McLaughlin and Wise 2014).

These cues do not always have to be uttered by the political candidates themselves. For one, the spouses of political candidates are often deployed as surrogates for the candidate (MacManus and Quecan 2008). For example, First Ladies often champion policies that are widely non-controversial in order to bolster approval for the candidate (Burrell, Elder, and Frederick 2011). This strategic use of a spouse for perception manipulation is an important element of campaigning (MacManus and Quecan 2008). Because of this, it follows that using a
spouse to influence ideological and religious perceptions could be an avenue for vote getting during a campaign.

The experiment I use is a vignette-style survey experiment that presents participants with one of three scenarios: (1) a brief introduction paragraph to a candidate, (2) the same introduction to a candidate, but with a non-religious quote from a spouse, (3) the same candidate introduction with a religious quote from the spouse. The partisanship of the candidate was randomized as well as the gender of both the candidate and the spouse. Respondents were then asked to rate the ideology and religiosity of the candidate, followed by a question about their willingness to vote for that candidate.

The results of this survey indicate that spousal religious cues can have an effect on ideological and religious perceptions of political candidates, leading to the conclusion that spouses are perceived as extensions of the candidates themselves. Not only that, but there is a clear disadvantage for female candidates having husbands using religious cues in terms of voter support. This finding is consistent with recent work by Calfano and Djupe (2011), who find support for the idea that female candidates using religious cues see less support compared to men.

These findings have some implications on real world politics. They suggest female candidates might consider using less religious language, or at least be more mindful of the language they or their partners are using on the campaign trail. If religious language being used by female candidates or their spouses is providing negative results for campaigns, it could explain the failure of the Republican Party to field female candidates as well as place more strategic considerations on the candidates that the parties run based on demographics. For
example, it would not make sense for the Republican Party to run a female candidate who is very outspoken about religion in a male dominated district.

Religion and politics

For many people, religion plays an important role in the way they make decisions and evaluate the world around them (Jennings 2016). For one, it provides a sense of stability, hope, and purpose in an otherwise chaotic and unforgiving world. With most Americans following a religion and the United States having a predominantly Christian culture, it makes sense that religion plays such a large role in the political process within the United States (Pew Research Center 2020).

With respect to the effects of religion on political participation, one argument is that a religious individual’s political participation hinges on the religious belief system the individual holds (Driskell, Embry, and Lyon, 2008). For example, believers in a highly involved and intervening God are much less likely to participate in politics compared to individuals who believe in, more abstractly, a divine being (Driskell, Embry, and Lyon, 2008). Because their belief is broader, they are more likely to see value in the political process and therefore participate in the voting process. This is significant as it cues us in to the types of people who are engaging in the political process, thus garnering the attention of political candidates and pundits.

Campbell et al. (2018) explain the importance of partisanship on religious views. Because partisanship is such a deep-rooted social identity, it follows that those views could impact the way we think about our other social identities. As they explain, group membership encourages group cohesiveness, meaning that it is beneficial for someone to conform to the other characteristics of their social group. This helps explain a rise in religious identity among
conservative voters, as well as the fall in religious participation among more liberal voters. They also contend that this creates potential for increased polarization on religious lines, with Republicans becoming more religious as their identity is perceived to be so (also see Margolis 2017).

One consequence of this polarization is the increase in consistency among partisans (Levendusky 2009). By establishing that there is a causal link between elite cues and voter consistency, partisan cues can have a significant impact on shaping voter behavior. This means that as the partisan elites become polarized on religion—Republicans becoming more religious and Democrats becoming less—their supporters are mirroring that. This could pose a problem as it potentially means that elites have a much larger influence on voters, not only influencing the way voters perceive events, but also how they perceive the reality of the world that they live in. This could also partially explain the rise in right-wing extremism, as religious nationalism has begun to take hold in minority groups on the right (Juergensmeyer 2010).

**Religious Cues**

Candidate cues are often used as a heuristic for low-information voters when deciding who to vote for and what policies to support (see, e.g., Lupia 1994, McLaughlin and Wise 2014). These cues provide the voter with information such as group membership and demographic characteristics. For example, voters tend to stereotype women candidates for office, affecting the way voters perceive and choose to vote for them (McDermott 1997). This use of heuristics plays an important role in voter choice, meaning that candidates have to rely on speech cues in order to emphasize their group membership (Conover and Feldman 1989). It is not surprising that
candidates would use religion as one of these group signals as many American voters are religious themselves.

The use of religious language in campaigns is not a new phenomenon, with candidates using different language cues for decades in American politics at each level of government. Candidates draw on their faiths in a God not only to garner favor among religious groups, but also to act as a calming voice for the masses (Coe and Chapp 2017). A majority of Americans are religious, and more generally Americans are accustomed to hearing politicians use religious language during times of great hope or times of despair, not only during campaigns. These cues are often found in speeches referencing a creator or some god-like figure, and are often paired with discussions of faith and prayer as a way to reference their religious beliefs. This is done in order to signal to potential voters that they share certain values with them. But, not all voters are receptive to such active signaling, leading to increased polarization among voters. The determinant factor of acceptance seems to be how an individual sees religion within their worldview (Jennings 2016). This can explain why those who are very active in their religious participation and place religion at the center of their lives are attracted to candidates that invoke such cues.

Consistent with this, there appears to be a difference in the effectiveness of religious cues by party. For one, evangelical Protestants respond strongly to religious cues made by members of the GOP, whose effects are significantly weaker for other mainline Protestant and Catholic voters (Calfano and Djupe 2009). Using these religious cues, however, can have negative effects for some candidates, especially women (Calfano and Djupe, 2011). Invoking religion makes women seem much more conservative than they may actually be, which is a problem as voters tend to not support candidates at the ideological extremes (Ezrow, Tavits, & Homola 2013).
**Political Spouses and Gender**

The importance—and popularity—of political spouses has increased tremendously over the past few decades (Burrell, Elder, and Frederick, 2011). With spouses playing a larger role in campaigns, it remains an open question as to how much influence they have over the perceptions of the candidate running for office. Whether or not voters are picking up cues from the spouse as a campaign surrogate or as a part of the candidates themselves has yet to be determined, but I posit the latter is the case.

Since the presidential election in 1992, spouses of political candidates have begun playing a much more important role in campaigning. Burrell, Elder, and Frederick (2011) find that spouses of politicians tend to have higher approval ratings than their partners, meaning that spouses are often deployed to support particular agenda items or win over a particular group of people. For example, a male candidate with low support among female voters may use his wife in order to make inroads with that demographic. The same could be true for female candidates using male spouses to counteract any potential stereotypes that might be brought up against a female politician.

We are even beginning to see spouses taking on policy roles. First Ladies have played a much more active role in presidential politics, notably Hillary Clinton’s healthcare plan, Laura Bush’s focus on literacy, and Michelle Obama’s push to end childhood obesity. Clinton, as we know, went on to have a political career of her own, providing a greater need to fully understand the role that spouses are playing in campaigns and how they can influence the way we perceive the candidates themselves.

One area where spouses could be employed in order for perception manipulation is religion. By having the spouse use religious language, it could signal to potential constituents
that the candidate is friendly towards religious rights. Not only that, but the spouse’s religious
cue could also lead to a change in voters’ perceptions of a candidate’s ideology, and in turn, their
willingness to vote for that candidate.

Gender is also a factor to be considered. Previous research shows that voters favor First
Ladies that embrace traditional gender roles (Burrell, Elder, and Frederick, 2011). This
reinforces the idea that female candidates continue to struggle to be perceived by voters as
competent and capable leaders. Even as First Ladies, a position with muted power in politics,
they can struggle to garner support if they embrace more serious leadership roles. It remains to
be seen whether the male spouse of a female candidate would encounter the same sorts of
problems. For example, a male spouse could potentially be more forceful in his desire to engage
in policy debates without the blowback to the candidate as seen with some notable First Ladies.
This again reiterates the need to understand how spouses are perceived in regards to campaigns
as if they are simply surrogates of the campaign. It would make much more sense that engaging
in policy would not be much of an issue for female spouses, but that’s not the case. Therefore, it
is reasonable to assume that spouses are viewed as an extension of the candidate, but that the
gendered lens they are viewed through could be the determining factor in their favorability.

Further, as Calfano and Djupe (2011) find, gender plays an important role in how
candidates are perceived both religiously and ideologically, with female candidates using
religious language being seen as much more religious and conservative than their male
counterparts. Knowing that cues can manipulate candidate perceptions and that spouses are being
seen as surrogates for the candidate, it begs the question of whether a spouse using a cue can
directly impact the perceptions of the candidate. To be more specific, could a male spouse of a
female candidate use religious cues in order to present their spouse as religious without affecting a voter’s willingness to support them?

Building off Calfano and Djupe (2011), I seek to answer the following questions in this thesis.

1. Does spousal use of religious language influence the ways in which voters view the ideology of political candidates?
2. Does spousal use of religious language influence the ways in which voters perceive the religiosity of political candidates?
3. Does spousal use of religious language influence the likelihood of support for that candidate?
4. Does gender play a role in how these perceptions are changed?

**Research Design and Data**

To examine these questions, I designed a vignette-style survey experiment. Participants were presented with one of six different vignettes describing a candidate running for office:

1. A male candidate with no spouse mentioned
2. A female candidate with no spouse mentioned
3. A male candidate with a spouse who references religion
4. A female candidate with a spouse who references religion
5. A male candidate with a spouse who doesn’t reference religion
6. A female candidate with a spouse who doesn’t reference religion

For each of these six conditions, the candidate was also randomly assigned to be a Democrat or a Republican. In total, there are 12 different vignettes (2 party identification possibilities x 2
gender possibilities x 3 conditions [control, placebo, and treatment]). Table 1 displays the text of these experimental conditions.

**Table 1. Text of Experimental Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Control</strong></td>
<td>[NAME] is a [Democrat/Republican] planning to run for the US House of Reps in the next election. When asked about their reasoning for seeking public office, [NAME] drew on his experience working within his community, saying, “I have lived in this community for my entire life, sharing both my time and energy in order to make it better than when I first got here. I hope that by being elected, I can do more to make that goal happen.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Placebo</strong></td>
<td>CONTROL TEXT + [NAME]’s wife, [NAME], gave a speech to voters at a rally this Friday in support of her husband. She discussed the policies that he plans to put in place, and specifically discussed how they would impact the women of their community. When asked about what her role would be if her husband were elected she said, “I am committed to helping [NAME] in any way possible. If that means just being his biggest supporter and <strong>cheering him on</strong>, then so be it. But no matter what, we are both committed to doing all we can to help fix the problems facing our community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Treatment</strong></td>
<td>CONTROL TEXT + [NAME]’s wife, [NAME], gave a speech to voters at a rally this Friday in support of her husband. <strong>She discussed how he leans on his faith in God when making decisions,</strong> and that she knew that he would do everything he can to help make their community stronger. When asked about what her role would be if her husband were elected she said, “I am committed to helping [NAME] in any way possible. If that means just being his biggest supporter and <strong>praying over him</strong> every morning, then so be it. But no matter what, we are both committed to doing all we can to help fix the problems facing our community.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Underlining added for emphasis. No text was underlined for respondents.

In the control condition, I am looking to measure how potential voters will perceive a candidate without any spousal references. This will provide a baseline measurement of perceptions of the candidate as described in the vignette. The placebo condition introduces the spouse to the vignette, but without any references by the spouse to religion. This provides a measure of whether a spouse providing a secular message will have any influence on the candidate’s perceived religiosity or ideology. The treatment condition then explicitly measures the effect of religious language on perceptions of the candidate. The candidate does not provide
any religious language cues, but the spouse does, providing us with a measure of whether or not the religious cue was carried over to the candidate when compared with the baseline measurements in the control condition.

It is important to note that the religious language comes from the Judeo-Christian construct of religion. As explained by Hughes (2019), there are very few instances of language cues towards minority religious groups by politicians and, specifically for Islam, when making those cues discussing Islam, those candidates focus on Islamic terrorism and negative descriptions of the Islamic faith. Instead, I focus on Judeo-Christian concepts of God and religious behavior such as praying. This is mainly due to the predominance of Judeo-Christian belief systems among not only U.S. politicians, but also the general American public (Pew Research Center 2020). This does not mean that candidates of minority religious backgrounds do not use religious language when speaking to their supporters, but that it is not widespread enough to warrant consideration for the scope of this thesis.

After receiving one of the 12 mock articles corresponding to 12 experimental conditions, respondents were asked three questions. “How religious do you believe the candidate to be?” “How liberal or conservative do you believe the candidate to be?” “How likely would you be to vote for the candidate?” The response options for each question were placed on a scaled that ranged from zero to 10 with anchors labeled “not at all religious / extremely religious,” “extremely strong liberal / extremely strong conservative,” and “very unlikely to vote for / very likely to vote for.”

---

1 The ideology scale also had an anchor at the midpoint (5) that said, “neither liberal nor conservative.”
Data

This survey experiment was included on a survey that was administered through Lucid in February 2021 (N = 1,912). For this study, I obtained informed consent, basic demographics (e.g. gender, race, education, religious affiliation, and religious attendance), and political characteristics (e.g. partisanship, voting behavior, ideology) prior to implementing the experiment. My sample consisted of a fairly representative racial composition including about 72% White, 11% Black, 7% Hispanic, 5% Asian, and 5% other. The partisan make-up of my sample includes about 49% Democrats, 34% Republicans, and 17% Independents.

Expectations

This research design permits me to test several expectations concerning how candidates are perceived when their spouse does and does not use religious language. I consider specific expectations with respect to each of the three primary conditions (Control, Placebo, and Treatment), followed by expectations that consider all conditions.

Control Condition

In the control condition I expect both Republican and Democratic respondents will perceive that the Republican candidate is more religious. This will likely be due to the fact that there is significant growth in religious rhetoric found in Republican politicians. The Republican candidate will also be expected to be perceived as more conservative. Due to the lack of any other information in this condition (i.e., the spouse is not mentioned), I expect willingness to vote for the candidate to be predicated on the voter’s partisanship.

---

2 The responses were collected from February 3-6, 2021. Human subjects approval was obtained from the IRB at the University of Mississippi (Protocol #21x-185).
**Placebo Condition**

In the placebo condition, the trend will continue of Republicans being seen as more religious and conservative, but the margin will shrink as the inclusion of a spouse will moderate perception of the Democratic candidate. Specifically, on average, I expect this condition to see higher willingness to vote for this candidate compared to the control condition as the spouse will provide more information to the respondents, allowing for a much stronger vote preference.

**Treatment Condition**

In the treatment condition, both the Republican and Democratic candidates will be perceived as religious as a result of the religious cue from the spouse, but the Republican candidate will still be perceived as the most conservative. Both candidates will also be perceived as more conservative than the control and placebo conditions, but the Republican will again be viewed as the most conservative. Willingness to vote for each candidate is expected to be less partisan, as the information provided to participants shows that they each align with the same religious values. For Democratic respondents, I expect this to be the least supported candidate compared to the control and placebo conditions. Alternatively, Republicans should be the most supportive of this candidate compared to the other two conditions.

**Female vs. Male Candidates**

In the control condition I expect female candidates to be perceived as less religious and conservative than male candidates and for Democrats to favor female candidates over male candidates. This expectation is based purely on demographic information of the parties (Pew
Research Center 2020. Considering that supporters of the Democratic Party are majority female, it would follow that the female Democratic candidate would be supported more than the male. As for their perceived lack of religiosity and conservatism, this is based on previous literature (see Calfano and Djupe 2011).

In the placebo group, female candidates will have more support among Democrats than male candidates and will be perceived as more religious and conservative than the control group. This is likely due to the fact that marriage could signal some kind of religiosity because marriage is often perceived as a religious institution. Republicans will favor male candidates over female candidates, with very little variation in terms of religiosity and ideological perception.

Finally, the treatment group will perceive women to be the most religious and conservative compared to male candidates. This is expected to significantly decrease respondents’ willingness to vote for women on average, as they will be perceived as the ideologically extreme candidate. Male candidates will see a modest boost in favorability among Republicans, whereas women will receive next to no benefit among Republicans. Democratic voters will be turned off by both male and female candidates as they will be perceived as the most religious and conservative group.

Participant Partisanship

The partisanship of the participant is of vital importance for this survey for a number of reasons. For one, because partisan congruence is such an important low-information heuristic, it would make sense that willingness to vote for a candidate with the same partisanship will be affected very little by exogenous factors, like religious cues. For example, within this experiment, willingness to vote for a candidate from a different party because of the use of or
lack of religious cues would be significant as it would be overriding their partisanship. Secondly, the partisanship of the participant is expected to influence the ideological perception of the candidate, with these perceptions expected to be move based on whether or not the spousal religious cue is present.

Results

It is important to begin discussing the measurements from the control condition as it sets up a baseline for the rest of the data. Figures 1-3 present results for the control condition for each outcome measure: ideology, religiosity, and willingness to vote for the candidate. As a reminder, each outcome measure ranges 0-10 with 0 being less religious, conservative, and willing to vote for the candidate and 10 the more religious, conservative, and willing to vote for. Each graph will show the estimated effect of the candidate being a Republican as opposed to a Democrat for Republican and Democratic respondents separately. See the Appendix for more details.
Looking at Figure 1, we can see how respondents perceived the ideology of the candidate in the control condition, with Republicans perceiving their co-partisan as significantly more conservative than the Democratic candidate. For Democrats, however, there is not a significant difference in the perceived ideology of candidates from either party, at least in this control condition. Thus, based on the limited information provided in the control condition, Republicans viewed the candidate as more ideologically aligned with them, but Democrats did not.

Religious perception is a bit different as, looking at Figure 2, perceived religiosity seems to be somewhat determined by the partisanship of the candidate—Democrats are slightly more likely to view the Republican candidate as less religious, whereas Republicans are slightly more likely to view the Republican candidate as more religious. However, these are not statistically significant differences.

Finally, with respect to the willingness to vote for a candidate, consistent with a long history of work in American political behavior (e.g., Campbell et al. 1960) partisanship is an important determinant of vote choice. Looking at Figure 3, we can see that a strong relationship
between candidate party identification and respondent party identification is present in the data, with respondents from each party favoring their same-party candidates by nearly a point each (on the ten-point scale). This is an important relationship to be mindful of as we examine the rest of the data as the main focus of this paper is whether or not this association between candidate and respondent partisanship is moderated by the use of religious language on the part of the candidate’s spouse.

Next, Figures 4-7 show the results for the placebo condition for each of the three primary outcomes of interest. The placebo condition adds a new element into the mix with the inclusion of the spouse. My initial expectation was that this would make candidates from both parties appear more conservative and more religious than the control condition, but that hypothesis was met with mixed results.

For example, looking at the perceived ideology of the candidate in the placebo condition in Figure 4, I found that Republicans are perceived as more conservative by respondents of both parties, with about a one-point increase in perceived conservatism for the Republican candidate.
However, when compared against the control condition (Figure 5), there is only a slight increase in conservative ideological perception, particularly evident among Democratic respondents toward the Republican candidate.
In terms of religious perception (Figure 6), we see both Democrats and Republicans view the Republican candidate as more religious than the Democratic candidate. This is important as religion was not brought up by the spouse in the placebo condition, but even so the mere mention of a spouse results in the Republican candidate being viewed as more religious, something we did not observe in the control condition (see Figure 2). In other words, simply being married and a Republican candidate seems to indicate greater religiosity, but the same is not necessarily the case for married, Democratic candidates.

With the inclusion of the spouse in the placebo condition, my initial expectation was that respondents would still be more likely to vote for the candidate of their party, but with a smaller gap in terms of partisanship. I thought this might be the case because the spouse might make the Democratic candidate appear more religious and conservative, which might result in Republicans being more inclined to support the Democratic candidate in this placebo group compared to the control group. Another possibility could be that respondents who identify themselves as Democrats, after seeing their candidate move closer to the middle because of this spousal
moderation, would have a smaller gap in who they are likely to vote for. The data points to this second expectation being more accurate. Figure 7 indicates that Republican respondents favor the Republican candidate by more than a point (roughly the same amount as they did in the control condition, see Figure 3). Democratic respondents, however, only support Democratic candidates slightly more than the Republican candidate, but this difference is not statistically significant ($p = .135$). This lends support to my hypothesis that the inclusion of a spouse has some moderating effect on partisanship in determining vote choice, as Democrats in the placebo condition (Figure 7) supported the Democratic candidate by about half as much as Democrats in the control condition (Figure 3).

![Figure 7: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Vote Choice among Placebo Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans](image)

Note: Positive values indicate being more willing to vote for the candidate. Whiskers indicate 90% confidence intervals.

Figures 8-10 show the results for the treatment condition for the three primary outcomes of interest. The treatment condition brings in another element: the religious cue from the spouse. For Democratic respondents, this should act as more of a moderating effect, similar to the way the spouse moderated their perceptions. For Republicans, this could also potentially be a
moderating factor given the greater similarities between the Republican and Democratic candidates outside of party identification.

Looking at Figure 8, among Democratic respondents, there is no statistically significant difference in ideological perception of either candidate. Among Republicans, however, there is ideological separation, with the Republican candidate being perceived as more conservative than the Democratic candidate.

![Figure 8: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived Ideology among Treatment Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans](image)

Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more conservative. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.

There is not a statistically significant difference in religious perceptions of either candidate. Members of each party view the Republican candidate as roughly equally religious to the Democratic candidate (Figure 9). The Republican candidate is still viewed as somewhat more religious than the Democratic candidate, but compared to the placebo condition (where the candidate’s spouse is mentioned without referencing religion, see Figure 6), the Republican candidate’s religious “advantage” is smaller and not statistically significantly different from the Democratic candidate’s perceived religion.
Nevertheless, Democratic respondents fall back on their partisanship even when the religious cue is included. As Figure 10 shows, as expected, Republicans continue to remain in line with partisan expectations. Moreover, despite the fact that Democratic respondents in the treatment condition viewed the Democratic candidate as no more liberal or conservative than the Republican candidate (see Figure 8) and no more or less religious than the Republican candidate (see Figure 9), Democratic respondents were still much more likely—more than a point on the 10-point scale—to express a willingness to vote for the Democratic candidate compared to the Republican candidate (Figure 10). It appears that giving respondents the religious rhetoric either gives them enough information to conclude that their party has the more favorable candidate or the religious rhetoric is not enough on its own to move people off of their partisanship.

Finally, I want to discuss the impact of the gender of the candidate. Figures 11-13 show the results for each of the three primary outcomes of interest separated by the randomly assigned gender of the candidate. As discussed above, in previous research, female candidates who used religious cues tended to suffer from being perceived as both more conservative and more
religious than men, decreasing respondents’ willingness to vote for them. When looking at the data, this finding holds up despite the candidate not being the one issuing the cue.

Figures 11-13 display the effect of the treatment condition (i.e., the spouse giving the religious cue) compared to the control and placebo conditions pooled together. The left side of each figure is for Democratic candidates, with Democratic respondents in the left-hand pane and Republican respondents in the right-hand pane. The right side of each figure is for Republican candidates, with Democratic respondents in the left-hand pane and Republican respondents in the right-hand pane. The black circles in each figure represent the effect for male candidates; the grey triangles represent the effect for female candidates. For example, the leftmost circle of Figure 11 indicates that among Democratic respondents evaluating Democratic candidates the effect of having a spouse give a religious cue results in male, Democratic candidates being perceived as more conservative compared to male, Democratic candidates without a spouse giving a religious cue (or with no spouse mentioned).
More generally, focusing on Figure 11, for male candidates only in one instance is the treatment condition candidate viewed as more conservative than the placebo/control candidate—when Democrats are evaluating Democratic candidates. For female candidates in contrast, they are almost always viewed as somewhat more conservative in the treatment condition, especially by Republican respondents. Importantly, and consistent with expectations, the Democratic female candidate is rated significantly more conservative by Republicans.

In terms of perceived religiosity (Figure 12), both male and female candidates in the treatment condition are perceived as more religious, by both Democratic and Republican respondents, regardless of whether they are a Democratic or Republican candidate. There is some evidence to suggest that female Republican candidates are not viewed as being as religious as male Republican candidates, especially by Democrats (see right panel of Figure 12). This may suggest that Republican male candidates are receiving that boost in religious perception from their spouse, but that same effect is not playing out as much for the Republican female candidate.
For the Democratic candidate, however, there is no significant difference in religious perception based on the gender of the candidate.

![Figure 12. Effect of Treatment Condition on Candidate's Perceived Religiosity](image)

Figure 13 presents the results for willingness to vote for the candidate. In general, the treatment condition is not statistically significantly different from the control/placebo conditions. For each of the eight estimates depicted in Figure 13, the confidence intervals overlap with the vertical line at zero. Nevertheless, the pattern does suggest that female candidates (grey diamonds) in the treatment condition are somewhat less likely to receive support than otherwise similarly situated male candidates (black circles), but this is not statistically significant. All four of the grey diamonds are to the left of the vertical line at zero, whereas only one of the four black circles is clearly to the left of that line (when Republican candidates are evaluated by Democratic respondents). This suggests that female candidates could suffer when their spouses are using religious language, which is significant considering the previous studies discussing female candidates using religious language (Calfano and Djupe 2011). However, the data does not find a significant difference in vote choice on the basis of gender, indicating that the spouse might be able to mute those negative effects of using religious cues for female candidates.
Discussion

These results indicate that political spouses are seen as an extension of the political candidate themselves. The spousal religious language cues appear to influence respondent evaluations of the candidate. These changes in perception seem to affect female candidate ideology more, consistent with previous literature regarding female candidates and religious cues (see Calfano and Djupe 2011). Despite this, there is some evidence that these perception changes could be manipulated by candidates’ strategically using religious cues, with the inclusion of the spouse potentially moderating the negative effects of religious cues.

These results provide avenues for future research. For one, female Republicans do appear to lose some votes among Republican voters as a result of their gender, though it is not a statistically significant difference. This implies that spouses are seen as extensions of the candidate and can be moderators for perception. The female Republican candidates were seen as more conservative among Republicans, but they were slightly less likely to be voted for
compared to the male candidates. I concur with the hypothesis that it is entirely possible that Republican voters have not had a model for a strong, competent female candidate that could change their perceptions of female politicians (see Calfano and Djupe 2011). This could be changing in the future, however, as the Republican Party pushes to bring in more female candidates for office, hence the need for an updated study once that model is in place if this trend were to continue.

For Democrats, however, it appears that using religious cues could be of some use. By moderating their perceived ideology, it could be the case that Democrats using that religious cue could attract independent voters without losing much within the party. This would, of course, only apply in certain situations. As Coe and Chapp (2017) concludes, the use of religious cues needs to be tailored to a specific audience. Because the Democratic Party is so diverse ethnically and religiously, it would make sense for politicians to tailor their cues for their audiences. This strategic use of language could be beneficial to future campaigns and future research needs to be conducted in this area in order to see whether or not this is occurring.

As with all research, there are a number of limitations in this thesis that I want to touch on. First, this research only focuses on the perceptions of typically Judeo-Christian politicians, although the language used tries to be as vague as possible in order to counteract this. This is not to say that candidates that belong to minority religious groups are not using religious cues in their rhetoric, but I expect that if they are, they would be using overtures as detailed in this research in order to appeal to a much wider audience. It would not make electoral sense for a candidate that holds minority beliefs to alienate themselves from the (religious) majority when trying to win an election. I expect this could be a topic for future research, but it is not a present concern of this thesis.
Another limitation is the fact that we are only measuring heterosexual couples. This is mainly due to the desire to understand the difference in religious perception between different genders. Specifically, we want to understand how religious cues from each gender can influence the religious perception of their spouse of another gender. A homosexual couple would be an interesting study on this topic though. For example, we understand that female candidates suffer electoral consequences and are perceived as very conservative and religious, but if that candidate also happened to have a same-sex spouse, would the voter perceive the female candidate as both more conservative and more religious? This is something for future research to consider, especially given the rise in LGBTQ+ candidates running for and being elected to office.

In terms of survey design, it is quite possible that the effects of these cues are muted due to the fact that such little information is given to the participant. What could strengthen these results would be a survey that makes better use of the language in terms of volume. While there is evidence that respondents were catching onto the cue, their willingness to vote for the candidate could be skewed by using partisanship as a low-information heuristic. One way I think this could possibly be redone would be using a mock article format that is filled with more context, allowing the respondent to have a better understanding of whether or not they would actually support the candidate.

Despite these limitations, it is clear that religious language can have an effect on how voters perceive a candidate’s ideology and religiosity. Not only that, but it appears as though spouses being used as surrogates for candidates is perceived as an extension of the candidate themselves. For female Democratic candidates, the use of religion can help moderate perceptions of them without sacrificing a significant amount of support. Female Republican candidates, however, seem to lose some support on average when using the religious cues. Because of this,
future research should delve deeper into the study of female Republican candidates and the ways in which they use their spouses in order to try and moderate perceptions of them.
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APPENDIX

All of the analysis presented in this thesis was completed using the statistical software program STATA. The Lucid survey was administered over Qualtrics. The .csv file from Qualtrics was read into STATA and then the analysis was conducted using the code below.

```
import delimited
"/Users/conor.dowling/Dropbox/Service/OleMiss_Faculty/Honors/Murphy/Data/misinfo_raw.csv",
varnames(1)

set scheme lean1

******************************************************************************
**Lucid Experiment Study**
******************************************************************************

import delimited
"/Users/conor.dowling/Dropbox/Service/OleMiss_Faculty/Honors/Murphy/Data/misinfo_raw.csv",
varnames(1)

set scheme lean1

******************************************************************************
**Consent & Attention Checks**
******************************************************************************

**Consent**
**Q105 - I have read and understand the above information. By completing the survey, I affirm that I am at least 18 years old and consent to participate in the study.
*consent = 1 (I agree to participate = )
*consent = 0 (I do not agree to participate = )
gen consent = qid104
recode consent (2=0) (1=1)
label define consent 1 "I agree" 0 "I do not agree"
label values consent consent
label var consent "Agree = 1"

keep if consent==1

******2,436 Agree

**Attention Check (1)
**Understand
*ac_1 = 1 (I understand = )
*ac_1 = 0 (I do not understand = )
gen ac_1 = qid147
recode ac_1 (2=0) (1=1)
label define ac_1 1 "I understand" 0 "I do not understand"
label values ac_1 ac_1
label var ac_1 "Understand = 1"

keep if ac_1==1

******2,269 passed first attention check

**Attention Check (2)
**Interest
*ac_2 = 1 (Compliance = )
*ac_2 = 0 (Non-compliance = )
```
gen ac_2 =.
recode ac_2 .=1 if qid148_1==1 & qid148_2==1
recode ac_2 .=0 if qid148_3==1 | qid148_4==1 | qid148_5==1
label define ac_2 1 "Compliance" 0 "Non-compliance"
label values ac_2 ac_2
label var ac_2 "Compliance = 1"

****1,695 passed second attention check (don't restrict to them automatically)

**********************************************************************************************

**Demographic and Political Characteristics**
**********************************************************************************************

**Gender (Lucid Measure)
*female = 0 (Male = )  
*female = 1 (Female = )
gen female = gender
replace female = (female - 1)
label define female 0 "Male" 1 "Female"
label values female female
label var female "Female = 1"

**Race/ethnicity (Lucid Measure)
*race1 = 1 (White = )  
*race1 = 2 (Black = )  
*race1 = 3 (American Indian or Alaska Native = )  
*race1 = 4 (Asian/Pacific Islander = )  
*race1 = 5 (Hispanic = )  
*race1 = 6 (Other = )
gen race1 =.
recode race1 .=1 if ethnicity==1
recode race1 .=2 if ethnicity==2
recode race1 .=3 if ethnicity==3
recode race1 .=4 if ethnicity==4 | ethnicity==5 | ethnicity==6 | ethnicity==7 | ethnicity==8 | ethnicity==9 | ethnicity==10 | ethnicity==11 | ethnicity==12 | ethnicity==13 | ethnicity==14
recode race1 .=5 if hispanic==2 | hispanic==3 | hispanic==4 | hispanic==5 | hispanic==6 | hispanic==7 | hispanic==8 | hispanic==9 | hispanic==10 | hispanic==11 | hispanic==12 | hispanic==13 | hispanic==14
recode race1 .=6 if ethnicity==15 | ethnicity==16
label define race1 1 "White" 2 "Black" 3 "American Indian" 4 "Asian/Pacific Islander" 5 "Hispanic" 6 "Other"
label values race1 race1
label var race1 "What is your race (or ethnicity)?"

*Create Race Dummy Variables
tab race1, gen(race_D)
label define race_D1 0 "Non-White" 1 "White"
label values race_D1 race_D1
label var race_D1 "White = 1"

label define race_D2 0 "Non-Black" 1 "Black"
label values race_D2 race_D2
label var race_D2 "Black = 1"

label define race_D3 0 "Non-AI" 1 "American Indian"
label values race_D3 race_D3
label var race_D3 "American Indian = 1"

label define race_D4 0 "Non-Asian" 1 "Asian"
label values race_D4 race_D4
label var race_D4 "Asian = 1"

label define race_D5 0 "Non-Hispanic" 1 "Hispanic"
label values race_D5 race_D5
label var race_D5 "Hispanic = 1"

**Education (Lucid Measure)**
*educ3 = 0 (Some HS or Less = )
*educ3 = . (HS Grad = )
*educ3 = . (Some College/Vocational = )
*educ3 = . ( Associate's Degree = )
*educ3 = . ( Bachelor's Degree = )
*educ3 = . ( Master's Degree = )
*educ3 = 1 ( Doctorate Degree = )
recode education ( -3105=.) (1=0) (2=1) (3=2) (4=2) (5=3) (6=4) (7=5) (8=5), gen(educ3)
replace educ3 = educ3/5
label values educ3 educ3
label variable educ3 "Education (0-1)"

**Income/HHI (Lucid Measure)**
*hhi1 = 0 (<$15,000 = )
*hhi1 = . ($15,000 - $19,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($20,000 - $24,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($25,000 - $29,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($30,000 - $34,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($35,000 - $39,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($40,000 - $44,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($45,000 - $49,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($50,000 - $54,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($55,000 - $59,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($60,000 - $64,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($65,000 - $69,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($70,000 - $74,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($75,000 - $79,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($80,000 - $84,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($85,000 - $89,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($90,000 - $94,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($95,000 - $99,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($100,000 - $124,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($125,000 - $149,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($150,000 - $174,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($175,000 - $199,999 = )
*hhi1 = . ($200,000 - $249,999 = )
*hhi1 = 1 ($250,000 and above = | prefer not to say)
gen hhi1 = hhi
recode hhi1 (-3105=24)
replace hhi1 = ((hhi1 -1)/23)
label variable hhi1 "HHI (0-1)"

*Income missing = 1
gen incomemis = 0
replace incomemis = 1 if hhi== -3105
label variable incomemis "Income missing = 1"

**Region (Lucid Measure)
tab region, gen(region_D)
label var region_D1 "Northeast"
label var region_D2 "Midwest"
label var region_D3 "South"
label var region_D4 "West"

**Age/born
**Q9 "In what year were you born?"
gen age2 = qid6 + 17
label variable age2 "Age (in years)"

**Age (Lucid Measure)
**age
corr age age2

**Party Identity
**Q21 "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?"
*party = 1 (Democrat = )
*party = 2 (Republican = )
*party = 3 (Independent = )
*party = 4 (Other = )
gen party = qid12
label define party 1 "Democrat" 2 "Republican" 3 "Independent" 4 "Other"
label values party party
label variable party "Party ID"

**Q23 "Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party, closer to the Republican Party, or equally close to both parties?"
*ind1 = 1 (Lean Dem = )
*ind1 = 2 (Lean Rep = )
*ind1 = 3 (Equal Both = )
gen ind1 = qid13
label define ind1 1 "Closer to the Democratic Party" 2 "Closer to the Republican Party" 3 "Not closer to one or the other"
label values ind1 ind1
label variable ind1 "Independent"

**Q27 "Would you call yourself a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican?"
*reps = 1 (Strong Rep = )
*reps = 2 (Not Strong Rep = )
gen reps = qid15
label define reps 1 "Strong Republican" 2 "Not very strong Republican"
label values reps reps
label variable reps "Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?"

**Q25 "Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or not a very strong Democrat?"
*dems = 1 (Strong Dem = )
*dems = 2 (Not Strong Dem = )
gen dems = qid14
label define dems 1 "Strong Democrat" 2 "Not very strong Democrat"
label values dems dems
label variable dems "Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?"

**PID - 3 Category
*pид = -1 (Rep = )
*pид = 0 (Инд = )
*pид = 1 (Dem = )
gen pid =.
recode pid .=1 if party==1
recode pid .=1 if ind1==1
recode pid .=0 if ind1==3
recode pid .=0 if party==4
recode pid .=-1 if party==2
recode pid .=-1 if ind1==2
label var pid "PID: Rep.=1, Инд.=0, Dem.=1 "

**PID - 7 Category
*pид7 = -3 (Strong Rep = )
*pid7 = -2 (Not very strong Rep = )
*pido7 = -1 (Lean Rep = )
*pido7 = 0 (Ind = )
*pido7 = 1 (Lean Dem = )
*pido7 = 2 (Not very strong Dem = )
*pido7 = 3 (Strong Dem = )
gen pid7 =
recode pid7 .=-3 if rep==1
recode pid7 .=-2 if rep==2
recode pid7 .=-1 if ind1==2
recode pid7 .=0 if ind1==3
recode pid7 .=1 if ind1==1
recode pid7 .=2 if dem==2
recode pid7 .=3 if dem==1
label define pid7 -3 "Strong Rep" 3 "Strong Dem"
label values pid7 pid7
label var pid7 "PID: Str. Rep.= -3 and Str. Dem.=3"

**Political Party (Lucid Measure)**
*pido7 = 0 (Strong Rep = )
*pido7 = . (Not very strong Rep = )
*pido7 = . (Leaning Rep = )
*pido7 = . (Independent/Other = )
*pido7 = . (Leaning Dem = )
*pido7 = . (Not very strong Dem = )
*pido7 = 1 (Strong Dem = )
gen pido7 =
recode pido7 .=-3 if political_party==10
recode pido7 .=-2 if political_party==9
recode pido7 .=-1 if political_party==8 | political_party==5
recode pido7 .=0 if political_party==7 | political_party==4
recode pido7 .=1 if political_party==6 | political_party==3
recode pido7 .=2 if political_party==2
recode pido7 .=3 if political_party==1
label define pido7 -3 "Strong Rep" 3 "Strong Dem"
label values pido7 pido7
label var pido7 "PID: Str. Rep.= -3 and Str. Dem.=3"

** Note: Use our PID Measure **

**Ideology**

**Q19 "Thinking about politics these days, how would you describe your own political viewpoint?"**
*ideo = -3 (Very conservative = )
*ideo = -2 (Conservative = )
*ideo = -1 (Somewhat conservative = )
ideo = 0 (Moderate = )
ideo = 1 (Somewhat liberal = )
ideo = 2 (Liberal = )
ideo = 3 (Very liberal = )
gen ideo = qid11
recode ideo (1=3) (2=2) (3=1) (4=0) (5=-1) (6=-2) (7=-3)
label define ideo -3 "Very Cons" 3 "Very Lib"
label values ideo ideo
label var ideo "Ideology: Very Conservative=-3 and Very Liberal=3"

**Political Interest**
**Q40 "How interested would you say you are in politics - are you very interested, somewhat interested, not very interested, or not at all interested?"
*pol_int = 0 (Not at all interested = )
*pol_int = .33 (Not very interested = )
*pol_int = .66 (Somewhat interested = )
*pol_int = 1 (Very interested = )
gen pol_int = qid27
replace pol_int = (((pol_int * -1)+4)/3)
label define pol_int 0 "Not Interested" 1 "Very Interested"
label values pol_int pol_int
label variable pol_int "High Political Interest = 1"

**Voting Q's**
**Q32 "Which of the following statements best describes you?"

**Voted in 2020**
*voted = 0 (Didn't vote = )
*voted = 1 (Voted = )
gen voted = qid19
recode voted (1=0) (2=0) (3=0) (4=0) (5=1)
label define voted 0 "Didn't Vote" 1 "Voted"
label values voted voted
label var voted "Voted 2020 = 1"

**2020 Vote For?**
**Q33 "For whom did you vote for President of the United States in the November 2020 General Election?"
*votefor = 1 (Donald Trump = )
*votefor = 2 (Joe Biden = )
*votefor = 3 (Other = )
gen votefor = qid20
recode votefor (1=-1) (2=1) (3=0)
label define votefor -1 "Donald Trump" 1 "Joe Biden" 0 "Other"
label values votefor votefor
label var votefor "Pres. Vote"
**Religion**

**Q15** "What is your present religion, if any?"

*religion = 1 (Protestant = )
*religion = 2 (Roman Catholic = )
*religion = 3 (Mormon = )
*religion = 4 (Eastern or Greek Orthodox = )
*religion = 5 (Jewish = )
*religion = 6 (Muslim = )
*religion = 7 (Buddhist = )
*religion = 8 (Hindu = )
*religion = 9 (Atheist = )
*religion = 10 (Agnostic = )
*religion = 11 (Nothing in particular = )

gen relig = qid9
label define relig 1 "Protestant" 2 "Roman Catholic" 3 "Mormon" 4 "Eastern/Greek Orthodox" 5 "Jewish" 6 "Muslim" 7 "Buddhist" 8 "Hindu" 9 "Atheist" 10 "Agnostic" 11 "Nothing in particular"
lable values relig relig

**Religious Attendance**

**Q17** "Aside from weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?"

*relig_att = 0 (Never = )
*relig_att = .2 (Seldom = )
*relig_att = .4 (A few times a year = )
*relig_att = .6 (Once or twice a month = )
*relig_att = .8 (Once a week = )
*relig_att = 1 (More than once a week = )

gen relig_att = qid10
replace relig_att = (((relig_att * -1)+6)/5)
label define relig_att 0 "Never" 1 "> Once a Week"
lable values relig_att relig_att
label variable relig_att "Religious Attendance (0-1)"

**Religious Importance**

**Q30** "How important is your religion in your life?"

*relig_imp = 0 (Not at all important = )
*relig_imp = .33 (A little bit important = )
*relig_imp = .66 (Somewhat important = )
*relig_imp = 1 (Very important = )

gen relig_imp = qid17
replace relig_imp = (((relig_imp * -1)+4)/3)
label define relig_imp 0 "Not Important" 1 "Very Important"
lable values relig_imp relig_imp
label variable relig_imp "High Religious Importance = 1"
**Religious Importance - Political Leaders**

**Q31 "How important is it to you that your political leaders share your religious beliefs?"**

*relig_imp_pol = 0 (Not at all important = )
*relig_imp_pol = .33 (A little bit important = )
*relig_imp_pol = .66 (Somewhat important = )
*relig_imp_pol = 1 (Very important = )

gen relig_imp_pol = qid18
replace relig_imp_pol = (((relig_imp_pol *.33 - 1)+4)/3)

label define relig_imp_pol 0 "Not Important" 1 "Very Important"
label values relig_imp_pol relig_imp_pol
label variable relig_imp_pol "High Religious Importance = 1"

****************

** Experiment **

****************

**Experimental Conditions (12)**

gen cond_maledem = 0
replace cond_maledem = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpmaledem == 1
label var cond_maledem "Condition: Male, Democrat, no Spouse"

gen cond_maledemrel = 0
replace cond_maledemrel = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpmaledemspouse == 1
label var cond_maledemrel "Condition: Male, Democrat, Spouse Religious"

gen cond_maledempla = 0
replace cond_maledempla = 1 if v190 == 1
label var cond_maledempla "Condition: Male, Democrat, Spouse Placebo"

gen cond_femaledem = 0
replace cond_femaledem = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpfemaledem == 1
label var cond_femaledem "Condition: Female, Democrat, no Spouse"

gen cond_femaledemrel = 0
replace cond_femaledemrel = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpfemaledemspou == 1
label var cond_femaledemrel "Condition: Female, Democrat, Spouse Religious"

gen cond_femaledempla = 0
replace cond_femaledempla = 1 if v193 == 1
label var cond_femaledempla "Condition: Female, Democrat, Spouse Placebo"

gen cond_malerep = 0
replace cond_malerep = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpmalerep == 1
label var cond_malerep "Condition: Male, Republican, no Spouse"

gen cond_malereprel = 0
replace cond_malereprel = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpmalerepspouse == 1
label var cond_malereprel "Condition: Male, Republican, Spouse Religious"

gen cond_malereppla = 0
replace cond_malereppla = 1 if v196 == 1
label var cond_malereppla "Condition: Male, Republican, Spouse Placebo"

gen cond_femalerep = 0
replace cond_femalerep = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpfemalerep == 1
label var cond_femalerep "Condition: Female, Republican, no Spouse"

gen cond_femalereprel = 0
replace cond_femalereprel = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpfemalerepspou == 1
label var cond_femalereprel "Condition: Female, Republican, Spouse Religious"

gen cond_femalereppla = 0
replace cond_femalereppla = 1 if fl_66_do_josephsexpfemalrepspous == 1
label var cond_femalereppla "Condition: Female, Republican, Spouse Placebo"

*Candidate No Spouse / Religious Spouse / Placebo Spouse
egen cond_relig = rowtotal(cond_maledemrel cond_femaledemrel cond_malereprel
cond_femalereprel)
lab var cond_relig "Condition: Candidate Spouse Religious = 1"
egen cond_place = rowtotal(cond_maledempla cond_femaledempla cond_malereppla
cond_femalereppla)
lab var cond_place "Condition: Candidate Spouse Placebo = 1"
egen cond_contr = rowtotal(cond_maledem cond_femaledem cond_malerep cond_femalerep)
lab var cond_contr "Condition: Candidate Spouse Control = 1"

*Candidate Dem / Rep
egen cond_rep = rowtotal(cond_malerep cond_malereprel cond_malereppla cond_femalerep
cond_femalereprel cond_femalereppla)
lab var cond_rep "Condition: Republican Candidate = 1"

*Candidate Male / Female
egen cond_female = rowtotal(cond_femaledem cond_femaledemrel cond_femaledempla
cond_femalerep cond_femalereprel cond_femalereppla)
lab var cond_female "Condition: Female Candidate = 1"

*Candidate Control Condition
egen cond_base = rowtotal(cond_maledem cond_femaledem cond_malerep cond_femalerep)
lab var cond_base "Condition: Baseline (control) Condition = 1"

**Outcome Measures
gen out_relig = qid154
label var out_relig "How religious do you believe the candidate to be? (0=not at all; 10=extremely)"

gen out_ideol = qid156
label var out_ideol "How liberal or conservative do you believe the candidate to be? (0=extremely liberal; 10=extremely conservative)"

gen out_vote = qid157
label var out_vote "How likely would you be to vote for the candidate (0=very unlikely; 10=very likely)"

**SET SAMPLE (N=1,912)**
reg cond_* out_*
keep if e(sample)

****************
**GRAPH STUFF***
****************

***Base Ideology Measurement (Figure 1)***
*Democrats*
reg out_ideol cond_rep if cond_base==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans*
reg out_ideol cond_rep if cond_base==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans
coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 1: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived Ideology among Control Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium))
legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more conservative. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_1, replace)

***Base Religious Measurement (Figure 2)***
*Democrats*
reg out_relig cond_rep if cond_base==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans*
reg out_relig cond_rep if cond_base==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans
coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 2: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived Religiosity among Control Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium))
legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more religious. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_2, replace)

***Base Vote Measurement (Figure 3)***
*Democrats
reg out_vote cond_rep if cond_base==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_vote cond_rep if cond_base==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 3: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Vote Choice among Control Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium)) legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate being more willing to vote for the candidate. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_3, replace)

***Placebo Ideology Measurement (Figure 4)***
*Democrats
reg out_ideol cond_rep if cond_place==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_ideol cond_rep if cond_place==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 4: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived Ideology among Placebo Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium)) legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more conservative. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_4, replace)

******************FIGURE 5*************************
*Democrats
reg out_ideol cond_place if pid7>0 & cond_relig~1 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_ideol cond_place if pid7<0 & cond_relig~1 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Republicans

coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) xline(0) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2))
title(Democratic Cand.) legend(pos(6) col(2)) saving(dem5, replace)

*Democrats
reg out_ideol cond_place if pid7>0 & cond_relig~1 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_ideol cond_place if pid7<0 & cond_relig~1 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Republicans
coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) xline(0) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2))
title(Republican Cand.) legend(pos(6)col(2)) saving(rep5, replace)

gr combine dem5.gph rep5.gph, graphregion(fcolor(white)) title("Figure 5. Effect of Placebo v. Control Condition on Candidate's Perceived Ideology", size(medium)) note("Note: Effect of Placebo v. Control condition separately for Democratic and Republican candidates, by respondent PID. " "Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more conservative. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_X, replace)

***Placebo Religious Measurement (Figure 6)***
*Democrats
reg out_relig cond_rep if cond_place==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_relig cond_rep if cond_place==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 6: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived Religiosity among Placebo Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium)) legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more religious. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_6, replace)

***Placebo Vote Measurement (Figure 7)***
*Democrats
reg out_vote cond_rep if cond_place==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_vote cond_rep if cond_place==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coefplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylabel("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 7: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Vote Choice among Placebo Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium)) legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate being more willing to vote for the candidate. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_7, replace)

***Treatment Ideology Measurement (Figure 8)***
*Democrats
reg out_ideol cond_rep if cond_relig==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_ideol cond_rep if cond_relig==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coeffplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylab("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 8: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived" "Ideology among Treatment Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium))
legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more conservative. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_8, replace)

***Treatment Religious Measurement (Figure 9)***
*Democrats
reg out_relig cond_rep if cond_relig==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_relig cond_rep if cond_relig==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coeffplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylab("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 9: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Candidate's Perceived" "Religiosity among Treatment Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium))
legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more religious. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_9, replace)

***Treatment Vote Measurement (Figure 10)***
*Democrats
reg out_vote cond_rep if cond_relig==1 & pid7>0
estimates store Democrats
*Republicans
reg out_vote cond_rep if cond_relig==1 & pid7<0
estimates store Republicans

coeffplot Democrats Republicans, drop(_cons) ylab("") xscale(range(-2 2)) xline(0)
title("Figure 10: Effect of Candidate being a Republican vs. a Democrat on Vote Choice" "among Treatment Group, separately for Democrats and Republicans", size(medium))
legend(pos(6) col(2)) note("Note: Positive values indicate being more willing to vote for the candidate. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_10, replace)

*************FIGURE 11*************
***BY CANDIDATE GENDER AND CANDIDATE PARTY***
*Democratic candidates
reg out_idiol cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Men_Dd
reg out_idiol cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Women_Dd
*Among Republicans
reg out_ideol cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Men_Rd
reg out_ideol cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Women_Rd

coeffplot (Men_Dd, label(Male Candidates)) (Women_Dd, label(Female Candidates)),
bylabel(Democrats) ///
|| (Men_Rd) (Women_Rd), bylabel(Republicans) ///
||, drop(_cons) xline(0) xscale(range(-2 2)) legend(cols(2)) ylabel("") title(Democratic Cand.)
saving(dem_cand, replace)

*Republican candidates
reg out_ideol cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Men_Dr
reg out_ideol cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Women_Dr

*Among Republicans
reg out_ideol cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Men_Rr
reg out_ideol cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Women_Rr

coeffplot (Men_Dr, label(Male Candidates)) (Women_Dr, label(Female Candidates)),
bylabel(Democrats) ///
|| (Men_Rr) (Women_Rr), bylabel(Republicans) ///
||, drop(_cons) xline(0) xscale(range(-2 2)) legend(cols(2)) ylabel("") title(Republican Cand.)
saving(rep_cand, replace)

gr combine dem_cand.gph rep_cand.gph, graphregion(fcolor(white)) title("Figure 11. Effect of Treatment Condition on Candidate's Perceived Ideology", size(medium)) note("Note: Effect of Treatment Condition v. Placebo/Control separately for male and female candidates, by respondent PID and candidate PID. "Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more conservative. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_11, replace)

***********************FIGURE 12*******************************
***BY CANDIDATE GENDER AND CANDIDATE PARTY***

*Democratic candidates
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Men_Dd
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Women_Dd
*Among Republicans
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Men_Rd
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Women_Rd

coefplot (Men_Dd, label(Male Candidates)) (Women_Dd, label(Female Candidates)),
bylabel(Democrats) ///
|| (Men_Rd) (Women_Rd), bylabel(Republicans) ///
||, drop(_cons) xline(0) xscale(range(-2 2)) legend(cols(2)) ylabel("") title(Democratic Cand.)
saving(dem_cand, replace)

*Republican candidates
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Men_Dr
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Women_Dr

*Among Republicans
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Men_Rr
reg out_relig cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Women_Rr

coefplot (Men_Dr, label(Male Candidates)) (Women_Dr, label(Female Candidates)),
bylabel(Democrats) ///
|| (Men_Rr) (Women_Rr), bylabel(Republicans) ///
||, drop(_cons) xline(0) xscale(range(-2 2)) legend(cols(2)) ylabel("") title(Republican Cand.)
saving(rep_cand, replace)

gr combine dem_cand.gph rep_cand.gph, graphregion(fcolor(white)) title("Figure 12. Effect of Treatment Condition on Candidate's Perceived Religiosity", size(medium)) note("Note: Effect of Treatment Condition v. Placebo/Control separately for male and female candidates, by respondent PID and candidate PID. " "Positive values indicate candidate is perceived as more religious. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals. ", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_12, replace)

***************Figure 13*******************
***BY CANDIDATE GENDER AND CANDIDATE PARTY***
*Democratic candidates
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Men_Dd
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Women_Dd

*Among Republicans
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Men_Rd
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==0
estimates store Women_Rd

coefplot (Men_Dd, label(Male Candidates)) (Women_Dd, label(Female Candidates)),
bylabel(Democrats) ///
|| (Men_Rd) (Women_Rd), bylabel(Republicans) ///
||, drop(_cons) xline(0) xscale(range(-2 2)) legend(cols(2)) ylabel("") title(Democratic Cand.)
saving(dem_cand, replace)

*Republican candidates
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Men_Dr
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7>0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Women_Dr

*Among Republicans
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==0 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Men_Rr
reg out_vote cond_relig if cond_female==1 & pid7<0 & cond_rep==1
estimates store Women_Rr

coefplot (Men_Dr, label(Male Candidates)) (Women_Dr, label(Female Candidates)),
bylabel(Democrats) ///
|| (Men_Rr) (Women_Rr), bylabel(Republicans) ///
||, drop(_cons) xline(0) xscale(range(-2 2)) legend(cols(2)) ylabel("") title(Republican Cand.)
saving(rep_cand, replace)

gr combine dem_cand.gph rep_cand.gph, graphregion(fcolor(white)) title("Figure 13. Effect of Treatment Condition on Willingness to Vote for Candidate", size(medium)) note("Note: Effect of Treatment Condition v. Placebo/Control separately for male and female candidates, by respondent PID and candidate PID. " "Positive values indicate being more willing to vote for the candidate. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence intervals.", size(vsmall)) saving(Figure_13, replace)