



2018

Inter-Female Hostility: Attractiveness and Femininity vs. Likeability

Savanah Henshaw

Lydia Estes

Lauren Olsen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/sigma>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), and the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Henshaw, Savanah; Estes, Lydia; and Olsen, Lauren (2018) "Inter-Female Hostility: Attractiveness and Femininity vs. Likeability," *Sigma: Journal of Political and International Studies*: Vol. 35 , Article 4.
Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/sigma/vol35/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the All Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sigma: Journal of Political and International Studies by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Inter-Female Hostility: Attractiveness and Femininity vs. Likeability

Savannah Henshaw, Lydia Estes, and Lauren Olsen

Introduction

Gender discrimination in business and politics is not a new phenomenon. Stories about the gender gap, feminist movements, and the glass ceiling have peppered the news since the women's movement began, and, until recently, people have generally blamed men for this inequality. However, research suggests that women actually play a significant role in perpetuating the gender gap due to a concept known as female hostility (Loya, Cowan, and Walters 2006). Female hostility is a destructive comparison mentality women sometimes exhibit when they feel inferior to another woman in some way. Examples of this mentality include: "If she is pretty, I'm not;" "If she is successful, I am a failure;" and "If she is smart, I am dumb." By comparing themselves to each other in this way, women inadvertently foster a mindset of competition that destroys relationships among them. While many factors could influence this mentality, we focused specifically on physical appearance and its effect on female hostility. Our experiment attempted to answer the following question: what is the relationship between a woman's physical appearance and her perceived likeability among other women? Specifically, we investigated whether women were more likely to ascribe negative traits to a female candidate if she is perceived as attractive. Using a simple survey, we studied the behavior of 139 women and found that attractiveness is negatively related to likeability among female voters at a 95 percent confidence level.

Female Hostility and Attractiveness in Politics

Our research question and design was based on an intriguing field of research within political science that investigates why women are underrepresented in Congress. Research in this field has demonstrated interesting relationships between attrac-

tiveness (femininity), gender, and success in politics. For example, despite multiple feminist movements and millions of women seeking representation in Congress, only 20 percent of federal legislators are female (Center for American Women and Politics 2017). Although many women advocate for female voices to represent them in Congress, recent polls show that U.S. women prefer men in positions of leadership (Litwan 2017; Ferber, Huber, and Spitze 1979). The obvious contradiction between what women say and how they vote has played a significant role in the underrepresentation of women in Congress.

For decades, research has shown that women are more hostile to each other than they are to men (Bleske-Recheck and Lighthill 2010; Chelser 2009; Gaitskill 2006; Haas and Gregory 2005; Jack 2009; Simmons 2002; Tulshyan 2012). In fact, from an early age, women begin demonstrating aggression and hostility almost exclusively to their female peers (Chesler 2009; Simmons 002). Women judge more attractive females to be less trustworthy; they threaten the resources and opportunities of their peers and create a lack of trust in other women (Gatskill 2006). As a result, women are much harsher critics of their female colleagues and, in many cases, they endorse gender-stereotypes more enthusiastically than their male counterparts (Ellemers, Van den Heuvel, de Gilder, Maas, and Bonvini 2004). This comparison and competition among females encourages women to succeed by elevating themselves above other women in the workplace and perpetuating gender inequalities among their inferiors. This pattern of separation and subjugation among professional women is known as the *queen bee syndrome* (Ibid.). It causes women to perceive assertiveness in other women as negative and augments feelings of distrust in female leadership (Haas and Gregory 2005; Mathiason 2010). This environment of competition can cause an attractive woman to decline in social status and popularity among her female friends and colleagues (Haas and Gregory 2005; Loya, Cowan, and Walters 2006; Simmons 2002). Though ample research has investigated the way successful women perceive and react to other women, little has been done to evaluate how those women perceive and react to their successful female colleagues. In this paper, we hope to address this gap.

In addition to the queen bee syndrome, the relationship between political success and attractiveness plays an important role in our research. In politics today, many citizens are poorly informed about candidates' qualifications or views. Unfortunately, this often leaves appearance as a primary factor for election success (Atkinson, Enos, and Hill 2009; King and Leigh 2009; Rosar, Klein, and Becker 2007; Martin 2014). Not only are attractive politicians more likely to be elected and supported by their constituents, but handsome and pretty politicians get away with unethical behavior while their less attractive counterparts are punished (Stockemer, Prain, and Moscardelli 2016). The voter population has repeatedly given their support to candidates who are well dressed, carefully coiffed, and genetically blessed. This phenomenon is not manifested exclusively in politics; in nearly every aspect of work, success is positively correlated with how well a person conforms to cultural beauty standards (Hamermesh 2011).

There is ample evidence that positively links hostility among women to attractiveness and femininity as well as to attractiveness and electoral success. Social scientists have thoroughly investigated the relationship between physical appearance and election results, but there have been insufficient studies about the influence of gender on this trend. To fill this void, we sought to combine previous scholarship by connecting female hostility and attractiveness to electoral success.

Attractiveness and Likeability Defined

We hypothesized that as a female candidate's attractiveness increased, her perceived likeability among other women would decrease. We planned to test our theory by manipulating the attractiveness of a female candidate and using a survey to measure her perceived likeability among female voters. In order to test this accurately, we needed to have clear definitions of our variables. Our primary independent variable was attractiveness, which we defined as the physical trait in an individual that is visually appealing to others. We operationally defined attractiveness by how well a person conforms to traditional beauty standards through the use of makeup. Beauty standards change constantly and vary by country and culture; however, the use of cosmetics has consistently been associated with higher levels of perceived "attractiveness, femininity, and sexiness" across borders and nations (Narang 2013). Research has suggested that the use of makeup positively reinforces sex-role stereotypes and is used regularly around the world as a method for women to appear and feel more attractive and feminine (Cox and Glick 1982; Miller and Cox 1982). These studies linking makeup and female attractiveness or femininity are abundant and reliable. In addition, using makeup allowed us to present the same political candidate in both treatments to avoid unnecessary bias in our results; because beauty is subjective, using different models as our political candidate would have created an enormous bias within our subject pool. Although makeup application is not the only method of measuring attractiveness and femininity, it was the best measure of the variable for our purposes.

In this experiment, we defined our dependent variable, likeability, as positive reactions to an individual. We measured this variable operationally by asking survey participants to rank the candidate's likeability using a Likert scale of one to ten. We also tested phrases that national public opinion polls typically associate with positive or negative attributes of politicians, such as informed, trustworthy, and qualified (Botti 2014). Using these phrases, we focused the participants' attention on what they liked and disliked about the woman specifically as a politician. Each participant rated the candidate on a scale of one to ten for different positive and negative attributes. We then looked at how likeable they rated her, which we used as our dependent variable to perform our statistical analysis.

Experimental Design

Our experimental design included a treatment group, a placebo group, and a control group. Based on common statistical norms, we needed at least thirty participants

for each group in order to achieve statistical power, with ninety participants overall. To find these participants, we used a script to personally invite our Facebook friends to take a survey, which they could complete at their convenience (see Appendix—A). We invited people from various socioeconomic classes to participate to make the sample as representative as possible. Using this method, we gathered data from about 139 women ages eighteen and older. We acknowledge that the group may not have been an accurate representation of the general public, but it did give us a basic idea of how plausible our theory was.

At the beginning of the survey, we asked participants to give their consent to be part of our research and to answer a series of demographic questions (see Appendix—B). Though we were explicitly studying the effects of attractiveness or femininity on our outcome measure, we were also interested in how differences among several subgroups in our sample affected our results. The subgroups we evaluated included age, employment status, and political affiliation. The distribution of these subgroups is shown in Table 1. By analyzing this demographic information, we measured the influence of these subgroups on our results.

Table 1

Distribution of Demographics							
<i>Number of participants in each demographic</i>							
Age		Employment Status		Household Income		Political Affiliation	
18-28	81	Employed for Wages	48	\$0–29,000	18	Republican	75
29-38	7	Self-Employed	11	\$30,000–50,000	17	Democratic	11
39-48	16	Out of Work	2	\$60,000–80,000	14	Independent	25
49-58	14	Homemaker	21	\$80,000–100,000	17	Green	0
59-68	4	Student	42	\$100,000–200,000	35	Other	1
69-78	4	Retired	2	\$200,000+	27		
79-88	2	Unable to Work	0				

Following the demographic questions, each participant listened to a twenty-second clip of a speech by a fictional female politician running for Senate (see Appendix—C). To avoid partisan bias, we chose a mock stump speech written by two former professional speechwriters—one Republican and one Democrat (Swaim and Nussbaum 2016). We also chose a section of the speech that focused on neutral topics, such as improving America, without addressing controversial or partisan issues.

All participants listened to the same speech, but each group saw a different screen while doing so. The placebo group saw a blank page. The control group saw a picture of a female candidate with unstyled hair and no makeup (see Appendix—E). The treatment group saw a picture of the same woman, but with well-kept hair and professional makeup (see Appendix—F). As we explained in the definitions section, we selected makeup as our treatment because females without cosmetics are typically viewed as less attractive or less feminine. For our placebo, the blank screen

eliminated any bias based on levels of attractiveness and femininity. Using the blank screen forced the participants to focus exclusively on the audio clip from the politician rather than on any visual cues. In this way, we determined how the candidate's physical appearance, rather than the content of the speech, affected participants' opinions.

After listening to the speech, participants ranked how likeable the candidate was using a simple Likert scale from one to ten. We used their responses to this question as our dependent variable to gauge how the women participating in the survey viewed the potential candidate. Finally, the participants answered several open-ended, qualitative questions about the candidate. These questions gave us more insight about how participants felt toward the candidate and why (see Appendix—D).

Causes and Effects of Female Hostility

Based on this experimental design, we hypothesized that as the female candidate's attractiveness increased, her perceived likeability among other women would decrease. This hypothesis was based on the evidence that female competition causes women to feel threatened by attractive females (Haas and Gregory 2005). As previously mentioned, this pattern is referred to as the queen bee syndrome. If a woman perceives another woman as attractive and successful, she is more prone to judge that female candidate according to traditional gender stereotypes (Ellemers, Van den Heuvel, de Gilder, Maas, and Bonvini 2004). For example, women will perceive attractive women as unintelligent, unambitious, or unassertive (Huddy and Terkildsen 2016; Ellemers, Van den Heuvel, de Gilder, Maass, and Bonvini 2004). Once women have attributed these stereotypes to the candidate, they subconsciously judge her as less qualified and will not vote for her.

Statistical Analysis of Likeability

To reliably assess this hypothesis, we ran several statistical tests in order to determine the impact of each of the treatment conditions as well as other variables on the candidate's likeability. Our survey included questions regarding three other subgroups in our sample that could have influenced the perceived likeability of the candidate. The subgroups we measured were age, employment status, and political affiliation. We asked about age to determine if women in various age groups responded differently to successful women. For example, older participants closer to the candidate's age might experience stronger levels of female hostility, because they feel more threatened by her than younger participants do. We also investigated how political affiliation affected participants' opinions by asking participants to indicate which political party they identified with. Different political parties have different perceptions about feminism and gender equality, which could influence participants' responses. Finally, we evaluated differences in socioeconomic status by asking about employment status. Participants who are currently working might feel a more competitive response toward the candidate than a stay-at-home mom would, because they are competing for the

same opportunities and resources. However, in our analysis of these subgroups, we found no statistically significant differences between these groups. This suggests there is no relationship between age, employment, or political affiliation and likeability (See Appendix—G).

After evaluating the subgroups, we began our analysis by using a t-test to compare the makeup treatment to the no makeup control. The results are included in Table 2. The difference between the mean likeability score for both groups was .80, which had a p-value of .036. Thus, we can confirm at the 95 percent confidence level that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups. Additionally, with a p-value of .018, we can confirm at the 95 percent confidence level that there was not only a difference, but the mean for the makeup group was statistically lower than the mean of the no makeup group. Based on this evidence, we can reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the two groups.

Table 2

Makeup vs. No-Makeup T-test			
<i>H₀: Likability for Makeup Treatment (M) - Likability for No Makeup Control (NM)</i>			
Treatment	Makeup	No Makeup	Difference
Observations	33	37	-
Mean	7.09	7.89	0.80
Standard Error	0.26	0.27	0.37
		T-statistic	2.14**
		P-value (H _a : M ≠ NM)	.036**
		P-value(H _a : M < NM)	.018**

To further investigate this relationship, we also compared the makeup group to the no makeup and placebo groups combined. The results of this t-test are included in Table 3. As it shows, there is a surprising difference between this test and the last test. When comparing the makeup group to the no makeup group, we found statistically significant evidence that the groups were different. However, when we added the placebo group, the difference was no longer significant. This suggests that the placebo group was more similar than the no makeup group was to the makeup group. Though we cannot confirm any causal reasons behind this discovery, further research could investigate them. It is possible that the women listening to the speech with no picture were imagining the speaker’s physical appearance as they listened and expected that she would be wearing makeup. Additionally, perhaps not wearing makeup actually makes the candidate more likeable, rather than our original theory that wearing makeup makes the candidate less likeable. None of this speculation can be confirmed through our experiment, but it does provide opportunities for further research.

Table 3

Makeup vs. Other Groups T-test			
<i>Ho: Likability for Makeup Treatment (M) – Likability for Other Groups (O)</i>			
Treatment	Makeup	Other Groups	Difference
Observations	33	70	-
Mean	7.09	7.42	0.34
Standard Error	0.26	0.21	0.36
		T-statistic	0.95
		P-value (Ha: M ≠ O)	0.34
		P-value(Ha: M < O)	0.17

The information we have gathered from the two t-tests and the regression of our subgroups have significantly added to the current literature on female hostility. The candidate was statistically less likeable when she was wearing makeup, meaning there is a significant relationship between attractiveness and likeability. We can confidently reject the null hypothesis that the candidate was equally likeable whether she was wearing makeup or not. Though the t-test that included the placebo group was not statistically different from the makeup group, future research with a larger sample size and improved methods of testing could achieve greater statistical power to investigate this relationship more thoroughly.

Qualitative Analysis of Likeability

Our qualitative data, like our quantitative data, demonstrated that there is a correlation between attractiveness, femininity, and likeability. Analyzing participants' responses to our survey's open-ended questions helped us discern the rationale behind the participants' perceptions. While these responses are individual and do not represent the respondents in general, they are valuable, because they give insight into our quantitative results.

To evaluate these mechanisms, we asked participants to give advice to the candidate and to identify what they liked and disliked about her. We avoided asking questions regarding the candidate's political views in order to collect information regarding the participants' overall perception of the candidate. The responses to these questions helped us identify the relationship between hostility, femininity, and attractiveness by illustrating the factors that affected likeability. They also indicated whether participants subconsciously stereotyped the candidate with makeup according to the traditional gender stereotypes as discussed earlier.

To accurately distinguish the differences in the qualitative data, we started by identifying comments that appeared across all groups and exempted them from our analysis. Most of the responses generated by the placebo group focused on the disin-

genuous nature of the candidate's speech. In an attempt to avoid party biases, we chose a speech that was vague and nonpartisan. Due to the general nature of the speech, participants in the control group thought the candidate sounded "robotic and fake" and suggested that she include more specifics. Comparing these comments to the treatment and control groups, we found that they appeared consistently across all groups. Similarly, when asked what they liked about the candidate, participants in all groups mentioned her "friendly" nature and "kind" demeanor. These comments illustrated several limitations of our experimental design. If we were to repeat this study in the future, we would alter the instructions, speech, and questions to guide the survey participants to respond about the candidate herself, not about her political opinions. Because these remarks appeared frequently in all groups, we assumed these comments originated from other influences and not from the effects of the treatment. Accordingly, we ignored comments that appeared in responses across all of the groups and those regarding the content of the speech. We also recognize that one person's comment does not speak for the entire group. By focusing exclusively on the differences between the groups, we were able to identify comments that provide insight pertaining to specific individuals' experiences within each group.

We began our qualitative analysis by first evaluating responses that specifically mentioned physical appearance. As explained earlier, we hypothesized that attractive candidates would be more likely to be perceived as untrustworthy or incompetent due to intrasexual competition among females. We anticipated this competition would cause participants to feel hostility toward the candidate and attribute these negative feelings to the candidate's appearance. Therefore, if participants cited physical appearance as an influential factor in their opinion of the candidate, this would indicate a causal relationship between appearance and likeability. The most interesting comment that mentioned physical appearance was one woman's response about the candidate with makeup: "She doesn't really look the part of a politician. I'd probably take her more seriously if she was brunette." This comment strongly suggested that the participant viewed the candidate as less qualified because of her appearance. By implying that she judged the candidate more stereotypically because of her hair color, she illustrated the competitive mentality that results from female hostility.

Another response that mentioned physical appearance shed additional light on the connection between attractiveness, femininity, and likeability. The participant said, "You seem nice, but perhaps some light makeup will make you look more polished and less granola." Initially, this comment seemed to contradict our hypothesis—this woman noticed the candidate's appearance and suggested she change it, just like the woman who commented about the candidate's hair color. On the surface, both participants appeared to have the same reaction. However, as we compared the two responses, we noticed an intriguing contradiction. Both comments suggested the candidate change her appearance in some way. However, in the first comment, the participant implied that the can-

didate's appearance negatively impacted her opinion of the candidate's capability. The second comment, however, only suggested that she change her appearance to look more polished, not to seem more capable. Though the reason for the participant's response is unclear, it is interesting that she commented on physical appearance rather than the candidate's other characteristics.

Though the first two responses supported our hypothesis, another woman who saw the woman with makeup gave a different perspective. She said, "[The candidate] seemed inviting to talk to. I think her appearance in the picture helped illustrate that." This was an intriguing response because it demonstrated another possible aspect of female hostility that we did not anticipate: female hostility could affect women in varying degrees. A woman's susceptibility to female hostility could potentially be weaker or stronger depending on her confidence level, life circumstances, or personal goals. Further research could examine the link between a woman's personal confidence and how strongly she experiences female hostility.

The qualitative responses we analyzed demonstrated important insights concerning the way individual women experience female hostility. They also provoked questions we would like to investigate further regarding why different women experience hostility differently. Though these results are not universally applicable, they do provide important insights to our quantitative findings about the relationship between attractiveness and female hostility.

Limitations

Though we have carefully designed our experiment and analyzed the results, we do recognize that all research inherently has limitations. In our case, we experienced limitations due to the need for ambiguity about the subject of our research. We have attempted to mitigate potential errors in our research by identifying and addressing these limitations individually.

One potential limitation was that likeability depends on more than simple levels of attractiveness and femininity. Some participants could have rated the candidate based on factors besides appearance, such as political biases, tone of voice, or other influences controlled for through our randomization. Our experiment sought to measure implicit biases; as a result, participants could not know the intent of the research, because it would have influenced their responses. Consequently, our questions elicited some vague or irrelevant comments in our qualitative data. We expected participants to discuss the candidate's character and ascribe negative or positive attributes due to judgments about her physical appearance. However, some participants inferred that the survey intended to measure political affiliation and gave answers regarding the content of the speech instead of the candidate herself. If we could conduct this experiment again, we would explicitly state that we were not measuring political values to discourage participants from responding about the speech's content. This would encourage participants to base their responses on the candidate's likeability and personality instead of on her political affiliation or policies.

Similarly, the intrinsic limits of quantitative and qualitative data posed another potential problem. While quantitative data provides statistical information, it does not explain the causal mechanisms behind these numbers. Conversely, qualitative responses do reveal causal mechanisms behind individual participants' responses but do not necessarily represent the population as a whole. In spite of these limitations, using both types of responses helped us understand the relationship between attractiveness, femininity, and likeability. The quantitative data helped us evaluate the direction and magnitude of this relationship, and the qualitative data helped us identify the causal logic behind it. Our qualitative data allows us to infer a relationship, but we cannot definitively confirm it for the entire sample.

Finally, one of the greatest limitations of our research is our sample. Because of limited resources, we only administered the survey through our personal social networks. Our acquaintances are possibly skewed toward our community's political leanings and are not representative of women from a normally distributed socioeconomic and geographic population. Thus, if we were to conduct this experiment again, we would survey a larger, more random, and normally distributed sample. Although many limitations restricted our design, our experiment helped us obtain important data regarding female hostility.

Conclusion

In spite of our limitations, we found that our quantitative data reflected a statistically significant relationship between attractiveness and femininity and likeability. We found statistically significant evidence that the candidate without makeup was more likeable than the candidate with, and we rejected the null hypothesis. In addition, our qualitative responses told an important story regarding the relationship between female hostility, attractiveness and femininity, and electoral success. For example, the participants in the makeup group evaluated the candidate much more negatively and stereotypically than those in the control group. Various comments demonstrated the role of attractiveness and femininity in this relationship.

Though our results were compelling and informative, we have only begun to examine the full implications of female hostility. The shocking void in current research must be filled for women to be represented equally in politics. Other factors, such as confidence and intelligence, could influence female competition. Further questions we could investigate include the following: Would women who are competing directly against each other dislike their more attractive competitors? Does the reaction of women to other attractive women vary from culture to culture? How does personal confidence affect variation in female hostility?

Though more research is needed, our findings have certainly added to the current literature on female hostility and have given us insight into what more we can study. Based on our compelling results, efforts to balance the ratio of men to women in Congress need to change and refocus. Thus far, most of these movements have been focused on influencing male voters, but if a woman's attractiveness and femininity

truly does decrease the likelihood that other women will vote for her, female hostility may be the new key to shattering the glass ceiling.

APPENDIX

A. Script for inviting people to participate in the study

Hi __,

I hope you're doing well. For one of my classes at BYU, we are researching elections and voter perceptions of candidates and we have to gather data using a survey. Would you mind taking a 5-minute survey to help me gather the data we need? I would appreciate your help so much.

Thank you in advance,

—

B. Consent

This study is being conducted by Lydia Estes, Lauren Olsen, and Savannah Henshaw as part of a political science course. We are studying what people look for in their political candidates. If you choose to proceed with this survey, we will introduce you to a potential candidate to gauge interest and future support for them in the upcoming state Senate elections. You will listen to a 30-second message and answer a few questions about how well they come across to the public. The survey should take no more than five minutes of your time. All information will be kept confidential and anonymous. Participation is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate altogether or withdraw from the survey at any time. If you give your consent, click next. We appreciate your time!

C. Script for Speech

You're not here for a lot of political rhetoric. You didn't show up to hear a lot of talk about how things could be different and better than what they are. You're here because you're done with politics. You're here because the promise of American democracy—the promise of opportunity for all—remains unfulfilled for too many.

If you paid any attention to this election, or the last one, or the one before that, you can be forgiven for thinking that our problems are insurmountable, that there's just nothing we agree on enough to get it done. But that's not true.

There's more that unites us than divides us. And while elections focus on the divide, I want to focus on what we share. Because—yes—there's sacred ground. But for each of us, I believe, there's also common ground. And that's the ground we need to cultivate.

We know we can make progress. But for us to do something, I need you to do something. I need you to vote. I need you to get your friends and neighbors to vote. I ask you to stand with me. Join me. And together we'll build the country we know we can be.

Because remember: This election isn't about any one candidate. It's about where we're headed as a nation, and I believe we're headed toward economic freedom, self-governance, strength abroad and prosperity at home. Thank you.

D. Survey Questions

1. What is your age?
a. 18–28 b. 29–38 c. 39–48 d. 49–58 e. 59–68 f. 69–78 g. 79–88
2. What is your annual household income?
*College students married and unmarried signify your parents' household income
a. \$0–29,000 b. \$30,000–50,000 c. \$60,000–80,000 d. \$80,000–100,000
e. \$100,000–\$200,000 f. \$200,000+ g. prefer not to answer
3. Are you currently
a. Employed for wages b. Self-employed c. Out of work and looking for work
d. Out of work but not currently looking for work e. A homemaker f. A student
g. Retired h. Unable to work
4. What Political Party do you most identify with?
a. Republican b. Democratic c. Independent d. Green e. Other f. None
5. The candidate speaking below is running for Senator in your state. Please click the link below to hear a portion from her speech. In answering the questions that follow, please assume the candidate agrees with your political views and shares the same values.
[Random assignment of picture one, picture two, or no picture]
[audio clip]
6. Select how strongly you agree with each statement. *(on a scale of 1–10)*
This person is friendly.
This person is likeable.
This person is warm.
This person is approachable.
I would ask this person for advice or for help.
I would like this person as my representative.
I would like to be friends with this person.
I would trust this person.
This person is similar to me.
This person is knowledgeable.
This person is entitled.
This person is bossy.
This person is annoying.
This person seems uninformed about important issues.
This person is arrogant.
This person appears indecisive.
This person appears to be easily swayed.
This person presented their message poorly.
This person is a poor leader.
This person is unqualified to run for office
7. What three words best describe the potential candidate?
8. What advice do you have for the candidate if they were to run for office?

9. What political party do you think this candidate belongs to? Why?
10. What do you like about the candidate?
11. What do you dislike about the candidate?

E. Photo One



F. Photo Two



G. Subgroup Regression

Table 4

Effect of Education Level on Gun Control Support	
<i>Dependent Variable: Gun Control Support</i>	
VARIABLES	
Age 18 to 28	-0.162 (0.930)
Age 29 to 38	-0.532 (1.003)
Age 39 to 48	-2.525*** (0.912)
Age 49 to 58	-0.978 (1.216)
Age 69 to 78	-3.405** (1.282)
Homemaker	0.384 (0.623)
Student	-0.738 (0.447)
Retired	2.271** (1.123)
Republican	0.607 (0.402)
Democratic	-0.965* (0.498)
Makeup Treatment	-0.528 (0.388)
Constant	8.134*** (0.906)
Observations	70
R-squared	0.336

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, Matthew D., Ryan D. Enos, and Seth J. Hill. 2009. "Candidate Faces and Election Outcomes: Is the Face-Vote Correlation Caused by Candidate Selection?" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 4, no. 3 (June): 229–49.
- Botti, David. 2014. "What Do Americans Want Most in a President?" (video). BBC News. Accessed November 10, 2017. www.bbc.com/news/av/magazine-27599064/what-traits-do-americans-want-most-in-a-president.
- Bleske-Reчек, April and Melissa Lighthall. 2010. "Attractiveness and Rivalry in Women's Friendships with Women." *Human Nature* 21, no. 1 (March): 82–97.
- Center for American Women and Politics. "Women in U.S. Congress 2017." Rutgers Eagleton Institute of Politics. Accessed October 16, 2017. www.cawp.rutgers.edu/women-us-congress-2017.
- Chesler, Phyllis. 2009. *Woman's Inhumanity to Woman*. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books.
- Cox, Cathryn L. and William H. Glick. 1982. "Resume Evaluations and Cosmetics Use: When More is Not Better." *Sex Roles* 14, no. 1 (January): 51–58.
- Derks, Belle, Colette Van Laar, and Naomi Ellemers. 2016. "The Queen Bee Phenomenon: Why Leaders Distance Themselves from Junior Women." *Leadership Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (June): 456–69.
- Dion, Karen, Ellen Berscheid, and Elaine Walster. 1972. "What is Beautiful is Good." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 24, no. 3 (December): 285–90.
- Ellemers, Naomi, Henriette Van den Heuvel, Dick de Gilder, Anne Maass, and Alessandra Bonvini. 2004. "The Underrepresentation of Women in Science: Differential Commitment or the Queen Bee Syndrome?" *British Psychology Society* 43, no. 3 (September): 315–38.
- Ely, Robin J. 1994. "The Effects of Organizational Demographics and Social Identity on Relationships among Professional Women." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (June): 203–08.
- Ferber, Marianne, Joan Huber, and Glenna Spitze. 1979. "Preference for Men as Bosses and Professionals." *Social Forces* 58, no. 2 (December): 466–76.
- Gaitskill, Mary. 2006. "Don't Hate Them Because They're Beautiful." *O, The Oprah Magazine*, April. Accessed October 16, 2017. <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&id=ef1a3cc9-e563-4807-bb86-975d515fe6b1%40sessionmgr4009&bddata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUm2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=20280180&db=th>.
- Haas, Arne and Stanford W. Gregory, Jr. 2005. "The Impact of Physical Attractiveness on Women's Social Status and Interactional Power." *Sociological Forum* 20, no. 3 (September): 449–71.
- Hammermesh, Daniel S. 2011. *Beauty Pays: Why Attractive People Are More Successful*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Huddy, Leonie and Nayda Terkildsen. 2016. "The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office." *Political Research Quarterly* 46, no. 3 (July): 503–25.
- Jack, Dana Crowley. 2009. *Behind the Mask: Destruction and Creativity in Women's Aggression*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- King, Amy and Andrew Leigh. 2009. "Beautiful Politicians." *Kyklos* 62, no. 4 (November): 579–93.
- Litwan, Anne. 2017. "Six Reasons Why We Need More Women in Government." Anne Litwan and Associates. Last modified January 9. Accessed October 18, 2017. www.annelitwin.com/six-reasons-why-we-need-more-women-in-government/.
- Loya, Bianca N., Gloria Cowan, and Christine Walters. 2006. "The Role of Social Comparison and Body Consciousness in Women's Hostility toward Women." *Sex Roles* 54, no. 7/8 (October): 575–83.
- Martin, Annie. 2014. "Rob Lowe Talks Being 'Pretty' and Politics." UPI Entertainment. Last modified April 7. Accessed October 16, 2017. <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.erl.lib.byu.edu/>

- eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=5df20296-0fa4-4308-980a-4eb2ea08cb5d%40sessionmgr4010&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZlQ%3d%3d#AN=B92Y1601054818&db=n5h.
- Miller, Lyn C. and Cathryn L. Cox. 1982. "For Appearance's Sake: Public Self-Consciousness and Makeup Use." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 8, no. 4 (December) 748–51.
- Narang, Devina. 2013. "The Psychological Factors that Affect Makeup Usage and the Perception of Makeup in Different Situations." Paper presented at the National Conference Undergraduate Research 2013, La Crosse, WI, April 10–13. Accessed November 11, 2017. www.ncurproceedings.org/ojs/index.php/NCUR2013/article/view/666.
- Reysen, Stephen. 2005. "Construction of a New Scale: The Reysen Likeability Scale." *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 33, no. 2 (January): 201–08.
- Rosar, Ulrich, Markus Klein, and Tilo Beckers. 2007. "The Frog Pond Beauty Contest: Physical Attractiveness and Electoral Success of the Constituency Candidates of the North Rhine-Westphalia State Election of 2005." *European Journal of Political Research* 47, no. 1 (January): 64–79.
- Sanders, Linley. 2017. "What Happened? In Interview, Hillary Clinton Gives Sexist Argument for Why She Lost the 2016 Election." *Newsweek*, September 13. Accessed October 18, 2017. www.newsweek.com/hillary-clinton-sexist-losing-2016-election-what-happened-book-664295.
- Simmons, Rachel. 2002. *Odd Girl Out: The Hidden Culture of Aggression in Girls*. New York: First Mariner Books.
- Stockemer, Daniel, Rodrigo Praino, and Vin Moscardelli. 2016. "The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: Do Attractive Politicians Get a 'Break' When They Are Involved in Scandals?" Lecture, ECPR General Conference Charles University, Prague, September 7. Accessed October 16, 2017. <https://ecpr.eu/Events/PaperDetails.aspx?PaperID=30450&EventID=95>.
- Swaim, Barton and Jeff Nussbaum. 2016. "The Perfect Presidential Stump Speech." *FiveThirtyEight*. Last modified November 3. Accessed October 23, 2017. <https://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/perfect-stump-speech/>.
- Tulshyan, Ruchika. 2012. "Why Women Are the Worst Kind of Bullies." *Forbes Magazine*, April 30. Accessed October 9, 2017. www.forbes.com/sites/worldviews/2012/04/30/why-women-are-the-worst-kind-of-bullies/#d5e04ae36b7d.