

# Reply to “Powerless Conservatives or Powerless Findings?”

L. J Zigerell, *Illinois State University*

Responding to Zigerell (2019), Utych (2020a, 5) suggested that “research about issues such as anti-man bias may not be published because it is difficult to show conclusive evidence that it exists or has an effect on the political world.” However, evidence of anti-man bias is available in publishable measures of bias against a group, such as negative stereotypes and experimental discrimination, as in the following surveys:

- In a 2014 survey (N=1,835), 9% of US adults indicated that “intelligent” is more true of women than men (Pew Research Center 2015, 17).
- In a 2018 survey (N=2,301), 31% of US adults indicated that women in high political offices are, in general, better than men in high political offices at being honest and ethical (Pew Research Center 2018, 36).
- The Schwarz and Coppock (2020) meta-analysis of candidate-choice survey experiments reported an on-average favoring of women candidate targets over men candidate targets.

Utych (2020a) reported an illustrative example to suggest that research on anti-man bias suffers from the file-drawer problem. In table 1, an individual-level five-point “perceptions of discrimination against men” measure of anti-man bias associated at  $p < 0.05$  with two Trump-related outcome variables, net of controls such as ideology, partisanship, authoritarianism, and egalitarianism. This measure of anti-man bias lost statistical significance in table 2 due to the addition of controls for perceived discrimination against majority groups (Whites and Christians) and perceived discrimination against minority groups (Blacks, Hispanics, and Muslims).

My analyses (Zigerell 2020) indicated that the measure of anti-man bias retains statistical significance in table 1 analyses when table 1 “perceptions of discrimination” measures are coded 1 for indicating that the amount of discrimination in the United States today is “none at all” and 0 for other substantive responses. This might be a better measure of bias than the five-point coding because “none at all” is the only response that is negative and clearly untrue (see Edelman, Luca, and Svirsky 2017; Starr 2015; Yavorsky 2019).

Properly concluding that a predictor suffers from the file-drawer problem requires application of no more rigor than is needed to publish. Thus, for this purpose, table 1 results are preferable because table 1 statistical control is more rigorous than the statistical control in some recent publications (e.g., Utych 2020b) that have predicted candidate evaluations using a measure of anti-woman bias. Utych (2020b) did not control for attitudes about racial or religious groups, so for assessing whether research on anti-man bias suffers from the

file-drawer problem, table 2 results would be informative only if authors or journal gatekeepers required more rigorous statistical control for the anti-man analyses in Utych (2020a) than for the anti-woman analyses in Utych (2020b).

Regardless, p-values are irrelevant for the Zigerell (2019, 720) complaint about “the dearth of gender-attitudes items about men.” Instead, the complaint is valid because measurement of attitudes about men is needed to produce a proper inference about the net effect of sexist attitudes. Research on sexist attitudes should incorporate measures of attitudes about men due to considerations about research design, not considerations about p-values.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT


I thank the *PS* editors for this opportunity to respond. Pew Research Center bears no responsibility for the analyses or interpretations of the data presented here. The opinions expressed, including any implications for policy, are those of the author and not of Pew Research Center.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Replication materials are available on Dataverse at <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/CJQROH>. ■

## REFERENCES

- Edelman, Benjamin, Michael Luca, and Dan Svirsky. 2017. “Racial Discrimination in the Sharing Economy: Evidence from a Field Experiment.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 9 (2): 1–22.
- Pew Research Center. 2015. “Women and Leadership: Public Says Women Are Equally Qualified, but Barriers Persist.” Washington, DC. Available at [www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015-01-14\\_women-and-leadership.pdf](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/01/2015-01-14_women-and-leadership.pdf).
- Pew Research Center. 2018. “Women and Leadership 2018.” Washington, DC. Available at [www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2018/09/Gender-and-leadership-for-PDF\\_updated-10.1.pdf](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2018/09/Gender-and-leadership-for-PDF_updated-10.1.pdf).
- Schwarz, Susanne, and Alexander Coppock. 2020. “What Have We Learned About Gender from Candidate Choice Experiments? A Meta-Analysis of 42 Factorial Survey Experiments.” *Journal of Politics*. Forthcoming.
- Starr, Sonja B. 2015. “Estimating Gender Disparities in Federal Criminal Cases.” *American Law and Economics Review* 17 (1): 127–59.
- Utych, Stephen M. 2020a. “Powerless Conservatives or Powerless Findings?” *PS: Political Science & Politics*. First View.
- Utych, Stephen M. 2020b. “Sexism Predicts Favorability of Women in the 2020 Democratic Primary...and Men?” *Electoral Studies*. In press.
- Yavorsky, Jill E. 2019. “Uneven Patterns of Inequality: An Audit Analysis of Hiring-Related Practices by Gendered and Classed Contexts.” *Social Forces* 98 (2): 461–92.
- Zigerell, L. J. 2019. “Left Unchecked: Political Hegemony in Political Science and the Flaws It Can Cause.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52 (4): 720–23.
- Zigerell, L. J. 2020. “Replication Data for: Reply to ‘Powerless Conservatives or Powerless Findings?’” Harvard Dataverse. [doi.org/10.7910/DVN/CJQROH](https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/CJQROH).

L. J Zigerell  is associate professor of politics and government at Illinois State University. He can be reached at [lzigerell@ilstu.edu](mailto:lzigerell@ilstu.edu).