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Abstract

This dissertation examines the topic of social perceptions regarding political candidates at the intersection of race and gender. Within this project I analyze 1) the degree to which stereotypes are held at different points of this intersection; 2) the degree to which these stereotypes can be influenced by way of priming via common news reporting messages; and 3) the ways in which these stereotypes and perceptions influence evaluations of Black female political candidates and their electoral prospects.

In order to examine these issues, I utilize data from two surveys I have designed: the 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey and the 2012 Political Candidate Evaluation and Social Beliefs Survey. The former gathers information regarding social and personal perceptions of “average” and “elite” Black women, White women, Black men, and White men, and the ways in which negative intersectional priming messages can influence the evaluation of each of these groups. The latter survey includes an embedded experiment in which respondents participate in two mock elections and candidate evaluations. One mock election includes a Black female with a relatively dark complexion as the fixed candidate and the other includes a Black female with a relatively light complexion as the fixed candidate, with each competing against either a White male, White female, or Black male opponent. Based on the data from the aforementioned surveys, I find that people engage in stereotyping in an intersectional,
rather than a one-dimensional, manner. Consequently, Black women at different social status levels and with differing skin tones are subject to distinct intensities of the attribution of racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes. In turn, the ways in which the voting public evaluates them as political candidates are influenced by these stereotypes.
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To the women in my family who have struggled against and overcome countless obstacles due to their race, gender, and position in society in order to lift me to where I stand today.
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1. Introduction

Aside from my interest in tennis, I am not much of a sports fan; however, I enjoy watching the Super Bowl every year, both for the game and for the commercials. Of course, I always expect extreme shock value in these advertisements, but as I watched the game in 2011, I was left with my mouth agape after seeing the "Love Hurts" Pepsi Max commercial. This ad features a relatively young Black couple, and the premise is that the wife is attempting to keep the husband from eating foods that are not healthy. Her methods for this include kicking him under the table when he orders something that is bad for him at a restaurant, slamming his face into a pie, and shoving a bar of soap into his mouth when he hides in the bathtub to sneak a hamburger. Needless to say, the ways she approaches her goal are violent, mean-spirited, and hurtful. In spite of the fact that she smiles lovingly at him when they drink Pepsi Max together on a park bench, this positive image remains only for a brief moment. When a young, blonde, White runner stops to sit near them and waves smilingly at the husband, he looks at her in an appreciative way and greets her in a friendly manner. This prompts the wife to hurl her full drink can at the husband, and when he ducks to avoid the can, it hits the other woman squarely in the head. Instead of helping the young woman as she writhes in pain on the ground, the couple jumps up and runs away while apologizing.

It took me a moment to fully process why this commercial, when it was clearly intended to be funny, had been so upsetting to me. A part of the problem was that it
seemed clear that at the base of the “comedic value” of the commercial was the fact that the couple was Black and that it was not out of the realm of possibility to find these sorts of actions and interactions. I felt somewhat amazed that the ad’s creators had managed to fit so many negative stereotypes of Black women into a 30-second TV spot. This relatively dark-skinned Black woman is portrayed as bossy, aggressive, abusive, emotional, jealous, emasculating, and violent, and the couple is portrayed as unethical and irresponsible in that they do not attempt to help the woman that they injured.

Of course, many can say that it is “just a commercial,” that race and gender do not factor into it, and that it does not include any underlying implications. Others may argue that it is a step in a positive direction toward the goal of a color-blind society to have a middle-class, young Black couple featured in a mainstream advertisement for a Fortune 500 company. These are both arguments that I wish I could fully adopt, and in an ideal world, a commercial of this nature would not be overly problematic. Nevertheless, a part of the reason that this comes across as offensive to some is that it calls upon so many negative traits that society has ascribed to a traditionally oppressed and degraded group. The ad even caught the attention of U.S. Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee, who took to the Floor of the House on the Tuesday evening following the Super Bowl and offered these remarks:

…I’m so disappointed with the Pepsi advertisement that showed a demeaning role for African American women…. It certainly seems ridiculous that Pepsi would utilize this kind of humor. It was not
humorous, it was demeaning...frankly, I consider this insulting, and so did many other women of all colors. (Kasperowitz, 2011)

Rep. Jackson Lee’s reaction and reprimand demonstrate one of the main issues with this commercial. The ad reflects the implicit messages we encounter at many different points in time via various forms of media that encourage the retention of negative stereotypes concerning particular groups. It did not explicitly say that Black women are mean, vindictive, and shrewish; that would have been utterly ridiculous given that this was a commercial designed with the purpose of selling soda. Instead, it merely added to the myriad stereotypical images of and messages concerning the perceived bad qualities that many assume Black women hold. It is important to recognize, particularly in the 21st century in the United States, that the perpetuation of stereotypes regarding groups does not have to be planned, purposeful, and insidious. Instead, it can easily occur by way of adherence to the status quo, social norms, and acceptable narratives of our society. Nevertheless, the lack of intent to harm by way of perpetuating cultural myths does not decrease the power and influence these stereotype-based messages hold over social perceptions.

On the whole, there is an intuitive recognition that stereotypes as generalized assumptions and perceptions have negatively affected women and racial and ethnic minorities in the United States. Moreover, stereotypes have a direct effect on public opinion regarding politics, which also directly affects the way in which people evaluate political candidates. While there has been some research specifically addressing
stereotypes concerning female candidates and Black candidates, there is very little empirical evidence that addresses whether there are stereotypes that are specific to Black women generally, and Black female candidates more specifically. It is important to determine whether stereotypes for subgroups defined by the intersection of salient identities exist because these stereotypes have the potential to influence voting and political representation. In turn, political representation, or a lack thereof, has a direct effect on a group’s political efficacy and political engagement (Tate, 2004).

The purpose of this dissertation is to ascertain the degree to which stereotypes exist at various points of the intersection of race and gender in order to determine the ways in which intersectional stereotyping may affect the evaluation and electoral prospects of Black women running for political office. By examining the effect of social perceptions on Black female candidates, it is possible to develop a better understanding of how and why political descriptive underrepresentation persists for this group, as well as other intersectional identity groups. Consequently, this knowledge may increase society’s ability to create strategies that focus on the root causes of disparities, which in turn may encourage and establish an alteration to the status quo.

1.1 Recognition of the Effects of Prejudice and Stereotyping on Black Women

As noted above, many have recognized the ways in which stereotypes can have negative effects on groups, particularly in that they encourage the unmerited ascription
of various traits to large groups of people with little allowance for the acknowledgment of people as individuals. Further, there are groups and organizations that have worked toward breaking down the social identity-based hierarchies that are reinforced by stereotyping. For example, in the late-1800s, Black women formed Colored Women’s Clubs across the nation in order to pursue the issues of racial uplift and social justice, and even sought to work together on a national scale by way of creating an umbrella group in 1896: the National Association of Colored Women (NACW) (Robnett, 1997; Mullane, 1993). Led by individuals such as Mary Church Terrell, Mary McLeod Bethune, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and Anna Julia Cooper, among many others, these Colored Women’s Club movements sought to protect the welfare and rights of women and children, break down negative social views concerning Blacks, increase the socioeconomic standing of Blacks, and encourage inter-racial understanding and acceptance. Mary Church Terrell wrote in 1902:

The National Association has chosen as its motto: Lifting as We Climb. In order to live strictly up to this sentiment, its members have determined to come into the closest possible touch with the masses of our women…. It is unfortunate, but it is true, that the dominant race in this country insists upon gauging the Negro’s worth by his most illiterate and vicious representatives rather than by the more intelligent and worthy classes. (Terrell, in Mullane, 1993: 406-407)

In this way, women with higher levels of social status within the African American community sought to produce internal progress in order to encourage change in external perceptions of the race, and of Black women in particular.
While these movements were somewhat classist in their views and approaches, the women leading them demonstrated their understanding of the fact that their race trumped their gender in terms of how society perceived them. They recognized that in order to gain some modicum of respectability within U.S. society, they had to combat negative racial stereotypes. This would be their only means for obtaining social mobility for Black women in particular and for African Americans as a whole more generally. Their recognition that race had a stronger effect than gender on societal perceptions of Black women was based upon the long-standing existence of the social narrative that all Blacks were fundamentally the same in that they were biologically inferior to Whites (Smedley, 2001). As America developed, first as a colony and then as a nation, society came to view Blacks as a monolithic group that was not suited to the responsibilities of self-determination. Those with the greatest amount of power in the U.S. worked toward developing and legitimizing this narrative in order to justify the maintenance of an economy based on slave labor in the presence of a freedom- and liberty-based political system (Smedley, 2001).\(^1\) With regard to perceptions concerning Black women, the biological narrative of “Blackness” overshadowed the virtuous narratives of “femininity.” As a consequence, society viewed Black women in terms of their race more than their sex, thus not allowing them the privileges and shelter of social norms

---

\(^1\) This biological explanation allowed for the “moral” justification of the enslavement of Africans and their descendants.
regarding femininity. These narratives did not disappear with emancipation, the evidence of which we see in the necessity for the development and purposes of the Colored Women’s Club Movements.

A century later, based on the context of this information, it is necessary to ask the following questions: Are Black women still viewed more in terms of race or has the influence of their gender increased in terms of social perceptions of this group? With greater sociopolitical mobility, are there now differences in how Black women are viewed based upon their social status? Arguably, in that there was a small degree of recognition in various pockets of U.S. society that some Blacks were socially and economically successful within the Black community, there acknowledgement to a small extent that some Blacks, both male and female, could not be defined by the negative portrayals regarding their race; however, on the whole, among individuals and throughout society and most forms of media, it was apparent that race trumped all and the overwhelming and ubiquitous viewpoint that Blacks were bad and inferior prevailed.

Given the purposes of the NACWs “Lifting as We Climb” efforts, I come to the question concerning the degree to which these problems of perceptions and stereotypes continue to be problematic for Black women today, especially in the political context. There are very little data available that specifically examines perceptions of Black women in the sociopolitical sphere, and as such I must collect these data in order to
examine social perceptions of Black women in the context of varying levels of social status. I also must determine whether it is possible for racialized and gendered perceptions to be primed in a negative way against elite Black women, given that they are the subgroup that is the most likely to enter electoral politics. The examination of negative priming is necessary because this is a strategy often used against political candidates. Finally, I must examine the ways in which stereotypes may affect society’s evaluations of Black female political candidates and what this means for their electoral prospects.²

1.2 Gender and Race in the Sociopolitical Sphere

Throughout most of the history of the United States, political candidates and actors have been White males from the upper echelons of society. As a result, the policies developed by the U.S. government have largely benefitted this small subsection of the nation. Nevertheless, as the U.S. has advanced toward honoring its creed of equality of and for all, we have seen increasing descriptive and substantive representation of a wide variety of groups. This is especially the case given the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965 (VRA), which ushered in an era of widespread political enfranchisement. One of the consequences of the VRA was a vast and immediate

² Recent work demonstrates that Black women in leadership positions are not penalized in the same way as White females and Black males for exhibiting dominating/aggressive behavior (Livingston, Rosette, and Washington, 2012). This finding further demonstrates the necessity for intersectional examinations into stereotypes and social reactions.
increase in the number of racial minorities and women elected to hold political office. In spite of the rapidly changing demographics of the political sphere over the past forty-five years, we find that racial minorities and women, and especially women of color, remain significantly descriptively underrepresented in politics.

There are a variety of possible explanations for this continuing political underrepresentation. These explanations can be specific to the candidates themselves or the voting public as a whole. One possible reason is that women do not desire to hold political office. This could occur for a number of reasons, including child-rearing responsibilities and general beliefs that women will be unsuccessful in a run for office. Nevertheless, research into this issue has found that women are increasingly interested in running for and holding political office and they engage in strategic action in order to be successful (Gertzog, 2002). Another candidate-based possibility is that racial minorities and women may generally be less qualified to hold office than their White male counterparts (Mandel, 1981). In addition to being politically underrepresented, these two former groups have also been underrepresented within the professions that are typical of officeholders, e.g. lawyers, doctors, business owners and/or managers. Even so, non-Whites and women are increasingly occupying these positions within society, and thus it could be expected that there is a significantly larger pool of these individuals that would be “qualified” to hold public office and have the desire to do so.
As mentioned above, in that there are now fewer barriers to obtaining political office with regard to the candidates themselves, it is necessary to take a closer look at explanations for underrepresentation that are related to the voting public. There are a variety of considerations that arise with regard to how people choose which candidate to support; however, given the history of racial and gender hierarchies within the U.S., it is necessary to look to the outcomes of these systems with regard to voter public opinion. Although social rhetoric and overt attitudes are moving away from “old-fashioned” racism and sexism, in which racial minorities and women are seen as biologically inferior to White men, new justifications for negative affect and treatment toward these groups have developed largely in place of the old ones (Swim et al., 1995; Sears et al., 1997). Some of these justifications are based on the idea that women and racial minorities hold attitudes and beliefs that are in complete opposition to the American core values of egalitarianism and individualism, given that they seek “special treatment” and undeserved resources.3 Directly related to this issue is the idea that some voters may believe that women and racial minorities will only represent “women’s” and “racial” interests, as opposed to the interests of an entire constituency. Additionally, in spite of the evidence to the contrary, voters may not want to have a

____________________________

3 It is important to note that when I use the term “women” I am referring to women of all races, unless otherwise noted. Likewise, when I use the term “Blacks” I am referring to African Americans of any gender. These distinctions are important given that within most research, as well as social rhetoric, the default category that is examined is White women when examining “women” and Black men when examining “Blacks.” This dissertation project challenges these norms by way of recognizing the intersectional identity of all individuals, based upon the crossroads of their salient identities.
woman or non-White individual in office due to the belief that these people are less qualified than other more traditional candidates. Regardless of the grounds people may invoke as justification for opposing female or minority candidates, the fact remains that something is driving this oppositional affect. *I posit that at the heart of any of this form of political opposition lies stereotyping that places characteristics upon women and racial minorities that vary greatly from those that people generally desire in their political candidates.*

### 1.3 Political (Under)Representation

Even before the founding of the United States, individuals living in what is now the United States both valued and demanded political representation. Moreover, it was specifically the lack of a positive response to this demand for representation that precipitated the American Revolution and led to the building of a new democratic nation. On the whole, citizens do not desire political representation for its namesake; rather, people want to have their voices, opinions, needs, and interests directly included in and met by the governance structures of their nations. The purpose of political representation and the appropriate form of representation was a matter of particular importance to the founding fathers of the U.S., and James Madison noted in Federalist 10 that there are many different interests, opinions, and factions that must be allowed some degree of republican representation, so as to ensure that there would not be a tyranny of any majority opinion. As a consequence of this continuing plethora of majority and
minority interests and groups, the character and form of representation remain highly significant political issues for Americans more than 200 years after the founding of this nation (Kammen, 1986; Lowi et al, 2008).

There are several different forms of political representation; however, the two that are generally seen as the most relevant to policy outcomes are descriptive representation, when officials share ascriptive characteristic with certain constituents, and substantive representation, when officials represent the interests of certain constituents (Pitkin, 1967; Dolan, 2005). These forms are by no means mutually exclusive; instead, it is possible for descriptive and substantive representation to occur simultaneously, solely, or not at all. While some may claim that descriptive representation does not increase substantive outcomes (Swain, 1993), a wide variety of literature suggests that descriptive representation can lead to a greater degree of substantive representation for some racial minority groups, women, and women of color (Bratton and Haynie, 1999; Haynie, 2001; Tate, 2004; Bratton, Haynie, and Reingold, 2006). Given that the presence of subordinate racial and gender groups within legislatures can lead to the increased representation of the interests of these groups, it is useful and necessary to determine the causes of the underrepresentation of these groups. Without a clear understanding of the origins of the relative lack of office holders that are from traditional subordinate groups, the status of these groups will endure a longer trip on the road toward both equality of opportunity and outcome.
As suggested above, women and racial minorities are particularly underrepresented in terms of holding elective office. This is a phenomenon that occurs at all levels of government throughout the United States. As of 2010, women held 17.0 percent of the seats in the U.S. Senate and 16.8 percent of the voting seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. Within the fifty state legislatures, women held 22.1 percent of the state senate seats and 25.2 percent of the state house or assembly seats (CAWP, 2010). With regard to Black officeholders, one seat was held in the U.S. Senate and 8.9 percent of the voting seats were held in the U.S. House of Representatives, which in turn means that they occupied a total of nearly 7.5 percent of the 535 seats in the U.S. Congress (BAiC, 2010). At that time, women of color held none of the seats in the U.S. Senate and 4.4 percent of the voting seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. Within the fifty state legislatures, women of color held 5.1 percent of the state senate seats and 4.6 percent of the state house or assembly seats (CAWP, 2010). According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey from 2008, women made up approximately 50.7 percent of the U.S. population. Additionally, Blacks constituted 12.4 percent of the U.S. and women of color 12.5 percent (ACS, 2008). Consequently, women made up over half of the total population, but only held less than a fifth of the national and less than a quarter of the statewide legislative seats. With regard to being proportionally represented, Blacks on the whole seemed to fair slightly better in that the percentage of seats they held is just over half of their percentage of the population.
Women of color only constituted 3.5 and 4.7 percent, or less than a twentieth, of the national and state legislatures respectively, as compared to constituting one eighth of the total U.S. population. Without a doubt, each of these populations is significantly underrepresented within the lawmaking bodies of both the states and the nation as a whole.

To some degree, this underrepresentation is intuitive and straightforward, given this nation’s long history of racism, sexism, and paternalism. Nevertheless, it would appear that it should be equally straightforward that, once these systems of domination were deemed unconstitutional and written out of U.S. law in a meaningful way in the second half of the twentieth century, a much greater degree of incorporation and representation of historically subordinate groups should ensue. It is possible to argue that this is a course that is currently in progress, in that we have seen a significant increase in the number of women and racial minorities in office over the past 40 years. If political incorporation is understood as political integration by way of electing previously legally subordinate groups to office in relative proportion to the sizes of their populations, as well as their integration into political spheres of influence, then it is natural to expect that this sort of incorporation must take a few decades to complete.4

4 This definition of political incorporation that I use is less restrictive than the one developed by Browning, Marshall, and Tabb (2003) in that their definition is specific to policy: “…the extent to which group interests are effectively represented in policy making” (11). Given that my project is specific to the extent to which stereotyping impedes and/or aides in Black women’s efforts to gain political office, my definition hinges
On the other hand, it is easy to argue that this underrepresentation is not dissipating, in that further political integration has tapered off somewhat. Consequently, it is quite likely that there are other underlying issues at play, such as institutional barriers and/or voters’ preferences and beliefs, that encourage the perpetuation of the lack of widespread office holding of racial minorities and women, particularly at the national and state levels.

1.4 Female Candidates in Politics

Susan Carroll identifies two main factors that contribute to the number of women holding elected political positions: “the recruitment of women to run for office, and their rate of success in winning elections” (1985: 5). Consequently, the main issues at hand in terms of women attaining political office are whether they run for office and whether voters are willing to elect them to office. There has been some debate regarding the latter issue of whether people will elect women, mainly between “common knowledge” and empirical study. It is generally assumed that women candidates are less likely to be elected to office than their male counterparts for a variety of reasons, e.g. “old boys” networks, inability to gather money and support for campaigns, beliefs that

more so on the issue of descriptive representation, whereas their definition hinges greatly on the issue of substantive representation.
women are ill-suited for politics, and the like (Mandel, 1981; Smooth, 2010). In spite of
the prevalence of these assumptions, academic research points to a different conclusion
(Newman, 1994). Utilizing a database of state and national legislature and gubernatorial
women run, women win…as often as men do” (79). This holds true across each level of
political office, as well as candidate type, i.e. incumbent, challenger, or open seat
candidate.

As political science research generally suggests, it appears that in terms of female
candidates, incumbency is the main factor that contributes to winning an election
(Erikson, 1971; Leeper, 1991; Seltzer, Newman, and Leighton, 1997). Interestingly,
women incumbents are more likely to be challenged than male incumbents, though they
still retain their offices at the same rates as men (Seltzer, Newman, and Leighton, 1997).
This seems to suggest that the general rules and outcomes of the election game work the
same for women, though they are tempered by continuing pesky assumptions and
perceptions that female candidates are weaker and less likely to win both election and re-
election.

With regard to voters’ perceptions, in spite of an increased likelihood to endorse
the idea of an increased presence of women in politics, the existing literature suggests
that voters, particularly males, attribute characteristics to female candidates that are not
looked upon favorably in politics, such as being passive and indecisive (Carroll, 1985;
Leeper, 1991; Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993b; Newman, 1994; Seltzer, Newman, and Leighton, 1997; McDermott, 1998; Fox and Lawless, 2004; Dolan, 2005). While it is acknowledged that some of the characteristics and stereotypes that are applied to women are traits that people want in their representatives, such as honesty, it is apparent that these stereotypes cannot fully mitigate the effects of those that are negative as they pertain to politics. In spite of their diverse political interests and issues, the media often portrays female Members of Congress as mainly focused on women’s interests (Niven and Zilber, 2001). Consequently, this unbalanced and biased coverage contributes to and amplifies voters’ perceptions and stereotypes regarding women in politics. Similarly, it influences how voters view what a female candidate’s approach to politics will be. While all of these aforementioned findings are based upon important research into the topic of women in politics, it is essential to recognize that these results are based upon research on White women in politics. As such, they tell us very little of women of color in electoral politics, and given the significant and dissimilar influences of gender and race in the United States, it is highly likely that there are important differences between White women and women of color in their quests for political office.

1.5 Black Candidates in Politics

Given that racial minorities are also relative newcomers to legislative politics in the U.S., they too face many of the barriers that female candidates face. In that African
Americans have traditionally been the largest and most researched racial minority group in the U.S., this examination will focus solely on race in terms of the Black/White dichotomy. The extant literature regarding Black political candidates has largely focused on willingness to vote for Blacks, campaign strategies, and the influence of the media. With regard to the first issue, given that it is generally assumed that Blacks will overwhelmingly vote for a Black candidate that supports their interests, much of the attention has focused on whether White voters are disposed to vote for a Black candidate (Williams, 1989; Citrin, Green, and Sears, 1990; Terkildsen, 1993; Sigelman et al, 1995; Reeves, 1997). Much of this literature demonstrates that White voters are not inclined to support a Black candidate. This reluctance occurs for a variety of reasons, including beliefs that Blacks are less qualified and effective than Whites in political office, and beliefs regarding hierarchical voting preferences based on group membership, i.e. Black candidates will only support “Black” issues. Conversely, Highton (2004) claims that there is a diminished reluctance among Whites to vote for a Black candidate, in that those who responded in exit polls were just as likely to have voted for the Black or the White candidate, regardless of partisan identification. While it is possible that this suggests some change in racial attitudes as they relate to electing

---

5 The vast majority of Black voters and Black political candidates are either affiliated with the Democratic Party, or at the very least consistently vote for Democratic candidates. One of the factors that contributes to this high incidence of partisan identification and/or voting is the feeling of linked fate that many Blacks across socioeconomic statuses feel (which, consequently, leads to the use of the Black Utility Heuristic) (Dawson, 1994).
individuals to political office, it is also likely that these results do not adequately address the possibility of social desirability effects or demobilization of White voters based on the presence of Black candidates (Philpot and Walton, 2007).

Given that a great deal of research has focused on whether Whites will vote for Blacks, it is natural that researchers have also examined the circumstances under which Whites are most likely to vote for Black candidates. Research on this topic of racial crossover voting has demonstrated that incumbency and newspaper endorsement of a Black candidate have a positive effect (Bullock, 1984). As such, the presence of a Black candidate in an election may prime negative racial affect in terms of voters’ evaluations of that candidate; however, if the candidate already holds the office s/he is running for, or if a reliable source supports the candidate, then this negative affect and judgment may be somewhat diminished. Furthermore, a much broader consensus has formed among researchers that suggest that Black candidates must run deracialized campaigns, in which they deemphasize or fully omit issues of race, in order to win elections in majority-White or broadly diverse electoral races by way of racial crossover voting (McCormick and Jones, 1993; Jones and Clemons, 1993).

Deracialization is a relatively effective tool for Black candidates in that it can help them to shed issue position stereotyping and work toward priming a common, superordinate identity that can unify a constituency (Transue, 2007). Nevertheless, this is somewhat difficult to successfully implement, particularly if there is a racially diverse
constituency, given that the Black candidate may have to appeal to the interests of racial minorities and work toward mobilizing them while simultaneously promoting a deracialized message. The main issue that can decrease the likelihood of racial crossover voting in the context of deracialization is the degree to which racial stereotypes are primed and salient. This priming can be implemented by way of an opponent’s campaigning, e.g. the “Willie Horton” ad from 1988 and the Jesse Helms Affirmative Action “Hands” ad from 1990, as well as by way of the media (Mendelberg, 1997; Valentino, Hutchings, and White, 2002).

Literature regarding campaign deracialization, and Black candidates more broadly, generally does not address the effects of racial stereotypes. It is assumed that people hold negative stereotypes with regard to race, thus making it necessary to run a deracialized campaign; however, less attention is given to the ways in which racial stereotypes influence voters’ evaluations of candidates (for exceptions which mainly focus on voting, see Sigelman et al, 1995; McDermott, 1998). Much more research needs to be conducted concerning the types of stereotypes people hold regarding Black political candidates and the ways in which and degrees to which those stereotypes affect voters’ evaluations of the candidates.

---

*For an example of a successful campaign of this nature, see the examination of the 2008 Obama campaign strategy in McClain and Stewart, 2010.*
With regard to stereotyping of Black political candidates and officeholders, it appears that, just as with female candidates and gender stereotypes, the media plays a particularly important role in the perpetuation of race-based stereotypes. In spite of the fact that African-American Members of Congress have increasingly diverse legislative agendas and voting records, the public often maintains the stereotype that these representatives only care about racial issues (Schaffner and Gadson, 2004). According to Schaffner and Gadson (2004), it is local media coverage in particular that focuses on the race-oriented legislative issues of Black U.S. House members, thus contributing to the perpetuation of race-based stereotypes. Valentino, Hutchings, and White (2002) have also demonstrated the significant strength of media priming effects in the context of racial stereotyping and Black political candidates.

1.6 The Intersection of Race and Gender

The literature on the intersection of race and gender is still in its nascent stages, but we are beginning to see a greater deal of attention being paid to this topic (Gay and Tate, 1998; Simien and Clawson, 2004; Philpot and Walton, 2007). In terms of the idea of intersectionality within political studies, we are most interested in groups of individuals that possess two or more salient, socially subordinate identities. The “subordinate” portion of this definition is particularly important because those identities are generally the ones that have been overlooked and/or omitted in the development of traditional
theoretical frameworks and empirical analyses (McClain and Stewart, 2010). We often find that subordinate groups are viewed as monolithic entities that think and act as one, which understandably and unfortunately leads most, if not all, researchers to ignore the natural complexity and variation that is found within any particular group. Given the degree to which systems of patriarchy and racial hierarchy have undergirded the social and institutional foundations of the United States, it is only natural that gender and race have become the two subordinate identities that we study the most.

In trying to develop theories and patterns regarding these subordinate groups, it is often the case that they are viewed largely in terms of one subordinate identity and one dominant identity. Consequently, women are largely studied as White women and Blacks are largely studied as Black men. This phenomenon is by no means relegated to academic conceptualization and empirical work; instead, this identity framing is also in line with societal hierarchies that play out in daily life. Even groups that find themselves within subordinate positions in society find ways to make distinctions within their ranks in order to structure hierarchical schemes. Examples of this can be seen in the Civil Rights and Feminist movements, where Black men and White women worked toward achieving their own goals while denying any truly significant position of power or benefit to Black women.

This is the point at which the definition of intersectionality comes into play. There is no doubt that, literally, there are many different outcomes when one considers
the intersection of identities, e.g. White women, Black men, White men, Black women; however, when a particular group is in question, some of these identities act as a conceptual default, while others are largely ignored. Consequently, in order to better understand the subordinate groups we are interested in, it is critical to look to the intersection of multiple subordinate identities, and in the case of race and gender in the U.S. this points especially to women of color.

Given that various sub-identities within socially marginalized groups are further subordinated by those group members that have the power and inclination to dominate, it is quite likely that these subgroups see the world through a lens that varies from that utilized by the larger group, for example, Latinas will have different ways of viewing social issues as compared to Latinos. Furthermore, it should also be understood that such a subgroup would, to some degree, also be viewed differently by society as a whole. In this case, groups that reside at various points of the intersection of race and gender will be subject to different societal stereotypes, i.e. Black women will be subject to stereotypes that are specific to them as a group. In that the effects of racism and sexism on Black women are multiplicative (Simien and Clawson, 2004), it is not sufficient to combine the results of studies on Black male and White female candidates. Instead, Black female candidates must be studied separately, given that the sexism and racism Black women faced in both the Black and women’s civil rights struggles decreased their opportunities for political inclusion (Dawson, 2001), and fortified barriers to political participation by
way of office-holding. Additionally, it will be essential to examine the degree to which stereotypic beliefs regarding a particular group vary across subgroups. Philpot and Walton (2007) found that Black women support and vote for Black female candidates at particularly high rates, and it will be important to determine the degree to which the beliefs of various groups have an effect on candidate choice in this context.

1.7 Theory

Throughout the second half of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century, one could argue that general attitudes in the U.S. regarding race and gender have become less discriminatory. Aside from the existence of largely socially integrated settings and increasing inclusion of these two groups in non-traditional occupations, e.g. doctors, pilots, CEOs, and the like, one of the major locations we can find less blatant discrimination is in the increasing presence of women and racial minorities within the national and the state legislatures. It is at these levels that individuals entrust their political power to others in order to represent the interests of the people, particularly in the context of crafting and maintaining appropriate laws of the land.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that a decrease in overt discrimination within U.S. society does not demonstrate that stereotypes are vanishing or that these stereotypes no longer have an effect on how people view the world and make decisions.
At the very base of human existence in a complex world, it is necessary to utilize categories and heuristics in order to be able to attend to any variety of issues that may arise from day to day. By grouping people together based on easily recognizable physical characteristics and attributing nearly universal meaning to those characteristics, by way of stereotyping, people make their own lives more manageable. Unfortunately, given that the stereotypes developed by society will inevitably misrepresent the nature and abilities of individuals within those groups, and skew social perceptions to favor a particular group, our innate quest for manageability ultimately interferes with the societal outcomes that are based upon our decision-making processes.

As a whole, the previous discussions of representation, candidates, and intersectionality provide the frame for my underlying queries: Are Black women viewed as a separate group as compared to Black men and White women? Does society consider Black women to be a separate group that has its own characteristics, strengths, and flaws, and do these views hold for all levels of social status? If this variation does exist, are Black women in a unique position as compared to “Blacks” and “women” when it comes to their chances of winning an election, based on how they are viewed by society? Furthermore, what comes to mind when people see a Black woman seeking political office?

I posit that Black women are seen as a separate entity that is engulfed by traditional perceptions of race and gender. As a consequence, society has formed a
separate set of stereotypes for Black women that differ from those for “Blacks” and “women”. Importantly, these stereotypes are primed based on the context of any given situation. As such, stereotypes specific to Black women will only come to mind in specific situations, e.g. discussions of welfare, civil rights, children living in poverty, sexual promiscuity; otherwise, Black women will largely share the general stereotypes associated with Blacks and women as groups. In spite of the likelihood that there is a specific set of stereotypes that is largely exclusive to Black women, I also expect that there is a degree of societal differentiation along socioeconomic lines (Gordon and Miller, 2005; Schneider and Bos, 2011). As such, the Black women that run for political office will probably be viewed as different from the “average” Black woman. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the former will only be subject to positive stereotypes; rather, it is expected that they will be subject to stereotypes that are not in line with societal expectations of politicians, given their historical lack of presence within the political realm (Eagly and Karau, 2002).

The stereotypes that people hold have a direct effect on their evaluations of political candidates (Sigelman et al., 1995; Eagly and Karau, 2002; Gordon and Miller, 2005). As such, if Black female candidates are viewed as particularly competent on the “traditional” issues of race- and gender-based interests, then they will be viewed as more socially and economically liberal than other groups (McDermott, 1998). Voters’ attitudes and beliefs regarding Black women will have a direct effect on how these
individuals are evaluated as candidates and the degree to which people are willing to vote these candidates into political office. In this case, electoral contexts and framing will be of particular importance. When people are primed to think about negative stereotypes that are associated with Black women, they will be less likely to rate Black female candidates positively in terms of trait stereotypes and will be less likely to vote for them. Furthermore, Black women with lighter skin will be more likely than those with darker skin to be evaluated as having negative stereotypes that are specific to Blacks, due to the effects of decreased racial self-monitoring; however, those with lighter skin will be more likely than those with darker skin to be elected because the former will be seen as more qualified and competent, in spite of what evaluations in the context of skin color differentiation may suggest (Terkildsen, 1993). In other words, individuals may have more negative feelings regarding darker skin candidates than lighter ones; however, given that they are more likely to monitor their reactions when they recognize that race is an issue, as is often the case when they see a darker skin tone, they will evaluate candidates on a variety of issues in a way that does not reflect their final vote choice (Terkildsen, 1993).

1.8 Structure

In order to test the theories I have set forth, I must first determine whether there is sufficient evidence to suggest that there is stereotype differentiation at various points
of the intersection of race and gender. The purpose of Chapter 2 is to test this theory of intersectional stereotyping by utilizing my 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey to determine the degree to which people apply stereotypes to the general and elite populations of Black women, White women, Black men, and White men. In Chapter 3, I turn to examine more closely the specific ways in which Black women are stereotyped at the average and elite levels. As noted earlier, a great deal of information is available concerning stereotypes of women and African Americans as separate groups, as well as how they are viewed as political candidates; however, there is very little available concerning how Black women are evaluated in general, much less when they are elites – i.e. the most socially and politically successful individuals within their intersectional identity group.

Chapter 4 addresses the ways in which priming messages that are specific to intersectional identities can have an effect on the attribution of stereotypes to both average and elite Black women. Chapter 5 examines the ways in which Black female political candidates, delineated by dark and light skin tone, are evaluated in terms of their social and economic ideologies, their personal traits, and their policy competencies. In order to test my hypotheses, I examine data from my 2012 Political Candidate Evaluations and Social Beliefs Survey, which allows me to analyze the ways in which

---

7 This is necessary because there is very little empirical research available that examines intersectional perceptions of groups, particularly within the political context.
people evaluate and consider their vote choice for Black female candidates. The mock elections within this survey allow me to determine the factors that influence the probability of people voting for dark- and light-skinned Black women. On the whole, the literature and empirical data that I explore in this project shed light on the utility of intersectional research approaches more broadly, and on social perceptions concerning Black women in politics more specifically.
2. Perceptions of Stereotypes at the Intersection of Race and Gender

The purpose of this chapter and the next is to work in both a theory-based and exploratory manner toward building an understanding of whether, and the degree to which, society holds beliefs regarding the application of stereotypes at various points of the intersection of race and gender. On the surface, given that researchers have increasingly studied race, gender, and stereotypes over the past few decades, it may seem to some that this sort of study is redundant; however, the vast majority of studies examining race and gender focus on only one of these identities at a time. It is essential to study these topics with an intersectional approach because the “simultaneity of [various forms of] oppression [present] the need to move beyond simple, additive models—for instance, adding a dichotomous variable such as race or gender to a regression model and controlling for its effects statistically” (Simien, 2007: 265-266). The study of multiple identities requires a multiplicative, rather than an additive, approach to both theoretical development and empirical methodology. This is due to the fact that the ways in which various identities interact and are perceived by society lead to unique experiences and perceptions of these groups.

Consequently, I argue that society, as individuals and as a whole, holds distinct stances on the applicability of certain traits to segments of the population that can be defined by two or more salient identity groups. More directly, this means that with
regard to particular characteristics, Black women are viewed in a distinct manner as compared to White women or Black men, in spite of the fact that they share salient identities. Further, the differences that are found among these groups cannot solely be explained by the influence of racial stereotypes on gender stereotypes, or vice versa (Foster, 2008). Nevertheless, in order to examine these issues and test the theory that stereotypes are applied intersectionally, it is important first to examine and develop a conceptual foundation with regard to stereotypes.

A great number of scholars, particularly social cognition researchers, have studied the issues of stereotypes and stereotyping in a broad range of contexts, and their approaches to these topics have varied widely (see Lippmann, 1922; Allport, 1954; Nelson, 2009). As such, researchers have applied many definitions to the concept of stereotypes, which vary depending on the scholar. For the purposes of this project, I rely on a relatively broad definition of stereotypes in order to develop a balanced approach to the examination of how stereotypes arise and are applied in the United States context of the intersection of race and gender. My definition relies on the one put forth by Schneider (2005): “stereotypes are qualities perceived to be associated with particular groups or categories of people” (24). This definition purposefully omits value judgments on the nature of stereotypes, such as that they are negative, fixed, and inaccurate. Instead, this definition of stereotypes provides an all-encompassing
approach that emphasizes the essential connection between categories and the traits, characteristics, and qualities that people ascribe to them.

The aforementioned definition of stereotypes includes the notion of the existence of categories as a component of the concept. It is important to recognize that categorization is a necessary condition for the process of applying stereotypes to an individual, but it is not a sufficient condition (Schneider, 2005). It is necessary for a person to be viewed as a member of a particular category or group in order for the stereotypes associated with that group to be applied; however, the categorization of an individual into a group does not automatically result in the application of stereotypes to a person via the process of stereotyping. In order to understand the purposes of stereotypes and the processes of applying them, we must first understand the fundamental qualities of categorization.

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 Innate Categorization

As humans, we are inundated with vast amounts of information that we must attempt to process from the very first day we arrive in the world. We must find ways to manage the incoming data in order accomplish the functions that are necessary for daily survival. The major method we have for doing this is creating categories and sorting new information into the categories that are most socially salient, based upon the
situation or context. According to Leyens, et al (1994), a category is defined as “an abstract structure of knowledge that groups things that hold together on the basis of coherence” (76). As such, our brains allow us to create “sorting bins” into which we toss similar and connected information in a quick, often automatic manner, so as to decrease the amount of effort we need to put into examining said information.

On the surface, and in terms of efficiency, this process of automatic categorization is highly useful and positive. It “gives meaning to the environment and facilitates communication between individuals sharing the same system of categories,” thus allowing us to transmit information and understand one another by way of being on the same page (Leyens al, 1994: 129). Additionally, categorization allows people to make generalizations about the world in a quick manner, thus freeing them to direct their attention to essential concerns. More importantly, “categorizing is not only a way of managing a vast amount of data, it is also a manner of extrapolating from a little information” (Leyens [1983] 1994: 129). This ability to use a small amount of information in the evaluation and decision-making processes is extremely useful and efficient; however, it does not always produce the most appropriate and accurate results.

Automatic categorization generally works well when we need to determine whether a food is safe to eat or whether the red eye on a stove would be too hot to touch; however, it is somewhat less reliable when it is implemented in the case of social contexts and issues. The reason for this is relatively straightforward: human beings are complex,
ever-changing, and at times unpredictable. People have the ability to process information, adapt, interact, think, and apply their own reasoning processes to their interactions with the world. There is no way to know with a high degree of accuracy what actions people will take and what decisions they will make.\(^1\) While categorization based on generalizations may be valuable in the case of our interactions with the natural and man-made aspects of the world – such as objects, seasons, animals, and the like – it is less reliable in the case of human interaction given the social, and thus changing, nature of people.

Part of what makes stereotyping feel wrong to many is that people are quite complex, unpredictable, and inconsistent, and “stereotypes seem to violate this sense of complexity” (Schneider, 2005: 563). By patently assuming that all individuals from one group possess a specific quality, such as being “unreliable”, we automatically discount the many that present evidence to the contrary. Automatic categorization of people in the form of stereotyping largely removes from our consciousness the aspects that allow us to view others as social beings. Again, people have the ability to think and interact, and this aspect of human nature inevitably brings us into conflict. Given the idea that conflict is at the base of the concept of politics, it is necessary to create a space for the examination of stereotypes in the spectrum of all things political (Lowi et al, 2008). Any

\(^1\) Conversely, De Marchi and Hamilton (2009) claim that individuals possess a variety of traits that, once identified, make it much easier to predict their decision-making and behavior. Nevertheless, this is not information that most people possess and utilize in their daily interactions.
issues that help us to understand the social underpinnings of conflict among individuals and groups, specifically stereotypes in the case of this project, must be examined through the lens of politics. Furthermore, politics must be viewed through the lens of stereotypes. Schneider (2005) highlights the importance of stereotypes within the political arena by pointing out that the stereotypes we hold regarding certain groups can directly affect the “social policies we support” (526). If we brand groups as “undeserving,” we are unlikely to support policies that would provide them with aid (Huddy and Feldman, 2009).

2.1.2 Generalizations versus Stereotypes

It is important to distinguish between generalizations, which we apply to things that are not human, and stereotypes, which we apply to humans and human behavior.² While categories are used for generalizations and stereotypes, the purpose and meanings of the categories that are used can have different effects. For example, the generalizations that “plates are flat” and “red apples are sweet” are relatively innocuous in the lives of individuals; however, stereotypes such as “men are good at math” and “old people are bad drivers” can have direct and indirect effects on the lives of the people both within and outside of the targeted groups (see Steele and Aronson, 1995;

² It is recognized that stereotypes (by nature) are generalizations that are applied to groups of people. For the purposes of this study, I am using the terms generalizations and stereotypes as a means of differentiating between the categorization of nonhuman objects and humans/human behavior.
Spencer, Steele, and Quinn, 1999 for more extensive explanations of stereotype threat). Boys that are told they are good at math may be more likely to have the confidence to excel in the subject, which will have an effect on the career paths that are open to them, just as the opposite has been demonstrated by Spencer, Steele, and Quinn (1999) to be the case for girls. Stereotyping and stereotype threat can have direct effects on political issues as well. By stereotyping the elderly as bad drivers, this group may be more prone to exhibit poor driving skills and society may be more likely to focus its attention on driving policy and legislation that is aimed at this group.

In that the use of categories leads to generalizing, it is likely that if someone fits the image of the prototype of a group, then others will assume the individual holds all of the traits that reside within that prototype (Schneider, 2005). For example, the image of a young, tattooed Black man in baggy clothing standing near a bus stop in an urban area may scream out “drug-dealing criminal” to the average viewer, as compared to “upstanding Ivy League graduate,” which is a scenario that also resides within the realm of possibility. The traits, qualities, and meanings that are attached to the prototypical images we carry of groups directly affect the way that society views and treats those individuals that fit these images to varying degrees.

It is worthwhile to reiterate that we should not solely think of stereotypes as negative in nature, in that some may be positive or neutral. Instead, we should focus more upon the effects of the stereotypes, e.g. a “positive” stereotype of a group may
place undue pressure upon the individuals within the group that do not fit the stereotype. On the whole, this is the purpose of this project: to determine the degree to which stereotypes at the intersection of race and gender have an effect on the public’s evaluations of political candidates. Nevertheless, this statement of purpose makes several assumptions that must be addressed: 1) a variety of stereotypes exist at various points of the intersection of race and gender, i.e. Black women are viewed in different ways and encounter different stigmas as compared to Asian men, White women, and so forth.; 2) these stereotypes are applied to the individuals that are likely to run for office, just as they would be to any other member of the groups to which the candidate belongs; and 3) these stereotypes have a direct effect on how the public views political candidates, and thus could have an effect on their vote choice. This chapter and the next work toward addressing the first two assumptions.

2.1.3 Stereotypes Regarding Race and Gender

For much of the history of the U.S., systems of race-based and gender-based oppression have existed as the unquestioned norm. The United States, along with most other nations around the world, justified discrimination against oppressed groups by way of creating narratives that paint women and non-Whites as inferior to White males, particularly rich and powerful men (Smedley, 2001). These narratives of inferiority
developed into stable stereotypes that help to demonstrate and validate the belief that these inferior groups were unfit for positions of power.

While it is now the case that “old-fashioned” sexism and racism, in which women and racial minorities are considered to be biologically inferior to White men, are increasingly vanishing from social rhetoric and overt attitudes, new narratives that have replaced the old ones also serve as justifications for negative affect and treatment toward these groups (Swim et al, 1995; Sears et al, 1997). Much of the literature demonstrates that Blacks are stereotyped as lazy, violent, unintelligent, dishonest, and irresponsible, among many other traits that are negative in nature (Kinder and Sears, 1981; Devine and Elliot, 1995; Nunnally, 2009). Further, these refined narratives suggest that women and racial minorities hold beliefs and attitudes that directly contradict the American values of individualism and egalitarianism, and as such these groups are looking for “special treatment” that they do not deserve (Schuman et al, 1997; Swim and Cohen, 1997; Kinder and Mendelberg, 2000; Sniderman, Crosby, and Howell, 2000). Nevertheless, Kinder and Mendelberg (2000) demonstrate that these American core values and principles are inherently racialized, thus meaning that the presence of these principles in the formation of attitudes and beliefs does not demonstrate the absence of race-based viewpoints and judgments. Consequently, we cannot simply brush aside the presence and effects of
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3 These values can be measured by way of traits hardworking and trustworthy.
racialized beliefs and stereotypes with regard to how they may influence individuals’ perceptions and sociopolitical ideas.

The same is the case with regard to women in U.S. society. The long-standing tradition of sexism in America is something that has only begun to break down on a major and consistent scale since the Feminist Movement of the mid-twentieth century, though the roots of this dismantling reach far back into the nineteenth-century. As stated above, overt beliefs regarding old-fashioned sexism, with the idea that women are and should be passive, nurturing, compassionate, trustworthy, warm, dependable, and mainly residing in the private sphere, have decreased over time while agreement with ideas regarding modern sexism have taken their place to a large degree (Swim et al., 1995; Swim and Cohen, 1997; Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993). Accordingly, Swim et al. (1995) state:

Thus people, while rejecting old-fashioned discrimination and stereotypes, may believe that discrimination against women is a thing of the past, feel antagonistic toward women who are making political and economic demands, and feel resentment about special favors for women, such as policies designed to help women in academics or work (200).

In spite of the appearance that society is eschewing traditional oppressive views, beliefs, and stereotypes concerning gender, it is apparent that just as with race, we are finding ways to reinvent traditional hierarchies by way of writing them onto what we espouse to be our traditional value systems. In this way, society creates a justification for continued discrimination and inequality that is more palatable and less easily
demolished, given that it is precisely some of those same “American values”, such as liberty and equality of opportunity, that Blacks and women have used to call for an end to racism and sexism.

Notwithstanding the fact that we view, evaluate, and judge people based upon many dimensions of identity, we often find that our conversations and examinations regarding groups hinge on only one dimension at a time, e.g. race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, and so on. Examples of this include “Asians are smart,” “Women are so emotional,” and “Southerners are not highly educated.” Each of these statements acts as a gross overgeneralization with the assumption that the vast majority of individuals within a group share the same trait(s). As such, this glosses over the differences that may occur at the intersection of multiple identities, as well as the variations found among individuals.

In light of the fact that in our general social dialogue we seem to have a propensity to talk about the traits of groups along one dimension, it is understandable why researchers have overwhelmingly used this same approach to the examination of identity groups. Researchers attempt to identify the situations in which a particular identity is salient and work to determine the factors that provide the salience for that identity. Nevertheless, just as the general use of stereotypes leads to the omission and overlooking of potentially important variation and differences, the focus of research on
one-dimensional identity overlooks and omits the very *differences of multiple identities* that may provide a more accurate, nuanced view of the world.

### 2.1.4 Intersectionality

In order to overcome this problematic approach of examining identity and its social realities by way of a one-dimensional view, many are beginning to recognize the need for a more nuanced and appropriately informed approach. Patricia Hill Collins (2000 [1990]) and Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989, 1991) appear to be the first to use the term, though not the concept of, “intersectionality,” which can be defined as a form of “analysis claiming that systems of race, social class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, and age form mutually constructing features of social organization, which shape Black women’s experiences and, in turn, are shaped by Black women” (2000:299). Both Collins and Crenshaw utilize the experiences of Black women, the development of Black feminist thought, and the concept of intersecting systems of oppression as a means to demonstrate the necessity for a more thoughtful approach. Furthermore, Collins (2000) combines these components as a means to develop a framework by which all oppressed groups and their influences on and within society ought to be examined. As such, an intersectional approach, while largely used within this project to examine the unique
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4 For the purposes of this project, I refer to “various points of the intersection of race and gender” and, as such, do not treat the idea of the intersection of race and gender as solely referring to Black women, which is often the practice in the extant literature (this view is also supported by Goff, Thomas, and Jackson [2008]). Nevertheless, the main focus of this dissertation is on Black women.
position of Black women, is not solely applicable to this group. Essentially, intersectionality “rejects the separability of identity categories, as it recognizes the heterogeneity of various race-sex groups,” which allows for broad applicability (Simien, 2007: 265). Consequently, intersectionality embraces the idea that groups are not homogeneous. Goff, Thomas, and Jackson (2008) go even further in calling the use of single identities into question:

…[I]f everyone can be described in terms of their race, gender, and age, then it must also be possible to view them in terms of a unique combination of race/gender/age identities as well. These considerations cast doubt on whether or not race, gender, and age are ‘basic’ perceptual categories, since there is no a priori reason to believe that any of these categories, in isolation, is more likely to be a basic category than some combination of them (393).

They are able to simply and clearly state that there is nothing that suggests that people engage in stereotyping based on single-identity categories. As with the aforementioned theories of categorization, we take in information and make judgments regarding each of the identities that are salient within our society as soon as we encounter an individual. There is no clear reason that we should assume that the category we sort an individual into is based solely on one identity such as race, gender, sexual orientation, or class, among others.

The recognition of the idea that groups are not homogeneous and that they are likely to be based on more than one salient identity provides the intersectional approach with its greatest strength and greatest weakness all at once. This approach provides a
more accurate picture of the sociopolitical workings of the world. Nevertheless, it is also extremely difficult to conceptualize and approach methodologically. There are a number of theoretical and methodological challenges to an intersectional approach.

First, it can be difficult to conceptualize, as it is necessary to recognize and appreciate that multiple identities cannot merely be added together, but must be treated as distinct. Second, multiple identities can be difficult to measure and examine. Given that we generally should avoid additive measures, determining whether there are particular identities that are more salient in a given context becomes problematic. For example, if a research project employed a measure that managed to capture information concerning Black women, but the context of the research topic at hand made it so that racial factors were largely salient while gender-related factors were not, then it would be highly difficult to extract this information from the actual data that was collected.

Additionally, in terms of implementing intersectional research plans, it can be quite difficult to obtain data. This is one of the biggest drawbacks and roadblocks in intersectional research, in that even when researchers do want to examine issues related to multiple identities, the ability to generate or obtain population samples large enough to adequately address these issues is virtually non-existent, particularly in that it can be debilitatingly expensive. Another challenge to intersectional work comes in the form of the difficulty of determining which intersections of identities constitute separate salient identity groups, such as Black women and elderly veterans. Incorporated into this
challenge is the necessity to understand when researchers might be trying to integrate “too many” identities. For example, should we consider 30-year-old bisexual Asian-American women that were born in Texas and make over $125,000 a year to be a group that shares both a sense of group identity and group consciousness, and recognize this as a group about which society holds specific views that differ from those held about a group that does not have two or three of these characteristics (McClain et al, 2009)? There is no definitive answer to this question, and as such, each researcher must make her own decisions regarding how to define, measure, and examine the groups that may be of interest. These challenges of intersectionality, in addition to the lack of recognition and acceptance of the necessity to examine multiple identity groups, are what have made researchers largely reluctant to move forward with intersectional examinations (Jordan-Zachery, 2007).

2.2 Theory and Hypotheses

As demonstrated above, stereotypes are necessarily tied to categories in the form of identity groups. Additionally, no one belongs to and is defined by one specific identity group. Given that there are certain identities that are often highly salient within society, e.g. race, class, and gender, people are generally defined and judged by their placement at the intersection of these groups. Unfortunately, there is little research available in terms of the ways in which groups, such as elite Black women, are viewed
by individuals and by society as a whole. Given the dearth of available data and research concerning stereotypes and beliefs at the intersection of various identities, the aims and directions of this chapter and the next are simultaneously theory-based and exploratory. Much of the theoretical grounding for the subsequent hypothesis-testing is based upon the literature concerning stereotypes regarding women and Blacks; however, given the aforementioned relative lack of intersectionality research on stereotypes, it is likely that previous theories will not clearly or fully explain the results.

It is widely accepted that there are stereotypes regarding Blacks that vary from those regarding Whites, just as there are stereotypes concerning women that differ from those concerning men. We generally recognize that racism and sexism have had an effect on the ways in which individuals are viewed within society, and as such, people are evaluated in terms of stereotypic beliefs relating to identity groups, such as race and gender. As noted earlier, it is generally accepted that stereotypes relating to old-fashioned racism and sexism have diminished somewhat within U.S. social thought; nevertheless, as observed by Huddy and Feldman (2009), it is likely that we have been too quick to dismiss the continuing effects of issues such as overt racism. By examining stereotype traits at the “social views” level, in some ways I am actually examining the degree to which people believe society generally holds and agrees with tenets of overt
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5 The extant literature concerning intersectionality is continuing to grow at a much faster pace than it has in the past, though far more slowly and with less acceptance in the field of political science than in other fields such as sociology. For more examples of intersectionality research in the field of political science, see Hancock, 2004; Smooth, 2006; Simien, 2006; Philpot and Walton, 2007; Timberlake and Estes, 2007.
racism and overt sexism, or at the very least the degree to which society holds explicit racist and sexist beliefs. If the vast majority of people rate groups in precisely the same way on a variety of stereotype traits, then we would be able to say that there is evidence to support the null hypothesis, which is that society no longer applies these traits to varying degrees based upon group identity.

My argument pushes back against this null hypothesis in that I believe that social views will continue to reflect racialized and gendered views of groups by way of stereotypes, regardless of social standing. Furthermore, with each intersectional group, there will be significant differences between how “average” and “elite” group members are viewed in terms of these stereotypes:

H1\text{null}: There are no significant differences concerning stereotype traits among any groups at the intersection of race and gender.

H1a: There are differences among the degrees to which stereotype traits are applied to groups at the intersection of race and gender.

H1b: There are significant differences concerning stereotype traits between “average” and “elite” members of groups at the intersection of race and gender.

H1b is of particular importance for this project on a broader scale because it underlies the overarching argument, which is that stereotypes concerning Black women in politics have an effect on the ways in which people evaluate this group. If there is no support for H1b, then it is not necessary to determine further how elite Black women are viewed,
because we would be able to rely solely on social perceptions of the average Black woman in order to understand Black female electoral prospects.

2.3 Data and Methods

In order to examine the degree to which stereotype traits are applied to people at the intersection of race and gender, I utilize data collected in my 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey, which was administered between August 16 – 18, 2011 through Qualtrics Labs, Inc panels. I designed this survey to measure stereotypes concerning four groups in the U.S.: White females, Black females, White males, and Black males. The subject pool consisted of 510 respondents, all of which were at least 18 years of age. Eighty-four percent defined themselves as White (n=429), 7 percent as Black (n=36), 3 percent as Asian (n=16), and 5 percent as Other races (n=27). Less than 8 percent of all respondents classified themselves as Latino (n=39), regardless of racial self-identification. Fifty-three percent of respondents identified as female (n= 268), with 47 percent identifying as male (n=238), and 95 percent were born in the U.S (n=481). Over
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6 The Qualtrics Survey Panel Management System utilizes an outside survey company, Clearvoice Research, in order to recruit and compensate subjects for the surveys that Qualtrics administers. In terms of sociopolitical events that may have an effect on subjects’ responses, it is important to note that the survey was conducted two weeks after the conclusion of a highly polarized and emotionally-charged, months-long debate and resolution concerning the debt-ceiling for the U.S. and whether the U.S. should default on its loans. This political issue in conjunction with the national economic recession may have contributed to respondents’ feelings concerning the political system and their personal economic situations.

7 Northeast, 27 percent (n=139); South, 22 percent (n=114); Midwest, 27 percent (n=140); and West, 17 percent (n=88). Five percent (n=24) were born outside of the U.S.
two-fifths of respondents had a college degree or higher (n=214), and just over half make less than $50,000 per year (n=267).

Respondents rated each group on a 10-point scale (ranging from “Not at all” to “Extremely”) concerning the degree to which a panel of nine character traits – i.e. stereotypes – applies to each group. This evaluation was further broken out into a differentiation of views concerning the “average” individual from each of the four groups, as compared to “elite” group members. Within the survey, “average” was defined as “the average person from this group” and “elite” was defined as “the most socially and politically successful individuals from this group.” Subjects first reported the degree to which they believe society as a whole associates these traits with each of the four groups. Subsequently, after two brief questions to check the attention of respondents, subjects were asked to share their personal views and ratings of the groups. By first asking respondents to identify the beliefs held by society as a whole, I hope to have mostly decreased the propensity of individuals to give socially desirable answers. Instead of having to answer difficult questions regarding personal beliefs near the beginning of the survey, the respondents had the opportunity to rely on ideas that
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8 While this was a 10-point scale, ranging from 1 to 10, respondents’ ratings were recorded to the first decimal point, as to allow the survey instrument to pick up any differentiation between two scale points that a respondent may have purposefully included (i.e. a respondent may have wanted to answer between a 3 and a 4, and if they did so their response was not rounded to the nearest whole number). An even scale (10-point), rather than an odd scale, was utilized as to avoid the visual cue to pick a middle or neutral rating; however, if a respondent wanted to rate a group directly in the middle, s/he was able to do so, which would result in his/her response being recorded as 5.5.

9 I only examine perceptions of social views in this chapter.
they have heard from family, friends, acquaintances, and the media, without feeling as though they would be personally judged for any of their answers. This increased level of comfort, in conjunction with reiterated assurances of confidentiality, should have made respondents feel somewhat more comfortable with giving accurate estimations of their personal views.10

The panel of nine traits included within the survey was based upon a variety of stereotypes presented in the extant literature regarding Blacks, women, Black women, and ideal political candidates, and they are as follows: aggressive, bossy, compassionate, emotional, hardworking, intelligent, irresponsible, trustworthy, and unethical.11 One issue that may complicate the analysis of the results concerning these traits is that each trait may not call forward the same ideas and meanings for each group. For example, when presented with the term “aggressive,” individuals may think of Whites in terms of being straightforward, pushy, and direct, whereas they may think of Blacks as being physically intimidating and violent when presented with the “aggressive” trait. There is little that can be done based upon the data collected in order to further determine the

10 It is possible to suggest that respondents would attempt to demonstrate the degree to which their personal views differ from those they reported as social beliefs. In order to decrease the likelihood of this, social and personal views were asked in separate sections of the survey, and given the length of the survey, it would be relatively difficult to remember the precise social views rating given to each trait of each group by the time the respondent was prepared to answer the personal views section.

11 The highly racialized and gendered stereotype traits included herein are based upon those highlighted in the extant literature. Traits pertaining to ideal political candidates, such as “trustworthy” and [not] “unethical” were included in order to examine the degree to which average and elite group members fit into definitions of ideal and electable political candidates. This is essential to the main topic for the larger project (Matland and King, 2002). These traits also provided useful overlap with highly racialized and gendered traits, which allowed for fewer measures.
precise and potentially varying definitions that respondents applied when confronted with each trait. As such, I must rely on earlier literature regarding racialized and gendered stereotypes in order to provide greater insight into how individuals may make distinctions regarding certain traits in terms of the application of those traits to various groups.

In order to test my hypotheses, I employ several tools. First, I provide descriptive statistics of the mean scores of the four groups, delineated in terms of “average” and “elite” evaluations. As to test the hypothesis regarding distinctions between and among groups along these racialized and gendered traits, I examine the statistical significance of the difference of means by employing t-tests. By examining difference of means, I am able to determine whether the general rating of groups as distinct from one another is statistically significant.

2.4 Results and Analysis

The results and subsequent analysis from Figures 1-2 and Table 1 examine the ways in which each of these groups is viewed in terms of the nine traits as compared to the others. These data both provide direct support for H1a and allow for exploratory analysis of precisely how stereotypes are applied at various points of the intersection of race and gender.
2.4.1 Social Views of the “Average” Individual:

![Figure 1: Mean Stereotype Scores of Social Views of the “Average” Individual](image)

**Aggressive:** With regard to how respondents believe society views Black women, White women, Black men, and White men, on average Black men are seen as the most aggressive and White women are seen as the least aggressive, with over 2.5 points difference between their ratings.\(^{12}\) On average, respondents rated White women below
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\(^{12}\) The raw data for Figures 1 and 2 are found in Appendix F. These data within Figures 1 and 2 provide descriptive statistics and do not examine statistical significance of any differences.
the midpoint of the 10-point scale, suggesting that they are seen somewhat non-aggressive. This finding supports the idea that women are stereotyped as passive, especially as compared to men, who are considered and expected to be aggressive. In further support of this belief regarding male aggression, and despite the fact that there is nearly a full point difference between the scoring of Black males and White males, they are both still rated well above the midpoint, and therefore seen as relatively aggressive. Given that women are generally viewed as not aggressive and Blacks are generally considered to be highly aggressive, it is interesting, though not unexpected, to find that Black women are rated as particularly aggressive, and even more so than White men. This finding demonstrates that in spite of gender-based stereotypes, Black women are judged in a negative light with regard to this trait.

**Bossy:** As with “aggressive,” the trait “bossy” is rated most highly for the two Black groups, with Black women rated about half a point higher than Black men. White men are rated, on average, just below Black men, while White women are rated well below all the others, as is the case with “aggressive”. For the latter group, this finding supports the gender-based ideas of women as docile and mild-mannered, though it goes somewhat against the view of women as “shrewish.”

**Compassionate:** By more than one point, White women are rated as the most compassionate of the four groups, with Black women also being rated above the midpoint. In the case of this trait, it appears that gender stereotypes are being applied to
both White and Black women; however, in the case of Black women, the stereotype that Blacks are not particularly compassionate appears to be tempering higher ratings of compassion that would be expected given their gender.

**Emotional:** Women are rated as far more emotional than men, with more than two points separating them. Among men and women, Blacks are seen as somewhat less emotional than Whites, though the difference between the two female groups is larger than that between the males. It is useful to note that women are rated as above the midpoint while men as rated below, which suggests that women are viewed as compassionate and men are seen as much less so.

**Hardworking:** Respondents rated White men as the most hardworking among these four groups, with White women being rated just below them. As expected, given the stereotype of Blacks as “lazy,” they are rated well below both White populations with regard to being hardworking. Interestingly, Black women are seen as being more hardworking than Black men. While this is not a result that is necessarily surprising, it does provide support for the theory that intersectional identities should be understood as multiplicative rather than additive. If men are considered to work harder than women, and Whites are considered to work harder than Blacks, we would expect the ordering of most to least hardworking to look like this: White men, (White women and Black men could be interchangeable), and Black women; however, here we find that for
Blacks, women are seen as working harder than men. As such, the ways in which race and gender work together and interact vary based upon the context, or trait, at hand.

*Intelligent:* Much as with the trait “hardworking,” the trait “intelligent” is seen as especially applicable to Whites. Interestingly, White women are rated as slightly more intelligent than White men in terms of social views concerning the average individual. This marks a clear shift in stereotypes over the past several decades concerning female intelligence. Blacks are seen as far less intelligent than Whites, with nearly two points separating White women and Black men. As with the White populations, Black women are rated as slightly more intelligent than Black men.

*Irresponsible:* As would be expected based on racialized views, both White males and females are viewed as relatively *not* irresponsible, with both being rated below the midpoint of the scale and women rated as less irresponsible than men. Conversely, Black men are rated as relatively irresponsible (being rated, on average, above the midpoint). Interestingly, the mean score for Black women in terms of the trait “irresponsible” falls directly at the midpoint, thus suggesting that the effects of gendered views concerning responsibility are pulling them in a more positive direction from the racialized views concerning responsibility. Nevertheless, these gendered views do not fully overcome the racialized ones.

*Trustworthy:* Each of the groups is evaluated in a similar, yet reversed, manner as is the case for “irresponsible”. On average, Whites are seen on the whole as
trustworthy, given that they are rated above the midpoint, with White women the most trustworthy of the four groups. Black men are seen as the least trustworthy in that they are placed below the midpoint, and gender again appears to be a mitigating factor that places the mean score for Black women near the midpoint of the scale. Interestingly, while White men on average are rated on the higher end of the scale, the mean score for this group is closer to the middle than is the case for their rating score on the “irresponsible” trait.

Unethical: Once again, we find a pattern similar to that for the “irresponsible” trait. Whites, particularly White women, are the least unethical, Black men are the most unethical, and Black women level out somewhere in the middle.

These results appear to suggest that, when considering the “average” person from the general population, Black men are viewed in a particularly negative fashion, while Whites, White women especially, are viewed more positively. These data work toward refuting the null hypothesis given that there are many instances in which there are relatively large differences between the mean scores for these groups on a variety of traits. In fact, the picture that is painted by these data is not one that is particularly positive for Blacks in general, and Black men in particular, with regard to how they will be viewed in a political and or electoral setting. Nevertheless, it is important to note and acknowledge that there is yet another salient identity at play when examining the issue of stereotypes in politics, which is social status or class. It is the most socially and
politically successful individuals, or “elites,” of a group that will be the most likely to run for and hold political positions. While this is certainly a widely held and understood belief within the discipline of political science, it is one that is implicitly understood and rarely explicitly acknowledged with regard to the implementation of research agendas (an exception can be found in Schneider and Bos, 2011). It is not sufficient to assume that the same stereotypes that are applied to the general population of each of these groups that reside at the intersection of race and gender will be applied to the same degrees for the elite members of these groups. As such, it is important to determine how elites from each group are viewed and when, as well as how, they are considered to be the same or different as the general public.

2.4.2 Social Views of the “Elites”

On the whole, it appears as though being classified as “elite” brings with it a particular set of stereotype ratings, in spite of other identities. This does not mean that there is not clear and significant variation that is specific to the ways in which each group of elites is perceived; however, on the surface, the data do suggest that elites are viewed in similar ways, which will be explained below in further detail, in the context of each of the nine traits. Given that the data within Figure 1 show there are clear differences concerning views of groups at the intersection of race and gender, I find evidence to refute the null hypothesis and support H1a, which states that there are
differences in the degree to which stereotype traits are applied at different points of this intersection. Furthermore, as I move forward I will work toward demonstrating that stereotypes specific to the intersection of race and gender do not remain static when these groups are examined in the context of social status.

Figure 2: Mean Stereotype Scores of Social Views of Elites

*Aggressive:* Unlike the “aggressive” ratings for the general population, in which Black males were seen as the most aggressive, elite White males received the highest ratings for this trait. They are closely followed by Black females and Black males, with White females rated lowest with regard to elites as “aggressive.” In spite of the fact that
both average and elite White females rate as the least aggressive of the four groups, elite White females are viewed as far more aggressive than the “average” individuals within the group, with a mean score that is more than one and a half points higher.

**Bossy:** In spite of the fact that “average” Black women are rated well above all other groups with regard to the degree to which they are perceived as bossy, the mean score for elite Black women is close to, yet below, both White females and White males. Interestingly, elite Black males are seen as the least bossy of the four groups, about a half of a point or more below the others. As such, it appears that Black elites may be seen as somewhat less aggressive, bossy, and pushy than White elites, possibly due to racialized stereotypes of elites that differ from those for the general population.

**Compassionate:** Elite Black women are by far rated as the most compassionate of the elite groups. Black males and White females are relatively closely rated, and the mean score for White males is nearly a full point below that of Black females. Interestingly, as seen in Table 2, this trait is the only one for Black females that does not demonstrate a statistically significant change in means scores between evaluations of the “average” and the “elite.” This could mean that society views Black women, regardless of social status, as equally compassionate, or society evaluates elite Black women differently from other elites with regard to this trait. Based upon the results in Figure 1-2 and Table 4, I suggest that the latter is the case, and that elite Black females are the
least likely to be prone to perceptions of the masculinization of “elite” status, specifically in the case of the “compassionate” trait.

**Emotional**: Gendered stereotypes continue to play a role in the evaluations of the degree to which elites are seen as emotional. There is more than a one point difference between all men and all women, with the means score of males below the midpoint and the mean scores of females above the midpoint.

**Hardworking**: Unsurprisingly, White males continue to be viewed as the most hardworking; however, as is expected due to the widely accepted idea that hard work leads to upward social mobility and success, all other elite groups are viewed as being hardworking as well. White females are seen as comparatively the least hardworking. As seen in Table 2, elite status among Blacks results in large and highly statistically significant differences in the evaluation of the degree to which Blacks are viewed as hardworking.

**Intelligent**: Elite White women are rated higher in terms of intelligence than any other elite group, with Black elites rated the lowest. This latter observation may suggest that old-fashioned racialized stereotypes regarding intelligence may continue to affect the ways in which Blacks are viewed, regardless of social status.

**Irresponsible**: There is not much difference among the groups on this trait, suggesting that elites generally are viewed as relatively responsible, regardless of gender or race. Further evidence of this is found in Table 2, in which it is demonstrated
that Black elites are seen as far less irresponsible than most other Blacks. Additionally, given that average Black males are viewed as the most irresponsible, and elite Black males are viewed as the least irresponsible, it is apparent that views specific to general elite behavior have a major effect on the evaluation of this group. Notably, when evaluated by race, “average” women are seen as less irresponsible than men, but “elite” women are seen as more irresponsible than their male counterparts. This finding may point to a small portion of the reasoning behind the idea that women are not as well suited for leadership and politics as elite men might be.

**Trustworthy:** Elite Black women are rated as the most trustworthy, with Black men closely following. Whites in elite positions are seen as less trustworthy than Blacks, with White women ranked the lowest. This finding further suggests that elite status can temper, and occasionally reverse, general racial stereotypes.

**Unethical:** There is negligible difference between the ratings of White females and males on this trait; however, on average, elite Blacks are rated a half point less unethical than elite Whites. This finding is interesting given the recent, widely-publicized investigations into ethical violations of Black male and female Congresspersons. These events would be seen as likely to prime the view that Black
elites are relatively unethical; nevertheless, this expectation does not play out within this data.\textsuperscript{13}

Table 1: Traits With Mean Scores More Than 1 point Above or Below the Midpoint (5.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Views: “Average”</th>
<th>Social Views: “Elite”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, Emotional</td>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, Hardworking, Intelligent, (\textbf{Not}) Irresponsible, (\textbf{Not}) Unethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate, Emotional, Hardworking, Intelligent, (\textbf{Not}) Irresponsible, Trustworthy, (\textbf{Not}) Unethical</td>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, Hardworking, Intelligent, (\textbf{Not}) Irresponsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, (\textbf{Not}) Compassionate</td>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, Hardworking, Intelligent, (\textbf{Not}) Irresponsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, Hardworking, Intelligent, (\textbf{Not}) Irresponsible</td>
<td>Aggressive, Bossy, Hardworking, Intelligent, (\textbf{Not}) Irresponsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 reports the traits about which groups are viewed relatively monolithically by society, or at least definitively on one side of the scale. All groups, with the exception of average White women, are seen as aggressive and bossy. This finding supports the widely held stereotypes of women as passive, gentle, and warm.\textsuperscript{14}

It further supports the theory that stereotypes are subject to intersectional forces. These

\textsuperscript{13} It is possible that the general public did not have a great deal of knowledge of these investigations, which would explain why the data do not reflect views that could be expected based upon claims regarding ethics violations.

\textsuperscript{14} These stereotype traits are based on research concerning ideas about women in general, in which race is rarely examined. In that the default category for “women” is generally “White women,” it can be argued that these traits are mainly applied to the latter group specifically.
two traits of “aggressive” and “bossy” are clearly both gendered and racialized, given that Black women are not subject to the same stereotypical beliefs as are White women. This latter group is further differentiated from all other groups in that it is the only one viewed as compassionate and trustworthy. Again, the racialization of these gendered traits depresses their effects on social perceptions of all Black women. In juxtaposition to White femaleness, average Black men are the only group seen by society as not compassionate.

The trait “emotional” is applied only for average women, both White and Black. Nevertheless, Figure 2 demonstrates that this trait is still highly gendered with regard to elites. Two traits that are highly racialized and class-based are “hardworking” and “intelligent,” in that average Blacks are the ones not rated as hardworking and intelligent, while elite Blacks are considered to be both. The traits that are applied to all elites are aggressive, bossy, hardworking, intelligent, and not irresponsible. Unsurprisingly, these are the same traits that are regularly applied to average White males. Interestingly, Black female elites, in addition to having all other elite traits, are the only group to be viewed as not unethical. If this perception extends to Black female politicians, it would provide a useful asset with regard to placing them closer to what people generally view as the ideal political candidate (Matland and King, 2002).

While there are relatively clear distinctions among each of these groups with regard to many of the mean scores for various traits, it is interesting to note that
differences between and among the average ratings for the elite groups are relatively small, especially as compared to the differences among the “average” groups. This would suggest the elites are seen as relatively similar and homogeneous, and this class status begins to work toward tempering racialized and gendered stereotypical views for groups in favor of more standardized views of people that are socially and politically successful – i.e. elites. Once again, based upon broadly held expectations and values in the United States, there is the belief that a strong work ethic and intelligence are necessary in order to achieve high levels of success. Consequently, those individuals that people consider to be elites are largely viewed as possessing many of the same traits to the same degrees, regardless of gender or race, because of the necessity for those traits in order to obtain and maintain that social status. Given that the elites are so closely rated and on the surface would appear to be somewhat indistinguishable in more absolute terms, it is essential to determine the ways in which they appear to be the same, as well as to determine whether the differences between the groups are statistically significant.

2.4.3 Variation of Social Views Regarding “Average” and “Elite” Groups

As demonstrated by Schneider and Bos (2011), people differentiate among subtypes within larger groups in terms of stereotype attribution; nevertheless, there is very little research that investigates the degrees to which and the ways in which groups are viewed distinctly based upon specific configurations of their multiple salient
identities. The two main identities that are included within this study are race and
gender; however, this research recognizes the likelihood that socioeconomic status has a
direct effect on the stereotypes that exist at various points of the intersection of race and
gender. In order to test the idea that the general population of each of the four groups is
viewed differently from the most successful members of each group, as argued in H1b, I
employ t-tests for the difference of means for each of the four groups’ average and elite
ratings. Table 2 indicates the degree to which we can say that there is a difference
between how society views the “average” person and elites within each group.

Black women:

With regard to the nine traits tested within the survey, the difference between the
mean ratings for average and elite Black women are statistically significant for all but
one. Respondents did not differentiate between the elite and general populations with
regard to the degree to which they are considered to be compassionate. Interestingly,
and somewhat counter-intuitively, elite Black women are seen as both more aggressive
and bossy than their average counterparts. This finding would be unexpected if we
were to assume that these traits are mainly applied to average Blacks; however, when
we consider, as seen above, that elites on the whole are seen as aggressive, bossy,
hardworking, intelligent, and not irresponsible, it becomes apparent that there is a
greater likelihood that each of these traits will be applied to Black women to greater
degrees when they achieve elite status. As would be expected based on this line of reasoning, in addition to being more aggressive and bossy, elite Black women are viewed as more hardworking and intelligent, and less irresponsible than the general population for this group. Additionally, elite Black women are seen as less emotional, thus further demonstrating the masculinizing effects of elite status. Finally, elite Black women are viewed as more trustworthy and less unethical than “average” Black women. This suggests that these traits are tied to racial perceptions and that elite status begins to strip away racialized views of these traits for Black women. With regard to Black women, these last two traits are not tied to traditional stereotypes of female status, in that they are viewed more positively on these traits when they are elites, at which point it would be more likely, due to the masculinization process involved in perceiving women as elites. If “trustworthy” and “unethical” were tied to femininity for Black women, we would expect to see the opposite effect when they reach elite status, as is the case for White women.

White women:

As per the results in Table 2, in terms of the difference between the mean ratings for average and elite White women, “irresponsible” is the only trait that does not have a statistically significant change between the groups. Elite White women are far more likely to be viewed as both aggressive and bossy than their “average” counterparts.
Furthermore, elite White women are rated as far less compassionate, emotional, and trustworthy than “average” White women. This is a particularly interesting finding in that the social status of “elite” appears to have a strong masculinizing effect on White women. Elite Black women apparently experience the same effect; however, the magnitude of this effect is far greater for White elite females as compared to their Black counterparts. When examined in conjunction with the raw mean scores from Figures 1 and 2 (numerical values found in Tables 23 and 24 in Appendix F), it becomes apparent that the ratings for all elites are somewhat regularized, thus further demonstrating that there is a socially held stereotype that the average White woman is not particularly aggressive or bossy. This finding supports the general literature regarding stereotypes of women, but it begins to complicate the picture regarding the application of widely held stereotypes to elite White women. Additionally, this lends further support to my argument that it is necessary to view and examine identity in an intersectional way, given that this approach better reflects our processes of categorization and stereotyping. Finally, elite White women are viewed as a little more intelligent, a little less hardworking, and somewhat more unethical than their average counterparts.

Interestingly, Table 2 demonstrates the sizeable differences in how Black women and White women are viewed in the context of social status. Of the differences of means that are statistically significant for the two groups, only the “emotional” trait moves in the
same direction. As such, it is apparent that elite status decreases the degree to which people think both groups of women have this highly feminized trait.

Table 2: Difference of Means for Social Views (Average – Elite)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>White Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
<td>-2.43***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>-0.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossy</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-2.18***</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.96***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.68***</td>
<td>-0.82***</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td>1.84***</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>-1.36***</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-1.90***</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>-1.56***</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-1.85***</td>
<td>-0.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>1.28***</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>2.01***</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>-0.72***</td>
<td>1.13***</td>
<td>-1.24***</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>-0.87***</td>
<td>0.90***</td>
<td>-0.49***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(two-tailed) df: 509; * p<.10 (t ≥ 1.65); **p<.05 (t ≥ 1.97); ***p<.01 (t ≥ 2.59)

Black men:

Interestingly, elite Black men are the only group that is viewed as less aggressive than members of the general population. They are also seen as far more hardworking, intelligent, and trustworthy, and far less irresponsible than their average counterparts. In addition, elite Black men are rated as somewhat less unethical and more compassionate than average Black men.\(^{15}\) I argue that these significant differences are due to the strong effects of the stereotypes discussed earlier that are specific to elites. In this way, while Black male elites are still seen as Black men, they are viewed as having a set of traits that encourage social success, as compared to the largely negative traits

\(^{15}\) The difference of means for the traits “bossy” and “emotional” were not statistically significant.
associated with Blacks in general. Schneider and Bos (2011) would explain these trait attribution variations by arguing that it is likely that elite Black males are seen as a subtype of the larger group and they are subject to a different set of stereotypes. I would argue further that this especially applies to elites of any group that has never traditionally held power – e.g. Black women.

*White men:*

It is quite interesting to note that the comparatively low differences between the means for White men are all statistically significant at a high level of confidence. The cause of this interesting finding is unclear; however, I posit there is the possibility that general views regarding White men cast them as all easily a part of the “elite,” or at least privy to the prerogatives and sense of power that is available to many, if not most, elites. Nevertheless, given the data in Table 2, there are clearly defined views, though with small variation, of White men that are “average” and those that are “elite”. The largest difference of trait scores for White men demonstrates that elites are viewed as somewhat more aggressive and bossy than “average.” Additionally, society views elite White men as more hardworking, intelligent, and unethical, while they are less compassionate, emotional, irresponsible, and trustworthy than their “average” counterparts.
Class/Social Status:

One trait stands out as possessing a difference that occurs with the change from average to elite status that appears across the board. All elite groups are viewed as more intelligent than average. This suggests that society on the whole believes that intelligence is a trait that is necessary for an individual to obtain elite status. There are some differences that move along racial lines while there are others that move along gender lines. Elite Whites are seen as a lot more aggressive and bossy than average Whites, while this trend is not the case for Blacks. Additionally, Black elites are viewed as more trustworthy than average, while White elites are viewed as less trustworthy, with the inverse relationship found for the “unethical” trait.16 This suggests that these are traits that are strongly tied to race for “average” Blacks and strongly tied to social status for “average” Whites, regardless of gender. Based on the data in Figure 2, there are no instances in which mean differences increase for all women and decrease for all men, or vice versa. As such, based on these data, it appears unlikely that any of the nine traits are strongly connected to gender without regard to race.

As stated above, there are four differences of means that lacked statistical significance. The following were not rated differently in a meaningful manner: compassionate (Black women); irresponsible (White women); and bossy and emotional

16 This conclusion is reached due to the fact that elites in general are somewhat more likely to be viewed as less trustworthy and more unethical. This is the direction of the findings for Whites, but the inverse relationship is found in a statistically significant way for Blacks.
(Black men). The lack of a statistically significant difference might indicate that a stereotype remains constant in spite of social status differences, and thus, can indicate that the stereotype is specific to, and durable, rather than fluid, for the particular multiple identity group. When viewed in conjunction with the raw mean scores from Figures 1 and 2, this suggests that Black women are not rated high or low in terms of compassion, White women are viewed as relatively responsible, and Black men are always viewed as relatively bossy and not emotional.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter presents a wide variety of information regarding stereotypes and the intersection of race and gender. The research focuses on social views regarding both the “average” and “elite” populations. With regard to the larger project, it is vital to examine views toward elites, inasmuch as political candidates are almost exclusively drawn from this population. It is necessary to work toward understanding the degree to which general stereotypes concerning the whole population apply to those that are most likely to be running for office, and this is especially the case with regard to Black women for the purpose of this project. Additionally, it is necessary to gather information regarding social views about average individuals so as to inform the previously referred to comparative purposes. This will help in the determination of the ways in which stereotypes of the “average” might be primed in a way that could affect elites.
There are several important findings within this chapter that bear reiteration. First, the data demonstrate that people believe that society views groups at varying points of the intersection of race and gender in differing ways and that society applies stereotypes to these groups to differing degrees. This is a major finding in that it validates one of the main arguments of this project and one of the justifications for this sort of work: identity is viewed intersectionally, rather than one-dimensionally, and this has an effect on the types of stereotypes that are applied to various identity groups.

Second, these data provide support for the argument that stereotypes that are specific to the general population of intersectional groups do not fully match and reflect those that are specific to the elite population of that group (H1b). It is important to make this distinction between general and elite stereotypes. Greater knowledge of the influence of social status can help researchers approach a better understanding of how people apply stereotype traits to those that are the most likely to seek political office.

As stated earlier, the aims of Chapters 2 and 3 are broad in that they are both based on theoretical underpinnings and they simultaneously seek to explore the nature of perceptions that previously have not been examined in an empirical manner. As such, the data that I have presented thus far allow me to support this chapter’s hypothesis, which is based upon tenets from the extant literature, as delineated earlier. The descriptive and statistical data presented here also have provided the means by which I can demonstrate with a degree of certainly the nature of the stereotypes held at
the intersection of race and gender. It was necessary to include a detailed examination of the ratings of each trait for each of the groups at the intersection of race and gender in the context of social status for two reasons: 1) these traits can have important political implications for each group in the context of candidate evaluation and electoral outcomes; and 2) given that the ratings are based on an interval scale, it is necessary to have points of reference to other groups that scholars have previously studied more extensively in order to develop a clearer sense of the position of Black women with respect to each of the stereotype traits. In that I have provided support for the idea of intersectional stereotype differentiation, I will turn to a more in-depth examination of this issue in the context of Black women.
3. The Effects of Racialized and Gendered Stereotypes on Perceptions Regarding Black Women

The previous chapter demonstrates that people apply stereotypes to varying degrees in the context of different points of the intersection of race, gender, and even social status. This chapter continues this work by focusing more directly on stereotypes regarding Black women by way of examining the degree to which racialized and gendered stereotypes are applied to both “average” and “elite” Black women. The literature outlined in the previous chapter demonstrates that there are stereotypes that are highly racialized and highly gendered (Swim et al., 1995; Sears, et al., 1997; Timberlake and Estes, 2007; Nunnally, 2009). Additionally, the data presented within that chapter provides support for the idea that certain traits are often connected to perceptions of race and gender. Given the extant literature and the previous chapter’s findings, we know that Blacks in the general population are often considered to be aggressive, lazy, unintelligent, irresponsible, and unethical, while women in the general population are often considered to be passive, compassionate, emotional, and trustworthy.

These racialized and gendered traits largely make up the stereotype images of the average Black man and the average White woman respectively. In spite of the fact that there is a good deal of information on how Blacks and women are viewed and stereotyped within the United States, there is very little information specifically on
perceptions regarding Black women. This chapter attempts to determine the degree to which highly gendered and highly racialized stereotypes are applied to Black women at different levels of social status. Further, it attempts to determine the degree to which widely held stereotype images of Black women are held for both average and elite Black females. In order to examine these issues, I draw from the literature presented in Chapter 2, as well as literature that is specific to intersectionality and stereotype images of Black women.

3.1 Intersectionality and Black Female Stereotype Images

In spite of the general lack of examinations of multiple identities, particularly in the field of political science, a small number of researchers over the past decade have begun to build the foundations for intersectional research (Simien and Hancock, 2011). Much of the earlier research has focused on Black women, for the same reasons explicated by Collins (2000), though there is also a broad spectrum of research that examines other crosscutting identities. With regard to politics, early research focused on the interviewing of Black women in politics, as well as the “double disadvantage” and “multiple jeopardies” hypotheses, which argue that Black women are doubly disadvantaged in the political sphere by both their race and gender (Prestage, 1977; Simien and Hancock, 2011).

---

1 Black Feminist Thought and Sociology scholars have long accepted intersectional approaches as necessary in the examination of society.
there is a gaping hole in the literature with regard to a systematic examination of the
degree to which stereotypes exist at the points of intersection of oppressed identity
groups.

Various scholars are working toward filling this gap by way of examining
stereotypes at the intersection of salient identities. Doan and Haider-Markel (2010)
claim that it is necessary to view all stereotyping intersectionally, and define this as
“stereotyping that is created by the combination of more than one stereotype that
together produce something unique and distinct from any one form of stereotyping
standing alone” (71). This viewpoint further supports my earlier claim in Chapter 2
regarding the likelihood that in some cases, a stereotype trait may call forth one meaning
in reference to one group and another meaning in reference to another group – e.g.
“aggressive”, “emotional”, and “unethical” may have various gendered and racialized
meanings, and thus may be interpreted in different ways when they are applied. In
spite of the potential difficulties this possibility may present for comparative analyses, it
is necessary to push forward in order to further the lines of reasoning that are
developing within this field of study. Other scholars support this claim that
intersectional research requires a nuanced approach (Browne and Misra, 2003;
Timberlake and Estes, 2007). For example, Timberlake and Estes (2007) contend that
context creates a variety of possible outcomes with regard to the applicability and
saliency of multiple identities, as evidenced in this scenario: “Black women may receive a wage penalty for being Black and for being female (additive intersectionality), or the penalty for being female may be stronger for Blacks than for Whites (interactive intersectionality)” (403). Various contexts, as evidenced above, not only will evoke differing levels of socioeconomic outcomes, but also will lead to differing levels of the application of stereotyping based on specific identities.

With regard to Black women specifically, it is quite likely that there are a variety of stereotype traits that are directly tied to perceptions of this group. Unfortunately, much of the available research on Black women does not attempt to measure the degree to which salient stereotype traits are applied to Black women (for an exception, see Gordon and Miller, 2005). While the “stereotype images” approach that is used most often to describe perceptions of Black women is one that is important, it is also necessary to get an understanding of somewhat more concrete ways that this group is stereotyped by way of the attribution of certain traits. Huddy and Feldman (2009) implicitly lend support to this idea by way of noting: “There is also a substantial connection between negative racial stereotypes, such as perceived Black willingness to work, and measures of overt racism” (430). Given this idea, determining the degree to

---

2 “Stereotype images” can be defined as personas that are broadly attributed to groups. Stereotype images for Black women, such as “Mammy,” “Jezebel,” and “Sapphire” will be discussed further below.
which stereotypes are held concerning a group will allow us to work toward uncovering the degree to which overt discriminatory attitudes are at play.

As mentioned above, much of the literature that examines perceptions concerning Black women focuses on stereotypical images. The three traditional stereotype images of the Black female that are most heavily researched and most regularly found in the literature are the “Mammy”, the “Sapphire”, and the “Jezebel” (West, 1995; Collins, 2000; Simms, 2001; Harris-Perry 2011). As per West’s (1995) description:

Through history, culture, and media, Black women have been portrayed most often in some combination of three images: (1) as highly maternal, family oriented, and self-sacrificing Mammies; (2) as threatening and argumentative Sapphires; and (3) as seductive, sexually irresponsible, promiscuous Jezebels (459).

Collins (2000) and Harris-Perry (2011) further explain that the Mammy image is one that subsumes unswerving devotion to Whites and race-based hierarchical societal arrangements. It is important to recognize that these images do not always present themselves as completely distinct from one another; based on context, the lines that divide them may become somewhat blurred. Nevertheless, these three images provide a relatively clear picture of the ways in which society historically has chosen to view Black women. More recently, a new image has developed and solidified in the public eye: the “Welfare Queen/Welfare Cheat,” who is lazy, angry, violent, and expects the
government to support her and her children (Gilens, 1999; Foster, 2008; Harris-Perry, 2011).

The perception of Black women as the “Welfare Queen/Welfare Cheat” developed along with the social programs of the 1960s that launched as a part of the War on Poverty, which was quickly couched in rhetoric that reflected race-based, rather than class-based, conflict (Quadagno, 1994; Collins, 2000; Hancock, 2004; Harris-Perry, 2011). This stereotype came about given that “[a]s long as poor Black women were denied social welfare benefits, there was no need for this stereotype. But when U.S. Black women gained more political power and demanded equity in access to state services, the need arose for this controlling image” (Collins, 2000: 78). I argue that, over time, this class-based challenge of increased access to social benefits for Black women has led to the incorporation of the “Sapphire” and “Jezebel” images into this broader category of “Welfare Cheat.”

The traditionally-held stereotypical images of Black women are not always easily converted into static traits, such as “aggressive” or “intelligent”, that can demonstrate a different way of viewing Black women as compared to Black men and White women. It is apparent from the earlier West (1995) quote that traits that call to mind particular feminized or racialized meanings in the context of White women or Black men can bring forward other images and meanings in the context of applying them to Black women.

3 The terms Welfare Queen and Welfare Cheat will be used interchangeably.
For example, the trait “compassionate” may bring forward the idea of motherhood, gentleness, and kindness when applied to White women, but for some it may call forward the image of the Mammy when applied to Black women. Likewise, the trait of “lazy” or not hardworking may bring to mind images of immoral, hardened criminals when applied to Black men, but may call forward the image of the Welfare Queen when applied to Black women. As such, it is important to determine when Black women are likely to be viewed in terms of racialized and gendered forms of stereotype traits, as well as when those traits are apt to take on intersectional forms and meanings. By attempting to create the closest possible approximation of a measurement of the most prevalent images and comparing each of these groups along this measurement index, we can begin to determine whether, and to what degree, these images continue to manifest within social thought and opinion, as well as the degrees to which they affect views relating to Black women and politics.

3.2 Theory and Hypotheses

As demonstrated earlier, there are a variety of traits that are highly racialized as well as highly gendered (Timberlake and Estes, 2007). While there is some overlap with regard to traits that are traditionally applied to both women and Blacks, e.g. level of intelligence, passive vs. aggressive, trustworthy vs. not trustworthy, there are several traits that stand out in the literature as being particularly racialized and gendered. In
terms of highly racialized traits, Blacks are often seen as particularly aggressive, lazy, stupid, unethical, and irresponsible. In terms of highly gendered traits, women are generally viewed as compassionate, emotional, trustworthy, and passive. I argue here that Black women are viewed in terms of gender when highly gendered traits are in question, just as they are viewed in terms of race when highly racialized traits are in question. Nevertheless, given that Black women do not fully fit the prototypical model of “Black” or “Woman,” they will not be rated as strongly “feminine” or as strongly “Black” as White women and Black men, respectively.

H2null: Black women will be rated equally with Black men and White women on highly racialized or gendered traits, respectively.

H2a: Black women will not be rated as highly on the gendered trait index as White women.

H2b: Black women will not be rated as highly on the racialized trait index as Black men.

Given that the proportion of Blacks that can be deemed as “elite” is particularly miniscule as compared to the White population, racialized stereotypes are far less likely to be applied to those Blacks that are considered to be a part of the elite. Stereotypes develop largely because there is the perception that the majority of those that make up a population possess a particular set of traits. Stereotypical beliefs regarding Blacks are generally highly negative and are in juxtaposition to the traits that are widely accepted as necessary for becoming successful within U.S. society – e.g. lazy vs. hardworking.
stupid vs. intelligent. As such, elites in general, and arguably Black elites specifically, are unlikely to be evaluated largely in terms of racialized traits. Nevertheless, I do not argue that elite status for Blacks removes them from racialized evaluations and, as such, Black elites will still be viewed through a “Black” lens, though to a far lesser degree than they will be viewed through an “Elite” lens.

H3: Elite Black women will be less likely to be viewed in terms of racialized traits than average Black women.

The following hypotheses largely follow the logic of the previous one. The images of the “Welfare Cheat” and “Sapphire” are largely associated with Blacks with lower socioeconomic status, while the “Mammy” image is most closely connected to elite social status, due to its conformity to the norms of White societal structures and hierarchies. The data would support the null hypothesis if it demonstrated that people are equally likely to view Black women according to the “Mammy” and “Welfare Cheat” stereotypes. I expect that the data will reject the null and demonstrate that these stereotype images are highly associated with class.

H4_{null}: Average and elite Black women will be rated equally in terms of the “Mammy” stereotype image and in terms of the “Welfare Queen” stereotype image.

H4: Elite Black women will be viewed more in terms of the “Mammy” image, while average Black women will be viewed more in terms of the “Welfare Queen” image.
3.3 Data and Methods

As with the previous chapter, the data presented here are based upon responses found within my 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey. As to demonstrate better how society views Black women in terms of the nine traits in this survey, I created bar charts specific to the “average” and “elite” segments of this group. The data within these figures are based on an ordinal recoding of social views that is explained below. In order to test my hypotheses, I employ t-tests to determine the degree to which Black women are seen in gendered and racialized terms as compared to White women and Black men. By using this method I am able to determine whether the groups in question are viewed as significantly distinct from one another. Additionally, I utilize scatterplots of the ratings of White women, Black men, and White men as compared to Black women on the Black index, as well as the Feminine index. By examining the scatterplots and fitted values for the three other groups, I am able to determine the degree to which and the point at which these groups are rated similarly to Black women with regard to racialized and gendered stereotypes. Finally, I employ t-tests to examine the differences of means for average Black women and elite Black women in terms of the degree to which the “Mammy” and “Welfare Queen” stereotypes are applied to them. In order to examine these stereotypes, I have developed the following indices for racialized, gendered, and Black female stereotypes, based upon the aforementioned literature and data:
Indices:4

In order to examine the degree to which the four groups are perceived in terms of “Black,” “Female,” and “Black Female” (Mammy and Welfare Queen) stereotypes, I created four trait-based indices, which translate to eight total indices when delineated for “average” and “elite” groups. Several traits are coded in reverse order as to reflect traits that are the opposite of the ones included in the survey, e.g. aggressive vs. passive, hardworking vs. lazy. Reverse coding is denoted below by “[Not]”:

Black/Racialized Index = Aggressive + [Not] Hardworking + [Not] Intelligent + Irresponsible + Unethical

Female/Gendered Index = [Not] Aggressive + Compassionate + Emotional + Trustworthy

Mammy Index = Compassionate + Hardworking + [Not] Irresponsible + Trustworthy

Welfare Queen Index = Aggressive + Bossy + Emotional + [Not] Hardworking + Unethical

4 The traits within the racialized and gendered indices have been tested empirically within the extant literature; however, the Mammy and Welfare Queen indices are largely based upon theoretical underpinnings regarding social perceptions of Black women. They are not examined herein for validity given that I am working to examine sets of stereotypes as the broader public understands them.

5 “Average” is defined as the average person from each group and “Elite” is defined as the most socially and politically successful individuals from a group.
3.4 Results and Analysis

3.4.1 Social Perceptions Regarding Black Women

Before examining the degree to which, and in what contexts, racialized and gendered views are applied to Black women, it is necessary first to examine the descriptive statistics regarding how Black women are viewed on the whole along the range of the nine traits that I tested for the purposes of this study. As seen in Figures 3 and 4, more than four-fifths of respondents believe society views Black women as both aggressive and bossy, while at least two-fifths think they are viewed as “a little” to “not at all” compassionate, all regardless of their social status. These are interesting findings in that, in general, we would expect that stereotypic beliefs regarding gender should encourage society to view all women as somewhat passive and compassionate or caring.

Figure 3 illustrates that respondents are relatively evenly split concerning whether society thinks “average” Black women are hardworking, intelligent, irresponsible, and trustworthy. This means that while half of the respondents that did not rate this group near the midpoint say that society views Black women in a positive light on traits that are important to U.S. society on the whole, the other half say that Black women are viewed in negative terms. Additionally, less than two-fifths say Black

---

* Figures 1 and 2 are based on the following recoding of the original 10-point scales for these items: 1.0-2.9 = “Not at all”; 3.0-4.9 = “A little”; 6.1-8.0 = “Somewhat”; 8.1-10.0 = “Extremely”. Responses between 5 and 6 on the scale are omitted in order to remove responses at the midpoint that do not clearly indicate whether a respondent attributes a particular trait to a group (these omissions only dropped between 49 and 138 responses out of a sample of 510). On the original scale, respondents view two of these categories (“Not at all” and “Extremely”) at the ends of the scales, thus allowing for the creation of the aforementioned 4-point ordinal scale.
females are viewed as “somewhat” or “extremely” unethical. On the other hand, Figure 4 tells somewhat of a different story in terms of social perceptions of Black women.

Figure 3: Social Perceptions of the Degree to Which Stereotype Traits Apply to “Average” Black Women

Just under 90 percent of respondents rate elite Black women as being either “somewhat” or “extremely” aggressive and bossy, which is slightly higher than the ratings for “average” Black women. On the surface this may seem to be an unusual finding; however, it is quite likely that, “aggressive” is seen as a different concept when it is evaluated with regard to elites as compared to the majority of the population. While elite Black females are seen as roughly equally as compassionate as other Black females, the elites are seen as less emotional. The major differences in evaluations of this group
are seen in the last five stereotype traits: elite Black women are far more likely to be rated as hardworking, intelligent, and trustworthy, and they are less likely to be rated as irresponsible and unethical as compared to “average” Black women. Whereas there was approximately a 50/50 split between respondents claiming Black women in general are viewed as hardworking, intelligent, and trustworthy, when asked about the elite individuals of this group, more than four-fifths claim they are hardworking and intelligent and more than three-fifths claim they are trustworthy.

Additionally, around 75 percent of respondents say that this elite group is only “a little” or “not at all” irresponsible and unethical. These data demonstrate that elite Black women – those that are most likely to consider becoming political representatives – are viewed by society in highly different terms as compared to “average” Black women. Further, this reveals that when Black women are seen as belonging to an elite segment of the population, some of the traditional racial views - i.e. laziness, lack of intelligence, lack of trustworthiness - begin to fall away. In the absence of any situational and contextual cues, society considers “average” and “elite” Black women to be two clearly distinct groups. In the next chapter, I will examine the degree to which context priming may be able to bring views of elite Black females closer to those regarding “average” Black females.

With regard to many of the traits examined in this study, social perceptions of Black women often situate them equally on the positive and negative ends of the
spectrum. When traits such as hardworking, intelligent, irresponsible, trustworthy, and unethical are examined, with all responses near the midpoint omitted, between twenty and thirty percent of the respondents place Black women at the extreme ends of the scale, thus claiming that they are either “not at all” or “extremely” tied to the given stereotype trait. This suggests that the tendency for scores regarding Black women to fall around the midpoint of the scale is not due to a major clustering of responses near the middle; rather it is largely due to a relatively even distribution of scores near the ends as well as the middle of the scale. Therefore, when people think of stereotypical beliefs regarding the “average” Black women, they are often nearly equally likely to say that the degree to which a trait applies to this group is either high or low, which means that Black women are largely being rated in both positive and negative terms.
Figure 4: Social Perceptions of the Degree to Which Stereotype Traits Apply to Elite Black Women

While this descriptive information is vital to the topic and arguments of this project, it is important to view Black women in comparison to other groups at various points of the intersection of race and gender in order to obtain a clear understanding of the relevance of their trait ratings. This is one of the justifications for incorporating a broader definition of intersectionality that extends beyond the matrices of oppression, in which scholars only take multiple oppressed identity groups into account, and includes various points of the intersection of two or more salient identities. Although the other groups are not the main focus of this examination, their experiences and the perceptions regarding the groups are vital to a clearer appreciation of the position of Black women in the public eye.
The previous chapter included data and analysis examining the degree to which people believe that society holds nine specific traits regarding four groups at the intersection of race and gender, all in the context of the social status of the groups in question. These data clearly rejected the $H_{1\text{null}}$ hypothesis in Chapter 2, in that they demonstrated that there are significant differences concerning stereotype traits among these four groups at the intersection of race and gender. Additionally, as seen in Table 2 of the same chapter, the data support the $H_{1b}$ hypothesis in that there are statistically significant differences between social views, based on stereotype traits, regarding the “average” members of each of these groups and their elite counterparts. The next sections of the data analysis for this chapter will allow me to take the examination of this topic to the next step, in that I am able to determine the degree to which racialized and gendered stereotypes are applied to both “average” and “elite” Black women. The data in Figures 5-14 and Tables 3 and 4 will allow me to test hypotheses $H_2$ and $H_3$, as well as further explore the nature of stereotype attribution for Black women.7

---

7 $H_2a$ and $H_2b$ argue that Black women will be rated lower on the racialized and gendered trait indices than Black men and White women, respectively. $H_3$ argues that Elite Black women will be less likely to be viewed in terms of racialized traits than average Black women.
3.4.2 Racialized and Gendered Traits

Figure 5: Mean Scores of Racialized Stereotypes for “Average” Blacks

Figure 6: Mean Scores of Racialized Stereotypes for Elite Blacks

The “Black Women” and “Black Men” values in Table 3 correspond to those found in Figure 5. For “average” Blacks, in the context of social perceptions of highly racialized traits, the difference between the mean ratings for Black women and Black men is always statistically significant. Of particular note and importance here is the finding that Black women are rated more positively on each of these traits than Black men, i.e. the Black men received higher ratings on each of the measures within the index. This finding should be expected given that Blackness is often equated with masculinity (Goff, Thomas, and Jackson, 2008), and as such, Black women’s female identity should have some degree of a mediating effect on their ratings. These results partially support
hypothesis H2a in that racialized stereotypes are applied to a lesser degree to average Black women than to average Black men.

Table 3: Difference of Means of Ratings for “Average” Blacks on Racialized Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>Diff of means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive***</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] Hardworking***</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] Intelligent***</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible***</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical***</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

The “Black Women” and “Black Men” values in Table 4 correspond to those found in Figure 6. On the whole, Black elites are rated in a highly similar fashion.

Among the highly racialized traits, “aggressive” is the only one with a difference of means between the two groups that is statistically significant. This is due to the simultaneous increase in ratings of elite Black female aggression and decrease in ratings of elite Black male aggression. The reason behind this result is unclear; however, there is the possibility that this may be explained by the idea that there are differing views regarding the “aggressive” trait in the “average” population as compared to the elite population. As such, there may be fewer negative connotations for this trait among elites, given the possibility that it is less likely to be associated with violence and crime, and more likely to be associated with assertiveness and leadership. Given that H2a includes the caveat that Black women will be rated lower than Black men on the
racialized trait index, the results in Table 4 and Figure 6 do not support H2a, and cannot refute the null hypothesis that Black women and men are rated equally on highly racialized traits. As such, it appears that H2a only stands in the context of perceptions of average Black women.

Table 4: Difference of Means of Ratings for “Elite” Blacks on Racialized Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>Diff of means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive**</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] Hardworking</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not] Intelligent</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

Figure 7 helps to elucidate the degree to which the racialized trait index is applied to Black women and men in the context of class. It is apparent that average Blacks, regardless of gender, are much more likely than elite Blacks to be viewed in terms of negative, racialized stereotypes. The elite status has the effect of overriding traditional racial evaluations of Black men to a greater degree than it does for Black women. In spite of the fact that perceptions of Black men change in a more dramatic way in the context of elite status than they do for women, it is important to note that, as elites, these two groups are rated much the same. Nevertheless, these data demonstrate that H2a can only be supported if it does not include the caveat that the effects are the same across social status.
Figure 7: Racialized Trait Index Mean Scores for “Average” and Elite Blacks

H3 states that elite Black women will be less likely to be viewed in terms of racialized traits than average Black women. This hypothesis holds for the racialized trait index and all but one of the individual traits that comprise the index. As referenced earlier, elite Black women are rated as more aggressive than “average” Black women, which thus is the only trait within the index that does not support H3. The difference of means between the ratings of average Black females and males on the racialized trait index is statistically significant \([t(430)= -8.16, \ p=0.00]\), while this is not the case for the difference of means between the ratings of the elite populations of these groups \([t(430)= 0.62, \ p=0.54]\). As such, in terms of racialized traits, the data suggests that Black elites are viewed as largely similar.
Table 5: Difference of Means of Ratings for “Average” Women on Gendered Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Diff of means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Not] Aggressive</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate***</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional***</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy***</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

The “Black Women” and “White Women” values in Table 5 correspond to those found in Figure 8. For “average” women, the difference of means between Blacks and Whites is statistically significant for each highly gendered trait. Society views Black women as less compassionate, emotional and trustworthy, and views White women as
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far more passive than Black women. As a result, these data support H2b, which states that Black women will be rated lower on the highly gendered (feminized) trait index. Interestingly, the mean scores for elite women are quite different, as seen in Table 8.

**Table 6: Difference of Means of Ratings for “Elite” Women on Gendered Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Diff of means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Not] Aggressive***</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate***</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional**</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy***</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

The “Black Women” and “White Women” values in Table 6 correspond to those found in Figure 9. As with elite Black men and racialized stereotypes, the status of “elite” for White women decreases the degree to which they are viewed in terms of highly gendered traits. The designation of “elite” for Black women has the same effect, but it is so small that it is barely noticeable (see Figure 10). As compared to elite White women, elite Black women are viewed as more compassionate, emotional, and trustworthy, which is a complete reversal of the application of these traits in the context of the general population. While the former are still seen as more passive than the latter, the magnitude of the difference of means shrinks dramatically.
It is useful to contrast the slope for the “Black Women” line in Figure 7 with that found in Figure 10. This result demonstrates that the status of “elite” has a greater effect on the application of racialized stereotypes upon Black women than it does on the application of gendered stereotypes on the same group. Figure 10 also demonstrates that, in terms of elites, Black women are seen as more feminine than White women. This result clearly does not support the caveat within H2b that Black women will be seen as less feminine than White women, regardless of social status. It also suggests that elite status exercises its masculinizing effect to a lesser extent for Black women than it does for White women. Additionally, the difference of means between the ratings of average
White women and average Black women on the gendered trait index is statistically significant \[t(430)= 19.43, p=0.00\], as is the difference of means between the ratings of the elite populations of these groups \[t(430)= 7.96, p=0.00\]. As such, in terms of gendered traits, the data suggests that Black women and White women are always viewed as distinct groups, regardless of social status.

### 3.4.3 Comparison of Black Females to Other Groups

The previous section roughly demonstrates how Black women are perceived on traits related to an identity they share with another group. This approach is particularly useful for determining whether there are differences in the attribution of stereotypical perceptions in the context of in-group variation, e.g. racialized views of Black men vs. racialized views of Black women. In spite of the utility of these measures, which are based on means scores, there are limitations to comparability across groups. A mean score only allows for an examination of the central tendency of the ratings for each group, which means that we cannot get a clear understanding of whether the relationships we see hold at all viewpoints. In other words, this sort of measure does not allow us to understand how groups are rated in comparison to one another at the margins. This is important information to acquire because it can show whether groups are being evaluated in similar ways.
In order to determine the degree to which people see Black women as a group that is distinct from others in the context of all levels of racialized and gendered perceptions, it is necessary to examine how respondents view Black women as compared to each group. The following scatterplots reveal how each respondent rated Black women as compared to White women (blue), Black men (red), and White men (green) on the racialized trait and gendered trait indices. As such, the coordinates for each point on the graph follow this example: (Black women\text{RaceIndex}, White women\text{RaceIndex}). Within this example, the results will allow us to determine how White women are rated when Black women receive low ratings on the racialized index as compared to how the former are rated when the latter are rated high on the index. These scatterplots will allow us to see how people are viewing one group as compared to the other. For example, if most cluster around a rating of 30 for White women and 20 for Black women on the gendered index, then it can be argued that people are differentiating between WW and BW with regard to feminized traits.

The dotted line on the graphs is the predicted value of the ratings for Black men, White women, and White men if each of the groups is rated in precisely the same way as Black women. As such, the closer a group’s fitted value line is to the slope of the dotted line, the more similar the ratings of that group to those for Black women. This would mean that society views the two groups largely in the same light with regard to the issue at hand – i.e. racialized or gendered views. Conversely, if a fitted value line has little to no
slope, this suggests two interesting points: 1) In terms of the stereotype traits in question, the group is not evaluated in the same way as Black women; and 2) The group itself is generally viewed as the same, or relatively uniformly for that index. Consequently, there is not a great deal of variance with regard to how people evaluate that group on those traits, in spite of the fact that there is variance in terms of the ratings of Black women for the same traits.

### 3.4.3.1 Racialized Views of “Average” and “Elite” Groups

![Figure 11: Comparison to “Average” Black Females on Racialized Trait Index](image)

Figure 11: Comparison to “Average” Black Females on Racialized Trait Index
The following data separately presents the ratings of average and elite social status groups in terms of the racialized and gendered indices. Figure 11 demonstrates that, on the whole, perceptions of “average” Black males, White females, and White males are increasing as perceptions of racialized stereotypes of Black females increase. This means that those who view the latter group in terms of these negative stereotypes also view other groups more negatively; nevertheless, the degree to which these other groups are rated more negatively varies significantly. The slope of the fitted value for ratings of Black males is by far the closest to mirroring the predicted value line, i.e. a one-to-one increase with the ratings for average Black females. This suggests that in spite of the fact that, as shown earlier, Black women are rated slightly more positively than Black men, the former are likely to be viewed in a negative light when this is the case for the latter. Race matters for this index in spite of any mitigating effects of gender, in that when these racialized stereotypes are less likely to be applied to the average Black man, they are also less likely to be applied to the average Black woman. The same is true when the stereotypes are strongly applied to each group. Interestingly, when the index ratings are low, people view Black men in a more negative light than they do Black women. Conversely, when the ratings are particularly high, i.e. when the BM fitted value crosses the predicted value line just below a rating a 40 out of the possible 50, Black women are rated more negatively than Black men in terms of racialized stereotypes.
As would be expected for a racialized trait index, which measures stereotypical
views of Blacks on traits such as aggressive, lazy, stupid, irresponsible, and unethical,
the scores for Whites are comparatively low. Additionally, there is little variation in the
scores of Whites, regardless of gender, despite the increase of scores of Black women.
Interestingly, as is seen with the White female and White male fitted value lines in
Figure 11, Whites have higher ratings than Black women when the latter receive ratings
at the lower level end of the scale. The reason for this is unclear, though it is possible
that the items within the scale are measuring different issues and ideas when the index
is used for Whites. Further evidence for this theory is that there is very little variance,
along with a relatively flat slope, for White women and White men on this index and
they appear generally to be rated near the middle of the scale. This is particularly the
case for White males, which may suggest higher amount of rankings near the midpoint.
There is also little variance for White women, but on the whole, they are rated lower
than all of the groups, adding support to the idea that White women are seen as most
distinct from Black men, and that “femaleness” is not associated with “Blackness” (Goff,
Thomas, and Jackson, 2008).
Figure 12: Comparison to “Elite” Black Females on Racialized Trait Index

Figure 12 examines racialized perceptions of elite Black males, White males, and White females, as compared to elite Black females. Here it is important and interesting to see that the slope for the BM fitted value line is still the one that most closely mirrors that for the predicted value line. This supports the idea that Black male elites are evaluated as more similar to Black female elites on racialized traits than the other two groups. This is noteworthy because it demonstrates that in spite of the fact that Black elites, both male and female, are seen as far less aggressive, lazy, stupid, irresponsible, and unethical than their “average” counterparts, when examining their mean scores,
they are still often viewed in racial terms. Additionally, this demonstrates that, despite the fact that the earlier data show that elites generally are viewed as highly similar, *racialized views and stereotyping still have a marked effect on perceptions of Black elites*. As such, there is an increased likelihood that Black elites will be susceptible to the negative effects of racial priming.

As noted above in the context of the racialized trait index for “average” Whites, racialized stereotype traits, when evaluated in the context of any elite groups, may have different meanings as compared to when they are evaluated in the context of the “average” people of each group. Nevertheless, as described directly above, it is apparent that the race of the target group has a direct effect on the likelihood of higher ratings for this scale. Ratings for elites are more tightly clustered than those for “average” groups. Additionally, in terms of this clustering, elites are placed lower on this racialized index; as such, they are viewed more positively than the general population. Of particular interest regarding ratings of elite Black females as compared to the other three groups, the clustering of values just above the predicted line suggests that respondents are slightly more likely to rate all other groups higher on (Black) racialized traits when elite Black females are rated lower; however, the trajectory of the fitted lines is below the predicted value line. Consequently, when Black women are rated high on this index, they are rated higher, more negatively, than all of the groups;
nevertheless, as per the location of the cluster of values, Black females are generally rated lower, more positively, for these traits than the other groups.

3.4.3.2 Gendered Views of “Average” and “Elite” Groups

In Figure 13, we see that even without regard to the ratings of average Black women on the gendered traits index, White women are rated quite high, White men just below White women, and Black men quite low. This finding lends support to the idea

Figure 13: Comparison to “Average” Black Females on Gendered Trait Index
that among the general population, perceptions of White women are highly gendered or feminized. The data presented earlier in this chapter also demonstrate this point; however, the data available within Figure 13’s scatterplot show that there is little variance in the ratings of this group on the whole, rather than just a high average rating. The issue of variance is the same for average White men on this scale, and it is apparent that they are seen less in terms of feminine traits than White women. Additionally, as with social perceptions of the “average” population regarding highly racialized traits (Figure 11), we can see that people view average Black men as quite different from average White women. When evaluated together, the data from these two scatterplots further support the argument that Blackness and “maleness” are highly associated with one another (Goff, Thomas, and Jackson, 2008).

By examining Figure 13 along the x-axis, it is apparent that the scores for Black women are clustered between the values above 20 and below 30, which is lower than the cluster for White women, which falls approximately between 25 and 35. This demonstrates that although the ratings of both groups are increasing at the same time, Black females are clearly perceived in terms of feminized traits to a lesser extent than White females. Furthermore, and of particular interest for this research, the slope for the BM fitted value line once again comes the closest of the three reference groups to approximating the predicted value line for equal evaluation with average Black women. This demonstrates: 1) There is a significant level of variance in the scores of average
Black males for this index; and 2) More importantly, even when evaluating groups in terms of highly gendered stereotype traits, the race of the group in question still plays a clear role. As such, **race continues to be tied strongly to evaluations of gendered traits, whereas gender is not as strongly tied to evaluations of racialized traits for the general population.**

![Figure 14: Comparison to “Elite” Black Females on Gendered Trait Index](image)

As is the case with the racialized trait index in Figure 12, Figure 14 illustrates that perceptions of elite groups have less spread and variation than those of “average”

---

8 In order for gender to be clearly connected to evaluations of racialized traits, ratings of White women would have to have a rate of increase or decrease closer to that of the predicted value line while ratings for White men would remain relatively unvarying.
groups with regard to highly gendered stereotypes. This supports my earlier claim in this chapter and the last that elites from all groups are generally viewed as similar, though racialized and gendered evaluations do still play a role in their evaluations. Further reflecting views of elites on racialized traits, the fitted value lines for each group are much closer to the predicted value line in terms of gendered stereotypes, with the BM fitted value line ever so slightly the closest, once again demonstrating the importance of race in the evaluation of gendered traits. On the whole, elites are clustered lower than the general population on this scale of femininity, and there is practically no difference among these groups in terms of their ratings. Nevertheless, as is demonstrated in Table 6, the small differences between the mean scores for elite White women and elite Black women are statistically significant, which suggests that they people evaluate these groups as distinct from one another in a more absolute sense.

The fitted values lines cross to below the dotted line at a point lower than the midpoint of the gendered index scale. This suggests that most respondents rating elite Black women highly on gendered traits evaluate all other elites at lower rates. As such, elite Black women seem to call to mind feminine traits – i.e. passive, compassionate, emotional, and trustworthy – to a greater degree than other elites. If this trend extends from elites to political officeholders, then Black women may find themselves at an electoral advantage, due to the similarity and closeness between some feminine traits, such as trustworthiness, and traits of “ideal” political candidates.
There are several interesting take away points that are elucidated by the data from these scatterplots. As would be expected, Black men are the most likely to be viewed in terms of highly racialized (Black) traits while White women are the most likely to be viewed in terms of highly gendered (female) traits. These groups are also the least likely to be viewed in terms of traits highly ascribed to the other group. Additionally, the race of the group being evaluated in terms of racialized or gendered stereotypes has a defined and similar effect, thus suggesting that race more directly influences evaluations of Black women than gender does, though they both have marked effects. Finally, elites of all groups are viewed as far more similar than each of the groups in the average population is seen as similar to the others, though race and gender still influence the evaluation of each elite group.

3.4.4 Black Female Stereotype Images

In that I can now claim that Black women are susceptible to racialized and gendered stereotypes in ways that differ from other groups, it is important to move toward determining the ways in which they are viewed in terms of stereotypes that are more specific to Black females. Figures 15 and 16 illustrate that social perceptions regarding the Black female stereotype images of “Mammy” and “Welfare Queen” vary
in terms of the social status of Black women. Figure 15 demonstrates that elite Black women are more likely to be viewed in terms of the Mammy stereotype image than average Black women, and the former are less likely to be rated as not having the traits that comprise this index. Figure 16 shows the opposite relationship between the Welfare Queen stereotype image and Black female social status. While people are less likely to rate either of these groups at the margins of this index, it is still apparent that they find that average Black women fit this stereotype image to a greater degree than elite Black women.

9 The “Mammy” index is comprised of the following traits: compassionate, hardworking, not irresponsible, and trustworthy. The “Welfare Queen” index is comprised of the following traits: aggressive, bossy, emotional, not hardworking, and unethical.
Additionally, a much smaller proportion of respondents place elite Black women at the high end of this index, thus suggesting that elite status diminishes the likelihood of the application of the Welfare Queen stereotype for Black women. In H4 I claim that elite Black women will be viewed more in terms of the “Mammy” image, while average Black women will be viewed more in terms of the “Welfare Cheat” image. I find evidence for this hypothesis in Figures 15 and 16. Further, I can reject the null hypothesis and claim support for H4 given that the differences of means for average and elite Black women with regard to these stereotype images are statistically significant in the hypothesized directions (Mammy: \( t(509) = -12.2, p= 0.00 \); Welfare Queen: \( t(509) = 8.7, \)

Figure 15: Box Plots of the Attribution of Mammy Stereotype Image to Average and Elite Black Women
p = 0.00). As such, it is apparent that different images and ideas come to mind when people consider Black women at different socioeconomic levels. Consequently, this means that we cannot assume that stereotypes regarding average Black women are the most accurate or useful for examining those Black women that may be most likely to enter electoral politics.

Figure 16: Box Plots of the Attribution of Welfare Queen Stereotype Image to Average and Elite Black Women
3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I examine the ways in which racialized and gendered stereotypes, as well as Black female stereotype images, are applied to Black women at varying levels of social status, and I encounter several interesting findings. First, these results bolster the theory that prototypical images lead to a greater intensity of stereotyping. This is demonstrated in that the societally accepted prototypical image of a woman in the U.S. is a White woman, just as the prototypical image of someone who is Black is a Black man. Average Black women do not fit the prototype for either “Black” or “woman”; as such, racialized and gendered stereotypes are applied to them to a lesser extent.

Second, elite status has a greater effect on racialized as well as gendered stereotypes for Black men and White women, respectively, than it does for Black women. In this way, the elite status moves Black men and White women farther away from the prototype model, thus significantly decreasing the degree to which they are evaluated based on traditional stereotypes. This helps to explain why the hypothesis that Black women are rated lower on racialized and gendered traits (H2) is only supported in the context of general populations, and not elite ones. Conversely, it is possible that Black female elites are more likely than the other two groups to be evaluated in terms of traditional gender and racial views. This is an issue that will need more examination. Nevertheless, the result of this greater effect on ratings for the White women and Black men is to bring some semblance of equalization to the rating of elite
groups. There is less variation among elites in terms of how they are evaluated, and racial and gender differences begin to fall away, or at least lessen. Nonetheless, race and gender continue to play important roles when it comes to perceptions regarding Blacks, women, and Black women specifically.

Third, the results from Figures 11-14 may suggest that Black female elites on the whole are seen least in terms of racialized (Black) traits and more in terms of gendered (Female) traits than the other three groups. This may lead to any combination of positive, negative, or neutral results for this group in terms of political evaluation. It may be that people will view them in terms of positive (masculine) ”Black” traits, such as aggressive leadership, and positive “feminine” traits, such as honesty, to view Black female elites as the most ideal candidates. It may also be the case that people will view them in terms of negative “Black” traits, such as being lazy, and negative “feminine” traits, such as being passive, in a way that will make elite Black women appear to be unsuited for political office. Some combination of these views may allow for them to cancel one another out, thus creating either neutral or ambivalent automatic perceptions concerning the combination of the effects of their race and gender that may not be to their advantage or disadvantage politically.

Finally, people attribute varying degrees of the Black female stereotype images of Mammy and Welfare Queen to Black women based upon social status. As anticipated in H4, society associated elite Black women with the Mammy image to a greater degree
than is the case for average Black women. I argue this is the case because elite Black women are seen as conforming more to the institutional values and practices that undergird the sociopolitical hierarchy. While it is certainly the case that elite Black women may also be viewed as somewhat militant for causes relating to race, I would argue that this viewpoint of elite Black women is reflected in the degree to which they are seen in the context of the traits that are specific to the Welfare Queen.

One question that arises in the midst of these findings is, when confronted with an individual from each of these groups, how likely is it that respondents can accurately categorize them, specifically with regard to social status? Furthermore, what is the likelihood that individuals will apply the same ratings in a real-life situation as compared to a controlled survey environment? These are issues that cannot be answered here based on the available data, but may be important to address in order to understand better the process of applying stereotypes in the context of an intersectional view. The next chapter works toward introducing more of the real-world into the examination of these groups by way of examining the ways in which stereotype priming can influence the application of stereotypical views and ideologies to Black women.
4. The Effects of Priming on Social Perceptions Regarding Black Women

In the previous chapters, I established that society takes an intersectional approach to the application of stereotypes and traits. This does not mean that all people within society purposefully set out to place individuals into groups and make determinations regarding the characteristics and attitudes they will hold; conversely, much of the stereotyping “work” is done on an automatic level, as with any other categorization. Nevertheless, the previous chapters regarding stereotyping can only go so far in helping us better to understand when and which stereotypes are likely to be activated in the political sphere, and how this stereotyping is influenced by context and situation. Before I can continue on in order to evaluate how political candidates are viewed in terms of their race and gender based on an intersectional approach, I must first determine whether intersectionally-based priming can have an effect on perceptions regarding both “average” and “elite” Black women, given the lack of research on this topic as explained in the previous chapter.1

This chapter examines a key issue that directly influences the degree to which we hold and express stereotypes: priming. Stereotypes and stereotyping are related to our perceptions of the outside world; however, our views and perceptions should not be considered rigid or static. Various forces can influence the way we approach the world

1 “Average” is defined as the average person from a particular groups, while “elite” is defined as the most socially and politically successful individuals from a group.
and the people we find therein. The presentation of specific ideas and images that bolster the validity of particular perceptions and stereotypes can encourage us to believe that much of society holds a certain stance or viewpoint concerning a group. Whether we choose to accept that viewpoint as accurate does not change the degree to which we believe society views it as accurate or applicable. Consequently, the images and messages we receive can have a profound effect on how we understand and view society. As such, although it is important to determine people’s personal perceptions regarding stereotypes of groups and subgroups, it is also important to get a broader view of what people think everyone else believes.

In the context of perceptions of societal views, this chapter specifically aims to address the following issues empirically: 1) whether highly targeted, intersectional primes are more effective than less-targeted, single-identity ones, and 2) whether race- and gender-based intersectional priming has an effect on perceptions of the ideological leanings of Black women. As such, I will work toward answering the following questions. In the context of intersectional stereotyping, can implicit priming of widely known stereotypes about Black women influence how people respond to explicit measures of stereotypes regarding this group? Will the social status of Black women affect the influence of the primes? Will this sort of priming have an effect on perceptions
of Black female social and economic ideology? Additionally, can implicit priming of widely known stereotypes about groups that share an identity with Black women, i.e. White women and Black men, influence how people respond to explicit measures of stereotypes regarding Black women? If so, what effect will these primes have on evaluations of this group?

\textbf{4.1 Priming}

It is relatively widely known that there are race-based and gender-based stereotypes that are presented to society in the form of images, either rhetorical or physical. These images traditionally have been highly ubiquitous, ranging from literature to folktales, from songs to radio, and from television to films. One feature of these images that is of particular importance is, historically, they have been acceptable to the point of non-recognition, i.e. they did not raise the red flags brought about by conscious thought. The general population of the U.S. was not outraged when seeing depictions of “black savages” in a Warner Brothers cartoon or when hearing a ditzy woman on a 1930s radio drama because these stereotypical images were accepted as

\footnote{This issue connects most directly to the degree to which people see themselves as similar to Black women on a sociopolitical level. Consequently, it can affect the degree to which people believe elite Black women would be able represent a set of shared interests. Further, this can affect the degree to which people believe they share similar values and interests with Black women in terms of having a basis upon which to build a coalition (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967).}
accurate and appropriate. These sorts of images bring a variety of stereotypes to the forefront of the minds of those exposed to them, without having to make explicit statements.

Particularly in the first half of the twentieth century, as well as previous centuries, even explicit statements of negative stereotypes of groups that were not White or male were not only acceptable, but they were touted as truth that was supported to varying degrees over time by scientific “fact,” general societal common knowledge, and institutionalized definitions (Haney-López, 1996). This age-old practice began to breakdown ever so slowly in the post-Civil Rights era, when it became less socially acceptable and appropriate to make explicit statements regarding group stereotypes. Nevertheless, many implicit messages continue(d) to make their way into the public sphere via various media forms. It is specifically this sort of implicit message-sharing that brings this discussion directly to the ways in which images and social narratives can influence both individual and social ideas regarding race and gender.

Priming can occur in a variety of ways, such as conversations with friends and family, direct personal experience, and the like; however, the most pervasive source of priming comes in the form of “media.” The messages we seek and receive via news reports, television, radio, newspapers, online weblogs and the like are readily available

---

3 While a few organizations, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the National Organization for Women (NOW), did reject and protest against negative racialized and gendered portrayals of non-whites and women, on the whole there was very little social push back against these images and messages (Wilson, Gutiérrez, and Chao, 2003; Mills, 1974)
and easily consumable. Their presence in our daily lives is so common place in the 21st
century that we hardly take note of them. As such, we do not always think critically
regarding the messages that we encounter during every point at which we encounter
them. Consequently, many of the implicit messages that are transmitted, whether
purposefully or not, can easily take hold without us being aware of this fact.

4.1.1 Difference Between Messages and Primes

I make a distinction between “messages” and “primes” only in terms of
attempting to clarify that all primes come in the form of messages, but not all messages
necessarily present themselves in situations in which they can be considered primes.
Implicit negative stereotypical images, such as those seen in the Pepsi Super Bowl
commercial from 2011, as described in the introductory chapter, may prime people to
think of Black women in a negative light if they are soon going to find themselves in a
situation in which they encounter a Black female; however, it is much more likely that
this message will be one that writes itself onto the subconscious where, along with many
other similar messages, it will be used to form the base of the stereotypes and opinions
we hold. Consequently, the messages we encounter and collect over time have an
influence on the opinions and ideas we hold (Zaller, 1992), but it is the relative timing
and applicability that counts for the classification of messages as primes with regard to
whether messages will prime a stereotype for the context in which people find
themselves.

4.1.2 Race- and Gender-Based Messages

The information presented within media messages covers nearly every
imaginable topic and viewpoint. Nevertheless, there are some messages and topics that
prevail over others given their varying degrees of social saliency. More specifically, in
the context of issues of race, negative racial cues and stereotypes abound (Entman, 1992).
There is evidence that news reports regarding crime disproportionately feature violent
crimes perpetuated by Blacks and that these messages increase the degree to which
Whites hold negative stereotypes and attitudes concerning African Americans (Entman,
1992; Peffley, Shields, and Williams, 1996; Gilliam and Iyengar, 2000). Additionally,
messages within news reports suggest that Black activists are more vocal regarding their
demands for social change. In conjunction with the presence of Black news reporters,
whose presence is viewed as evidence of decreased racial discrimination, these negative
views concerning Blacks, crime, and politics all contribute to increased racial resentment
among Whites (Entman, 1992). Furthermore, while it may be that explicit negative racial
appeals based on old-fashioned racial views are no longer acceptable, implicit negative
racial appeals continue to present themselves with relatively little backlash, as is seen
with the public discourse concerning welfare queens and Latino immigrants (Gilens, 1999; Foster, 2008; Pérez, 2008; Stewart, Pitts, and Osbourne, 2010).

Gender-based stereotypes also prevail in the context of media messages. While they do not carry the same negative connotations as the race-based messages, they are grounded in the patriarchal structure that has supported gender-based oppression. The media often portrays women by way of objectification and traditional gender roles. Advertisements overwhelmingly present women as objects of male sexual desire, while articles concerning women in sports are more likely than those concerning men to emphasize the attractiveness of the athlete (Schneider, 2005; Knight and Giuliano, 2001). Furthermore, women are more likely to be presented in home settings and passive roles than men, and they are shown as “consumers rather than givers of advice, and in subordinate work situations” (Schneider, 2005: 345). This demonstrates that even as old-fashioned sexism has waned in our acceptable social discourse, old-fashioned gender roles continue to receive preference in our media messages, though to a far lesser degree than was the case in previous decades. In turn, it is possible for political campaigns to utilize these messages and themes as political tools against opponents in order to prime stereotypes that are not ideal for a political candidate.
4.1.3 Priming and Political Candidates

An area of study that has interested the political science discipline is the effect of priming on views regarding political candidates. One of the major reasons for this is that many electoral campaigns include negative advertising that is geared toward painting an opponent in a negative light with regard to his/her policy positions, competency, or personal traits. There is evidence that negative campaign approaches are being used increasingly often and they are being used in order to manipulate and appeal to voters’ emotions (Ansolabehere et al., 1994; Brader, 2006). Additionally, there are even more opportunities for negative priming against political candidates, given the U.S. Supreme Court ruling on the Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010) case in which corporations are essentially interpreted as possessing personhood and thus the right to free speech as found in the First Amendment, as well as possessing the ability to spend unlimited funds on political advertising as speech. These circumstances raise the question of what effect these types of messages have on political candidates when the messages specifically target various intersections of race and gender.

With regard to the effectiveness of priming, research demonstrates that implicit primes are more successful than explicit ones (Mendelberg, 2001; Valentino, Hutchings, and White, 2002; Valentino, Traugott, and Hutchings, 2002; Huddy and Feldman, 2009). According to Mendelberg, “implicit racial appeals convey the same message as explicit racial appeals, but they replace the racial nouns and adjectives with more oblique
references to race” (2001: 9). This omission of direct reference to race is of particular importance because it allows a “person’s commitment to egalitarian conduct” to remain in place in their estimation, due to the ambiguity of the racial message (Mendelberg, 2001: 112). In that there is currently a norm of attitudes of egalitarianism with regard to groups that have previously been viewed as unequal under the law, particularly Blacks and women, politicians and their campaigns shy away from explicitly priming negative stereotypes while following their electoral incentive to use implicit cues (for more detailed examinations of this topic, see Mendelberg, 2001; Valentino, Hutchings, and White, 2002; Valentino, Traugott, and Hutchings, 2002).

In spite of the strong effect of cues that are presented implicitly, the priming effect is likely to be diminished when counter-stereotypical information and/or images are introduced because they encourage “conscious processing of the racial content of the message” (Valentino, Hutchings, and White, 2002: 77). This “conscious processing” is important in that it allows for a similar level of evaluation that occurs with explicit priming. I do not attempt to test a theory relating to the presentation of counter-stereotypic messages; instead, I use this to inform the development of my primes. Consequently, I only use negative images in the priming treatments and avoid incorporating counter-stereotypic information concerning the general view of Black women. Furthermore, negative images and narratives are generally more likely to be found in news stories and they reflect sociopolitical issues and issue positions that might
be utilized in negative campaign advertisements (Valentino, 1999). In future iterations of this project, it will be useful to incorporate negative priming in the form of campaign advertisements as to better understand the effects of this priming on political candidates; however, one of the primary purposes of this project is to determine whether we ought to be taking an intersectional approach to our examination of the priming of stereotypes. As such, I use negative messages that typically could be found in everyday media accounts to determine the degree to which these messages can be used to prime attitudes toward individuals at various points of the intersection of race and gender, particularly Black females, and to determine whether there are variations in these effects when social status is altered.

4.2 Theory and Hypotheses

4.2.1 Priming

In order for priming messages to be effective, they must have grounds upon which they can be activated. The prime must be connected closely enough to the target as to trigger a clear result. There must be some base connection between the prime and the target for an effect to occur. Given this, it stands to reason that the more the prime matches issues relating to the identities of the target, the greater the priming effect will be. This is precisely the reason that an intersectional approach to the study of the effects of priming is necessary. With regard to actual negative advertising, this is something
that is intuitively practiced and understood; however, with regard to academic research, it is not a practice that is always followed, and when it is intuitively addressed, it is not necessarily recognized or acknowledged in terms of its purpose. In that I believe primes that directly match intersectional identities will be the most effective at calling forth stereotypes, I argue the following hypotheses:

**H5a:** The Black female treatment will increase racialized perceptions of Black females.

**H5b:** The Black female treatment will decrease gendered perceptions of Black females.

**H5c:** The Black female treatment will decrease ratings of perceptions of Black females as conforming to the Mammy stereotype.

**H5d:** The Black female treatment will increase ratings of perceptions of Black females as conforming to the Welfare Queen stereotype.

In spite of the recognition that it may be easier to prime stereotypes that are connected to the intersectional identity of the target, it is also important to acknowledge and remember that the purpose of priming may also be to more generally connect negative ideas, views, and perceptions concerning one group to a target that does not possess the same ascriptive identity, as seen with the Willie Horton ad in the 1988 Presidential campaign. Given this point, it is also important to examine whether and the ways in which primes specific to groups that do not fully match the target's intersectional identity have an effect.
Black women share racial identity with Black males and gender identity with White females. As such, messages regarding these groups will have an effect on views toward Black women. Additionally, the combination of this connection to other treatment groups and the negative nature of these treatments will have a negative effect on views of Black women, thus increasing racialized and "welfare queen" ratings and decreasing gendered and "mammy" ratings. Given that the Black males and White female treatments are not as closely tied to Black female identity as the Black female treatment, the magnitude of these effects will be smaller. At the same time, there is a remote possibility that negative priming specific to Black women may be sending a more direct, though still implicit, signal about stereotypes specific to Black women, thus encouraging people to work toward countering those stereotypes in order to avoid socially undesirable responses. Nevertheless, given the implicit nature of the primes in this study, it is unlikely that the presence of highly targeted primes will encourage conscious processing of the racialized and gendered primes. Additionally, Black women do not share race and gender identities with White men, and thus are seen as quite distinct from this group. Consequently, the White male treatment will be the least likely to prime ideas and stereotypes regarding Black females. Given these considerations, I posit that:

H6a: The Black male and White female treatments will have the same directional effect on perceptions of Black women as the Black female treatment, but the magnitude of the effects will be lesser than that seen with the latter treatment.
H6b: The White male treatment will not have an effect on views of Black females, regardless of social status).

I demonstrated in the previous chapter that elite Black females are perceived as distinct from the larger Black female population; however, this distinction does not automatically lead to the assumption that people cannot be primed to view elite Black females as closer to average Black females, who are seen in a far more negative light. Based on the earlier theory concerning the stronger effects of more relevant primes and the findings from the previous chapter, the hypothesized priming effects of H5 and H6 are expected to be less strong for elite Black women than for average Black women, given the that content of the primes include pictures that the respondents would be more likely to classify as “average” as opposed to “elite.”

Finally, I argue that priming based on the Black female treatment will cause respondents to view Black women more stereotypically in terms of political ideology, regardless of social status, and in spite of the fact that the prime does not relate to the issue of ideology. This theory is based on the idea that the priming of one set of stereotypes of a group also primes other stereotypes concerning the group, even when the first set is disavowed or dismissed (Berinsky and Mendelberg, 2005). Cues regarding stereotypes that people reject can still prime people for stereotypes that may be somewhat more palatable or acceptable. This can mean that people may be more likely to reject trait stereotypes, such as “irresponsible” and “unethical,” while accepting
issue-position stereotypes, such as “competent on welfare issues” all at once. As such, I argue the following:

H7: The Black female treatment will result in perceptions of all Black women as more liberal on social and economic ideologies (regardless of social status).

4.3 Data and Methods

In order to test the effects of priming on stereotype attribution, respondents within the 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey were randomly assigned to either a control group or one of four separate treatment groups. The control group receives two brief, race-neutral articles regarding topics that are unrelated to the issue of stereotypes and group characteristics (animal rescue and fraternity/sorority hazing), while the treatment groups receive one race-neutral article (animal rescue) and one racially-charged context-priming article that is specific to one of the four groups within the survey—Black women, White women, Black men, and White men. The treatments are brief, fictitious, negatively-toned articles regarding the following issues (reference group in parentheses): tax evasion and white-collar crime (White males); violence against domestic partner (White females); violent, inner-city crime (Black males); and shoplifting and irresponsible parenting (Black females). The articles do not directly refer to a specific

4 The content of the treatments is located within Appendix B.
5 Valentino (1999) demonstrated that stereotype-based news coverage can have a negative effect on perceptions and evaluations of a political officeholder.
group, but they include a picture that depicts an individual from the reference groups in handcuffs being led away by White officials. The expectation here is that the articles prime a particular set of stereotypes that may not necessarily come forward in the control group.

The priming articles within the study are consistent with the images and stories set forth regularly in the news media. By including negative images of individuals at various points of the intersection of race and gender, I am providing implicit racial and gender cues and specifically avoiding the use of any explicit references to gender and race within the articles. Much of the research on priming in political research has demonstrated that this implicit approach is the most methodologically effective and is also the most widely utilized within the “real-world” due to our desire to maintain some semblance of egalitarianism (Mendelberg, 2001; Valentino, Hutchings, and White, 2002; Valentino, Traugott, & Hutchings, 2002; McIlwain and Caliendo, 2009). Further, campaign managers know that people often vote against a candidate they do not like as opposed to specifically voting for a candidate they fully support. As such, campaigns

---

6 The content of the articles is geared to prime the following stereotype traits: All four of the treatments – unethical; White male – not trustworthy; White female – emotional; Black male – aggressive; and Black female – irresponsible. As per the evidence presented within Berinsky and Mendelberg (2005), the presence of various stereotypes, even if rejected, can prime other connected stereotypes, such as political ideology.

7 The photographs in this survey originated in online articles. I fully altered the names, locations, and circumstances surrounding the photographs, and the sources of the photographs are noted within the survey. Nelson and Kinder (1996) use a similar method, in which they utilize photographs from Newsweek and Time as framing images in their Experiment IV.
will do their best to prime negative stereotypes in order to decrease the political viability of an opponent, hence the plethora of negative advertising.\(^8\)

In order to test H5 and H6, I employ t-tests to examine whether the differences of stereotype indices means between the control group and the treatment groups in question are statistically significant. To provide further insight into the effect of the Black female treatment on social perceptions of the applicability of racialized, gendered, and Black female stereotypes to Black women, I run eight separate OLS regressions in which the four stereotype indices, further delineated by “average” and “elite” status, are the dependent variables.\(^9\) Additionally, in order to test H7, I run four separate OLS regressions in which the dependent variables are Black female social and economic ideology, delineated by “average” and “elite” status. Within this survey, in order to measure ideology, respondents were asked to place each group on separate 7-point ideological scales, ranging from “1” as “Liberal” to “7” as “Conservative,” for social issues and economic issues. Examples of social issues that were presented in the survey were “capital punishment, gay marriage, abortion, etc.” and examples of economic issues were “government spending, tax policy, etc.”

\(^8\) In future work, I plan to include positive context-priming in order to test the effectiveness of positive priming in which candidates themselves engage as to bolster their chances of getting elected.

\(^9\) The stereotype indices are the same as in chapter 3: Black/Racialized Index = Aggressive + [Not] Hardworking + [Not] Intelligent + Irresponsible + Unethical; Female/Gendered Index = [Not] Aggressive + Compassionate + Emotional + Trustworthy; Mammy Index = Compassionate + Hardworking + [Not] Irresponsible + Trustworthy; Welfare Queen Index = Aggressive + Bossy + Emotional + [Not] Hardworking + Unethical
4.3.1 Independent Variables and Controls

As noted above, in order to test the degree to which the Black female treatment may affect the attribution of racialized, gendered, and Black female stereotypes on Black women, I will use this measure as an explanatory variable. This is coded as a dummy variable, with inclusion in the Black female treatment coded as 1 and all others coded as 0. This independent variable is also vital to the regression model that examines Black female political ideology. Additionally, given that I have argued that there is an underlying connection between views of average and elite Black women, which can be primed, I include within the Stereotype Index model the independent variable of how the “other” group is rated on that index. For example, if I am examining the racialized stereotype index for elite Black women, then I include the racialized stereotype index for average Black women as an independent variable as one of the measures.

It is useful to keep in mind the difference between stereotypes and stereotyping. The former is a set of shared beliefs, and thus collective, whereas the latter is a process that is performed within each individual (Leyens et al, 1994). This distinction is not meant to overlook the fact that an individual’s process of stereotyping is heavily shaped by social influences; rather, it is meant to demonstrate that the ways in which and the degree to which a person chooses to apply stereotypes vary on the individual-level. As such, in order to better understand who engages in stereotyping, it is important to
include within the analysis the demographic variables that are often salient within U.S. society. The “individual-level” control variables that are included within this survey are race, gender, age, income, education, region born, region in which you have lived longest, respondent political ideology (both social and economic), and respondent party identification.

### 4.3.2 Regression Models

As described above, the following regression models are built to measure the effects of priming and various individual-level control variables on the application of stereotype traits and stereotype-based ideologies to both average and elite Black women. “Stereotype Index (avg/elt)” below describes the dependent variable that is being tested and whether it is specific to either the average or elite Black woman. For example, this can mean “Mammy Index (elt)” as well as “Gendered Index (avg)”:

\[
\text{Stereotype Index(avg/elite)} = B_1(\text{Black Female treatment}) \\
+ B_2(\text{Stereotype Index (elite/avg)}) \\
+ B_{3:11}(\text{Controls}^{10}) + \text{Constant}
\]

The model to examine the effect of the Black female prime on social perceptions of Black women’s social and economic ideological stances also takes into account the effects of each of the four stereotype indices on the dependent variable. Additionally, as

---

10 The controls include the following variables: White, Female, Age, Income, Education, Born in the South, Respondent Social Ideology, Respondent Economic Ideology, and Respondent Party ID.
with the logic from the previous model, in that views concerning Black women are interconnected, I test the degree to which perceptions of social and economic ideology of Black women at both social status levels are correlated to the dependent variable at hand. As such, when the dependent variable is Social Ideology of Elite Black women, the three ideology variables included in the model are Social Ideology (Avg), Economic Ideology (Elt), and Economic Ideology (Avg). The same individual-level controls from the stereotype index model are incorporated into this Black Female ideology model:

\[
\text{Black Female Social Ideology(\text{avg/elt})} = B_1(\text{Black Female treatment}) \\
+ B_2(\text{Social Ideology(elt/avg)}) \\
+ B_3(\text{Economic Ideology(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_4(\text{Economic Ideology(elt/avg)}) \\
+ B_5(\text{Racialized Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_6(\text{Gendered Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_7(\text{Mammy Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_8(\text{WelfareQueen Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_{9-17}(\text{Controls}) + \text{Constant}
\]

\[
\text{Black Female Economic Ideology(\text{avg/elt})} = B_1(\text{Black Female treatment}) \\
+ B_2(\text{Economic Ideology(elt/avg)}) \\
+ B_3(\text{Social Ideology(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_4(\text{Social Ideology(elt/avg)}) \\
+ B_5(\text{Racialized Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_6(\text{Gendered Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_7(\text{Mammy Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_8(\text{WelfareQueen Index(avg/elt)}) \\
+ B_{9-17}(\text{Controls}) + \text{Constant}
\]
4.4 Results and Analysis:

4.4.1 Priming Treatments and Stereotype Trait Indices

The results concerning priming are somewhat mixed and support my hypotheses in some instances while not supporting them in others.

Table 7: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Average Black Women on the Racialized Trait Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female**</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

Table 7 presents data concerning perceptions of social attitudes regarding “average” Black females in terms of the degree to which they are racialized via the attribution of negative, highly racialized stereotypes.11 In support of hypothesis H5a, the Black female priming treatment had a statistically significant effect on the placement of average Black women on the racialized trait index, which consists of the following traits: aggressive, [not] hardworking, [not] intelligent, irresponsible, and unethical. The respondents within this treatment group rated average Black women higher on the negative racial trait index than was the case for the respondents within the control group. The Black male prime has a similar effect, though it is smaller and not

---

11 Given the nature of the specific stereotypes associated with racialized and gendered traits, I will refer to them as “negative” and “positive,” respectively, throughout this analysis (Smith and Stewart, 1983).
statistically significant. Thus, within this study, the implicit priming of racialized stereotypes by way of Black male images does not definitively affect perceptions of average Black women, and it affects these perceptions to a lesser degree than the Black female prime does. Given the lack of statistical significance, I do not find support for H6a, which claims that the Black male treatment and White female treatment will have a smaller, but significant, effect on racialized perceptions of Black women. The results move in the same direction for the White female prime, but are not statistically significant. In support of hypothesis H6b, there was virtually no difference for perceptions of average Black women with the White male priming treatment. These results demonstrate that in the case of racialized stereotypes, highly specific, intersectional primes are more effective in altering the application of these traits to average Black women than those primes that are less clearly tied to single, salient identities for this group.

Table 8: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Elite Black Women on the Racialized Trait Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

As seen in Table 8, none of the priming conditions had a statistically significant effect on racialized perceptions of elite Black females. This finding does not support my
H5a hypothesis, but does support my earlier assertion that the priming treatments would have a lesser effect on perceptions of Black women, given that the photos within the primes are not readily classified under “elite” status. Overall, in the case of highly racialized traits, the priming of stereotypes that people are more likely to see as applying to “average” individuals – as found in the treatment articles – does not have an effect on perceptions of elite Black women.

Table 9: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Average Black Women on the Gendered Trait Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female**</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male**</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

Table 9 demonstrates that both the Black female and Black male treatment conditions depress gendered trait ratings of average Black women. Given these two specific treatments have this effect, it is likely that the treatments specific to Blacks are priming negative racialized views concerning average Black women. In turn, this decreases the extent to which people view average Black women as feminine. This makes sense, once again, in the context of the connection between Blackness and masculinity.
Table 10: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Elite Black Women on the Gendered Trait Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

Tables 9 and 10 show the ratings of Black women, regardless of social status, on this gendered index are relatively close. As such, the degree to which all Black women are viewed as feminine is relatively static. Nevertheless, in the case of the general population of Black women, the degree to which they are viewed by way of traditional female stereotypes can be affected by negative racial stereotypes. In terms of the combination of the highly gendered traits of [not] aggressive, compassionate, emotional, and trustworthy, the data on perceptions of average Black women support H5b and the data on perceptions of elite Black women do not support this hypothesis – i.e. the Black female prime is effective on views of the former group but not on views of the latter. Further, these data present partial support for H6a, in that the Black male prime had a statistically significant effect on the application of gendered stereotypes to average Black women. Nonetheless, there was no statistically significant effect based upon either of
the White perpetrator treatments. None of the treatments were significantly different from the control with regard to the application of gendered traits to elite Black women.

**Table 11: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Average Black Women on the Mammy Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female*</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female*</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male*</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

The degree to which the average Black woman is perceived in terms of the stereotypical Mammy image appears to be relatively susceptible to negative identity-based priming. As seen in Table 11, and in support of hypotheses H5c and H6b, with partial support for H6a, perceptions of average Black women as “Mammy” are not altered in a statistically significant manner in the context of the White male treatment, while they are decreased in a statistically significant way in the context of the other three treatments. Furthermore, based on the p-values, we can say with greater assurance that the Black female treatment brought about the reported effect, as compared to the Black male and White female treatments. In terms of the aforementioned partial support for H6a, which states that the White female and Black male treatments will have an effect on

---

12 The finding that the White male treatment did not affect the attribution of gendered stereotypes to average Black women supports H6b.
perceptions of Black women, but to a lesser extent than the Black female treatment, the magnitude of the difference of means for the White female treatment is lower than that for the two Black treatments. Nevertheless, these latter treatments have virtually the same magnitude for their differences of means. As such, H6a is supported in that all three of these treatments had an effect on perceptions of Black women, but it is not supported in that the Black female treatment did not clearly have a larger effect than the other two. Still, the level of statistical significance with regard to there being an apparent difference between the treatment and the control is stronger for the Black female treatment, thus supporting the theory of H6a.

In spite of these findings for perceptions of average Black women as “Mammy,” – i.e. compassionate, hardworking, [not] irresponsible, and trustworthy – these findings with regard to priming do not hold for elites. Table 12 demonstrates that, once again, the priming treatments did not have a meaningful effect on the perceptions of elite Black women. As such, this finding gives further weight to the two-fold argument that average and elite Black women are viewed as different from one another and those differences are so deeply felt that primes specific to the former have little to no effect on how the latter is seen. Notwithstanding this last component, Tables 15 and 16 will show that even though these Black women are viewed as distinct subtypes, they are still largely evaluated in the same direction for each set of stereotypes.
Table 12: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Elite Black Women on the Mammy Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

As noted in Table 13, in terms of ratings of average Black women as the “Welfare Queen,” the Black female treatment is the only one that has a strong and statistically significant effect on this perception. This finding supports H5d and H6b, but does not support H6a, which is the idea that priming that is not intersection-specific can still be effective in altering general perceptions of Black women as possessing “Welfare Queen” traits. The negative Black female treatment priming article about a woman shoplifting with her young child in tow, which includes a picture of a Black woman being arrested, calls forth the image of the unethical and lazy welfare queen, and this has a clear effect on how people evaluate social perceptions of average Black women. Interestingly, this treatment does not have the same effect in the context of social views regarding elite Black women.

---

13 The “Welfare Queen” index is composed of the following traits: aggressive, bossy, emotional, [not] hardworking, and unethical.
14 The priming articles and corresponding photos are found in Appendix B.
Table 13: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Average Black Women on the Welfare Queen Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female**</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

The results in Table 14 are particularly interesting given that there are no statistically significant differences of means for any of the treatments with regard to perceptions of elite Black women as the “Welfare Queen.” Given the strong effect of the Black female treatment on perceptions of average Black women, as seen in Table 13, and given the specificity of the index to ideas and stereotypes regarding Black women, it would be expected that this treatment would have some effect on views about elites from this group. This lack of a statistically significant effect further demonstrates that not only are average and elite Black women viewed as different, but also the priming treatments affect perceptions of these groups in different ways.

Table 14: Difference of Means Between the Control Group and Each Treatment Group for Elite Black Women on the Welfare Queen Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatments:</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Diff. of means</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black female</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black male</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the whole, it is apparent that the Black female priming treatment has a direct and statistically significant effect on each of the stereotype-based views at hand – race, gender, “Mammy,” and “Welfare Queen” – when considered in the context of the average Black woman. Consequently, priming by way of negative reporting of a story that is most often associated with average Black women has a negative effect on views concerning this group. Importantly, I find here that none of the treatments had a statistically significant effect on social beliefs regarding elite Black women. As such, especially in the case of the Black female treatment, articles that have the ability to prime negative views do not automatically have a clear and direct effect on views about all Black women. This demonstrates that elite Black females are viewed as distinct from the general population of their race-gender intersectional identity group; however, it is important to note they are not viewed in a more positive way than is the case for the control. To rephrase, the aggregated data does not show respondents rating average Black women below the mean ratings for the control group while rating elite Black women above the mean ratings for the control group. This suggests that people are not going out of their way to make grand distinctions between these groups. Consequently, people rate them as dissimilar, but not as opposites.

In spite of the fact that there were no statistically significant results regarding the effects of the priming treatments on views of elite Black women, there is an interesting
finding within these results. Although the results are not statistically significant, the Black male treatment – an article on a violent robbery – has the largest effect of depressing gendered and “Mammy” perceptions of elite Black women (see Tables 10 and 12). These two indices are composed of positive and relatively neutral traits. This finding does not apply in the case of the racialized and “Welfare Queen” indices (see Tables 8 and 14). As such, it appears that there may be a trend toward less positive evaluations of elite Black females when people are primed with negative information relating to Black males. This would mean that when traditional negative racial stereotypes are primed via negative messages concerning Black men, elite Black women are less likely to be rated as possessing positive traits; however, they are not more likely to be seen as possessing negative traits. Therefore, it may be possible to prime negative racialized views against elite Black women by way of attaching them to negative messages about Black men, with the result being that the former group is viewed less positively, though not more negatively, than might normally be expected.

Based on the results within these tables, there is significant support for H5a-d in the context of average Black women and very little support for H6a. The only context in which both the Black male and White female treatments had a significant effect on perceptions of average Black women was for the “Mammy” image. While the level of significance was stronger for the Black female treatments, the magnitude of the differences of means for the three treatments as compared to the control was not largely
varied. Additionally, the effect of the Black male treatment on gendered views of average Black women was stronger in magnitude and equal in statistical significance as compared to the effect of the Black female treatment, thus further rejecting this hypothesis. As expected in H6b, the White male treatment did not have effects on mean scores that are significantly different from those found within the control. This suggests that 1) the priming of negative stereotypes regarding White men does not have an effect on perceptions of Black women, and 2) the negative nature of the articles is not the sole factor that drives the differences between the mean scores for the control and the treatments.

4.4.2 Influence of the Black Female Treatment on Stereotypic Perceptions Regarding Both “Average” and “Elite” Black Females

Given these findings demonstrating that the use of priming specific to intersectional identity is often more effective than priming based on one traditionally-referenced identity, it is important to examine precisely when this form of priming has an effect on stereotypes. Tables 15 and 16 elucidate the factors that affect social stereotypical perceptions of both “average” and elite Black women. Table 15 demonstrates that the Black female treatment has a clear and significant effect on three of the four stereotypes concerning average Black women, thus supporting hypotheses

\[\text{15 Tables 25 and 26 in Appendix F include expanded regressions models for Tables 15 and 16.}\]
H5a, b, and d. This priming increases racialized and “Welfare Queen” perceptions while decreasing gendered perceptions.16

Table 15: OLS Regressions for the Priming Effects of the Black Female Treatment on Perceptions of Society’s Views of the Average Black Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Racialized Index</th>
<th>Gendered Index</th>
<th>Mammy Index</th>
<th>Welfare Queen Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female Treatment</td>
<td>1.80**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.03*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.68***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Soc. Ideo.</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Econ. Ideo.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Party ID</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj-R2</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

16 The Black female treatment decreases “Mammy “ perceptions of average Black women, but is not statistically significant. As such, this finding is in line with H1c but does not support it with a high enough degree of certainty (due to the lack of statistical significance).
In this way, negative implicit priming has the effect of increasing negative views and decreasing positive views of the general population of Black women. Consequently, when these negative messages are conveyed, they further connect average Black women to their race and further remove them from their gender. Additionally, these priming messages further connect them to the negative Black female stereotype image of the Welfare Queen.

Table 16 shows that the Black female priming treatment is not correlated to the attribution of any of the four stereotypes to elite Black women. This result addresses the question of whether the cognitive distinctions people make between “average” and “elite” Black women are so large as to influence the effectiveness of intersectional identity-based priming for these groups. Based on these results, it appears likely that the difference in social status between elite Black women and the Black woman pictured in the priming treatment may have been large enough to lead people to distinguish between the two groups to the point of not being influenced by an “unrelated” priming message. As such, given that elite Black women are more likely than the “average” Black woman to become a political candidate, these results suggest that, within the

---

17 Another possible reason as to why the Black female priming treatment did not have an effect on perceptions regarding elite Black females is that this image is not a prototype for one of the main identities people use for making judgments (e.g. “Black” or “Female”). While I have argued that intersectional identity based on non-dominant identities does lead to automatic stereotyping, it is also important to note the possibility that identities such as race and gender alone provide opportunities for quicker and stronger cognitive associations. Consequently, if an intersectional-based priming message does not fully match the intended target, it is possible that it will have less of an (or no) effect, particularly as compared to a single-
political arena, stereotype attribution for this group will be unaffected by priming that is highly targeted to negative stereotypes concerning its race- and gender-based intersectional identity.

Table 16: OLS Regressions for the Priming Effects of the Black Female Treatment on Perceptions of Society’s Views of the Elite Black Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Racialized Index</th>
<th>Gendered Index</th>
<th>Mammy Index</th>
<th>Welfare Queen Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female Treatment</td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>P&gt;</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.55***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>1.61**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Soc. Ideo.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Econ. Ideo.</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Party ID</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.47***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj-R2</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01
In addition to understanding the ways in which identity-specific priming has an effect on how Black women are perceived based on stereotypes, it is also important to better understand who is more likely to apply these stereotypes to this group. On the whole, as seen in Table 15, as age increases, people are more likely to think the general population of Black women is viewed in terms of (positive) gendered and “Mammy” traits, whereas they are less likely to view this group in terms of (negative) racialized and “Welfare Queen” traits. This is interesting in that conventional wisdom suggests that younger individuals are more likely to be liberal and positive in their views concerning racial minorities, whereas these results suggest the opposite could be true. On the other hand, this finding may merely demonstrate that younger populations have a more cynical view of social perceptions regarding race and gender in spite of the mitigating effects of elite social status. Notably, age does not come into play with regard to people’s perceptions of the attribution of these four sets of stereotypic traits in the context of views of elite Black women. In terms of social views regarding “average” Black women, Whites are far more likely to believe the former group is perceived in the context of racialized and “Welfare Queen” traits and less likely to believe the group is perceived in terms of highly feminized traits, thus demonstrating that there is a

---

18 With regard to perceptions concerning the general population of Black females, there are several groups of demographics that do not have a statistically significant effect: gender, income, education, and respondent political party identification. 19 Candis Smith (2011) also finds evidence that younger generations may hold stronger, more negative racial stereotypes than previously believed, and that their support for minority candidates may be due to the deracialized campaigns of the candidates as compared to support for ending racial disparities.
connection between race and racialized stereotyping for the general population. Results such as these demonstrate the necessity for multivariate analysis, in that it allows for greater insight into the ways in which seemingly stable perceptions vary in terms of salient identities and ideas.

In terms of social perceptions of both average and elite Black women, respondents’ income, education, and economic ideology do not have a statistically significant effect. Further, respondents’ economic ideology and whether they were born in the South do not alternatively affect their beliefs about society’s views of average Black women. Interestingly, unlike views concerning the general population, gender has an effect on perceptions of elite Black women. Women are less likely to say society views elite Black females in terms of racialized and “Welfare Queen” stereotypes and are more likely to say society views this group in terms of the “Mammy” stereotype. Additionally, as compared to all other regional groups, people born in the South are more likely to believe society applies racialized and “Welfare Queen” stereotypes to elite Black women. This finding seems to suggest that, generally speaking, for Southerners, the effects of elite status on Black women are significantly dampened with regard to negative, racially-charged perceptions. As such, it is possible that for those born in the South, there is little differentiation along class lines with regard to negative social views of Black females. Consequently, this provides evidence for the idea that people from the
South have a more traditional view of Blacks, by way of seeing them as a monolithic group that cannot or perhaps ought not be individuated.

As per the results in Table 16, those that are more socially conservative are more likely to find that society perceives elite Black women in a stereotypically negative manner – i.e. in terms of “Welfare Queen” traits. The “socially conservative” findings reflect the direction, though not the magnitude of the “born in the South” findings in terms of the Welfare Queen stereotype, which may mean individuals that are more socially conservative are less likely to make class-based distinctions among Black women in terms of negative traits. Further, it may be that those that are socially conservative have a more negative view of elite women in general, due to the fact that the social status of this group is in opposition to traditional female roles.

Finally, when people feel closer to the Republican Party and less close to the Democratic Party, the degree to which they believe society views both average and elite Black women in terms of the Mammy stereotype decreases. The same is the case with regard to perceptions of evaluations of elite Black women on gendered stereotypes, and those that feel closest to the Republican Party are most likely to think society views average Black women in highly racialized terms. As always with this data, it is important to remember that the respondents are responding in terms of what they believe society thinks, as opposed to their own personal views. As such, these responses give a broader view of how these groups are perceived, and give some insight into the
viewpoints of the people that surround the individuals that participated in the study. Consequently, we get a better sense of how various segments of the population perceive social norms and narratives.

4.4.3 Priming and Black Female Ideology

As stated earlier in H7, I claim that people who are exposed to negative primes specific to Black women will be more likely to view all Black women as socially and economically liberal, regardless of social status. This is due to the theory that even if people do not agree with a set of stereotypes that are primed, this priming process can still call forward other group-specific stereotypes that they are more likely to hold. In order to test this hypothesis, I run four OLS regression for the following dependent variables: Social Ideology(AvgBF), Social Ideology(EltBF), Economic Ideology(AvgBF), and Economic Ideology(EltBF). Tables 17 and 18 present the results of these regressions.

As seen earlier in my discussion of my regression models, in order to better determine what explains perceptions of Black female political ideology, I also include ratings of political ideologies of Black women delineated by social status and ratings of the applicability of racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes of Black women.
### Table 17: Influence of the Black Female Prime on Perceptions of the Ideological Leanings of Average Black Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soc Ideo - AvgBF</th>
<th>Economic Ideo - AvgBF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>p&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Female Treatment</strong></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soc Ideo - AvgBF</strong></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Econ Ideo - AvgBF</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.38</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soc Ideo - EltBF</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.22</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Econ Ideo - EltBF</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.10</strong></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racialized Index - AvgBF</strong></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gendered Index - AvgBF</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammy Index - AvgBF</strong></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WelQn Index - AvgBF</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.33</strong></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BornSouth</strong></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respon. Soc Ideo</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respon. Econ Ideo</strong></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respon. Party ID</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>constant</strong></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R2</strong></td>
<td>0.4111</td>
<td>0.4612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OLS Regression: *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

Further, I include the same control variables utilized in the stereotype index regressions.

Tables 17 and 18 show that, regardless of social status, I find support for H7 only in the context of beliefs regarding the economic ideology of Black women in the general population. The data do not support the theory that the priming of negative stereotypes regarding Black women can influence perceptions of the ideological leanings of all Black women on social issues. The finding that is of particular importance for this project is
that the Black female treatment had a statistically significant effect on social perceptions of elite Black women economic ideology. While the treatment had the expected effect for average Black women in that it caused people to view this group as more economically liberal, the treatment had precisely the opposite effect for elite Black women. This may show that the Black female treatment caused a major mental juxtaposition between the social status of the prime and the target: elite Black women. This sort of differentiation calls to mind the idea that elites are often more economically conservative, which may work toward explaining this finding. In that Black women generally are considered to be highly ideologically liberal, if this sort of priming actually decreases the degree to which people believe elite Black women are economically liberal, this may work in their favor if they choose to enter electoral politics, in that they may appear closer to the median voter.
Table 18: Influence of the Black Female Prime on Perceptions of the Ideological Leanings of Elite Black Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Ideo - EltBF</th>
<th>Economic Ideo - EltBF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>p&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female Treatment</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Ideo - AvgBF</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Ideo - AvgBF</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Ideo - EltBF</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Ideo - EltBF</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized Index - EltBF</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered Index - EltBF</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammy Index - EltBF</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WelQn Index - EltBF</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BornSouth</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon. Soc Ideo</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon. Econ Ideo</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon. Party ID</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R2</td>
<td>0.3653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OLS Regression: *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01

In terms of social perceptions of Black women, these results show that both social status groups are evaluated in the same direction in terms of political ideologies, in spite of the fact that they are viewed as distinct groups. As such, as social ideology increases for the average Black woman, it does the same for elite Black women. If people did not believe these groups to be interconnected on some deeper level, it is likely that there would be no relationship between these groups or even an inverse relationship for these
variables. With regard to the extent to which other stereotypes affect social views on Black female ideology, the only index that had a statistically significant effect on economic ideology was the “Welfare Queen” index. Once again, there is a clear connection between the views of Black women in relation to this stereotype trait and positions on economic ideology, and once again, they move in opposite directions. In Tables 15 and 16, an increase in respondents’ economic ideology increases the application of “welfare queen”-specific traits for average Black women, and decreases this application for elite Black women. In the case of Tables 17 and 18, the increased attribution of welfare queen traits to average Black women increases the degree to which they are seen as economically liberal, but the opposite is the case for elite Black women. These results further demonstrate the odd relationship between the two groups in that they are at once seen as similar and dissimilar, and it is the context of the matter at hand that determines in which direction they will be evaluated as compared to the other group.

Finally, very few controls had an effect on ratings of Black female political ideology. For average Black women, Whites see this group as more socially liberal, while women see the group as more economically liberal. For elite Black women, as respondent age increases, this group is seen as more socially liberal. As such, each of these demographic variables has the result of viewing Black female ideology in a highly stereotypical manner.
4.5 Conclusion

On the whole, the priming of negative stereotypes associated with the general population of Black women has a marked, negative effect on social perceptions of average Black women; however, this priming does not influence the way in which elite Black women are perceived in terms of stereotype traits. Interestingly, the Black female treatment did influence perceptions of elite Black female economic ideology, but not in the expected direction, thus refuting H7. Instead, when people received this negative priming, they were more likely to see this group as more economically conservative than was the case for the other priming treatments. As such, the image of an “average” Black woman being arrested brought forth in one particular context – economic ideology – the idea that elite Black women are highly dissimilar to average Black women.

With regard to the other hypotheses, I find support for H5a-d only in the context of the general population of the target group. I did not find support for these hypotheses for elite Black women because the priming treatments did not have an effect on racialized, gendered, and Black female stereotype image perceptions of this group. The largest priming effect on perceptions of elite Black women, though it was not statistically significant, came from the Black male treatments, which may be a result of the general belief that this group fits the prototypical image of negative racial (Black)
stereotypes. This treatment has an effect on the relatively positive indices, specifically the gendered and Mammy indices, thus suggesting that for evaluations of elite Black women, a cognitive linkage to a negative racialized image does not encourage people to view them more negatively on undesirable (Black) traits, but it does encourage them to not view them more positively on more desirable (Female) traits. The lack of statistical significance in the priming results concerning elite Black women further demonstrates that it is necessary to develop a better understanding of social views concerning elite Black women, in that these perceptions clearly differ from those concerning the average Black woman. As such, future research will have to be tailored to work toward finding negative images and stereotypes of elite Black women based on this research in order to determine how class-specific priming may have an effect on perceptions of this group.

If the Black female priming had a liberalizing effect on perceptions of elite Black female political ideology, then people may have been more likely to see Black female political candidates as more liberal and ideologically extreme, than they really are. This is a scenario that potentially has negative general election implications, and possible positive, Democratic primary election implications. In that this priming effect was not found, I must move forward toward determining more specifically the ways in which the voting public views Black female political candidates, as compared to Black female

\[20\] I did not find support for H6a with regard to elite Black women because the Black male and White female treatments did not have a statistically significant effect on the applications of stereotypes to the group in question. Nevertheless, I did find support for H6b in that the White male treatment did not have an effect on any of the elite Black female stereotype measures.
elites. I now have a strong foundation upon which to base my hypotheses concerning how society perceives and evaluates these political candidates, and I must determine how this may affect their electoral prospects.
5. Evaluations and Electoral Prospects of Black Female Political Candidates

The previous chapters worked toward demonstrating that differing degrees of stereotyping exist at various intersections of race and gender, and that these stereotypes can be influenced by way of priming. Each of these investigations was necessary in order to have a basis upon which to examine how the intersection of race and gender affects the evaluation of Black women in the political sphere. This chapter will work toward answering the following questions: How are Black women evaluated as political candidates and how successful are they in electoral contests? To what degree do stereotypes, prejudices, and demographics influence the evaluation and electoral prospects of Black female candidates?

5.1 Candidate Evaluation and Electoral Support

Throughout the majority of America’s history, society has not viewed racial minorities and women as adequately equipped to understand and handle politics, and thus these groups have not been fully incorporated into the political system. Another explanation for this lack of incorporation is that the majority of those in power have not wanted these subordinate groups to have the ability to implement policies that would reflect their sociopolitical interests, which were often in direct opposition to the interests

---

1 I define political incorporation as the degree to which a group is integrated into political institutions and spheres of influence. Traditionally, the U.S. denied the right to vote to non-Whites and women, and even when those rights were extended to these groups, there was a significant backlash and attempts to thwart these political rights. Also, in terms of political incorporation, these groups largely have been descriptively and substantively underrepresented in the electoral, judicial, and executive politics of the nation.
associated with elite White male dominance. Even once women and racial minorities gained this incorporation, society as a whole considered politics to be an inappropriate field for anyone that was non-male, as well as non-White. With regard to individuals’ views of the appropriate roles and positions of women in society, the private sphere has overwhelmingly dominated the consensus (Mandel, 1981; Swim et al, 1995; Dolan, 2005). Nevertheless, legal and social inequality have decreased, and over the years an increasing number of people say that women should have an equal role with men in conducting the business of the public sphere, and thus should have an equal role in society (Dolan, 2005). People are also increasingly supportive of the idea that there should be more women in government in general, with nearly 60 percent agreeing with this position in 2000, up from a little over 30 percent in 1975 (Dolan, 2005). This information may help to explain why there has been a somewhat steady and significant increase in female descriptive representation since the early 1970s; unfortunately, it does not help us to understand why that progress has leveled off at such a low level of representation. Consequently, it appears that there are still some mechanisms at work that are preventing individuals from both supporting and electing non-traditional candidates. In order to understand better how the stereotypes people hold regarding groups influence the electoral prospects of political candidates, we must examine the character of stereotyping in candidate evaluation.
5.1.1 Ideologies, Traits, and Policy Competencies as Candidate Evaluation

Huddy and Terkildsen (1993a) claim that people apply two types of stereotypes – belief and trait – in the context of gender. Belief stereotypes refer to ideologically-based orientations, while trait stereotypes refer to physical, emotional, and social traits. Examples of trait stereotypes include characteristics such as being caring, knowledgeable, and honest, while belief stereotypes include the degree to which an individual is believed to be liberal or conservative. McDermott (1998) notes that this is a useful categorization of stereotypes for the study of voters’ perceptions of political candidates. Trait stereotypes can directly affect whether individuals think a candidate will be competent regarding very specific social, economic, and security issues. Belief stereotypes have a similar effect, though it is filtered through a lens of beliefs regarding partisan interests and ideals (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993a).2 Given the broad nature of the term “ideology,” I further argue that differentiating “liberal” and “conservative” beliefs along both social and economic lines, as opposed to implicitly presuming ideology has one dimension, will provide a much more accurate picture of how people evaluate and apply stereotypes to political candidates concerning belief traits.3

---

2 A “liberal” stereotype can lead to the belief that a candidate is competent regarding social issues like poverty, while a “conservative” stereotype can lead to the belief that a candidate is competent regarding economic and/or security issues like taxation and foreign affairs.

3 Regarding social understandings of ideological stances, it is widely, intuitively understood that a liberal stance is one that is progressive and seeking change/reform of the status quo, while a conservative stance is one that seeks to maintain traditional views, values, and policies. As such, anti-abortion rights stances are viewed as socially conservative, while preference for increased monetary support to citizens from the government is seen as an economically liberal stance.
Another important means of analyzing ideas regarding belief stereotypes is the examination of perceptions of issue positions and issue competence of candidates. This allows for the assessment of a more direct link between well-defined stereotypes and candidate evaluations. Recent evidence suggests that belief stereotypes, particularly those specific to issue competence, have a clearly defined effect on female candidate evaluations and support, while the effects of trait stereotypes appear to be waning (Dolan, 2010). Nevertheless, more evidence on this topic is necessary before this idea can be definitively supported. It is also necessary to examine the effects of these various categories of stereotypes on candidate evaluations in the context of race and the intersection of race and gender (McDermott, 1998).

5.1.2 Stereotypes and Prejudices Concerning Groups and Candidates

Much of the literature regarding politics, stereotypes, and race and gender demonstrates that the general public associates relatively clearly defined sets of stereotypic beliefs and traits with minority and female candidates. These stereotypes vary in the degrees to which they are in line with or opposed to the desired characteristics of successful and “ideal” political candidates. In general, stereotypic beliefs about women and Blacks as candidates imply that they are ideologically liberal (McDermott, 1998). While it may often be the case that these individuals are

4 Characteristics of successful and “ideal” candidates include: having leadership skills, being trustworthy, being empathic, having integrity, and being competent. These characteristics factor into being “qualified” for holding office (Matland and King, 2002; Banducci et al, 2008; Adams et al., 2011).
ideologically liberal, the effect of this stereotype may be that female candidates and Black candidates are viewed as more liberal than their issue positions should suggest to voters.

Additionally, studies focusing on women and politics claim that female candidates are stereotypically perceived as passive, compassionate, and more trustworthy than men, while it is often presumed that Black candidates are compassionate toward the poor and minority groups, and less competent on most other political matters (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993b; McDermott, 1998; Dolan, 2005).

Schneider and Bos (2011) further state:

There are three different areas of stereotypes where the public could hold stereotypes of Black politicians: traits (e.g., Black politicians are more empathetic than White politicians), issue competencies (e.g., Black politicians are more capable to handle issues related to racial equality compared to White politicians), and beliefs or ideology (e.g., Black politicians are more liberal than White politicians) (4).

Neither stream of research, however, addresses how race and gender combine to influence voter perceptions of candidates. Arguably, Black female candidates are stigmatized and disadvantaged politically by stereotypic beliefs and traits that apply to their gender and ascribed racial group. Gordon and Miller (2005) provide evidence that demonstrates that candidates are evaluated differently regarding trait and issue position stereotypes at various intersections of race and gender. For example, Black female and Latina candidates are viewed as particularly sophisticated, and Black female candidates are viewed as most knowledgeable and competent in terms of civil rights issues.
Nonetheless, much more work needs to be conducted in this area by way of this intersectional approach.

Assessing the degree to which Black female political candidates are evaluated in a stereotypical manner is especially important in spite of the shift away from “old-fashioned” sexism and racism, given that scholars have demonstrated that stereotypes can influence judgments even when one disagrees with the content of a stereotype (Devine, 1989). Moreover, recent work has shown that even falsified stereotypes can affect one’s political evaluations by activating other traits and beliefs connected to the discredited stereotype (Berinsky and Mendelberg, 2005). By examining the influence of stereotypes on evaluations of Black female candidates, these findings may be extended to a variety of domains where stereotypic beliefs and traits about race and gender overlap.

Nevertheless, stereotypes that are applied to the candidates themselves – as measured by beliefs and traits – do not fully take into account the ways in which race- and gender-based prejudicial attitudes can directly influence electoral support. I have noted above that “old-fashioned” racism and sexism are much less acceptable in U.S. society; however, this does not mean that race- and gender-based prejudice are now absent from the public mind. Instead, somewhat more subtle forms of prejudice – such as modern sexism and racial resentment – are now just as pervasive and influential as earlier forms of prejudice (Dwyer et al., 2009). As examined and noted in Chapter 2 in greater depth, scholars find that a key element of these prejudicial views is that women and Blacks do not fully subscribe to important American core values and norms such as fairness, hard work, and individualism, which is evidenced by the fact that these groups
make demands upon the political system for “special treatment” (Schuman et al., 1997; Swim and Cohen, 1997; Kinder and Mendelberg, 2000) As such, people feel resentful of these groups because they are attempting to obtain influence and resources that they do not deserve (Kinder and Sanders, 1996; Swim et al., 1995; Dwyer et al., 2009; Wilson and Davis, 2011). Given that these negative prejudicial attitudes may be ubiquitously applied, and given that researchers have found evidence that perceptions regarding female and Black candidates are affected by these attitudes, it is reasonable to assume that these viewpoints could influence the way in which people evaluate Black female political candidates (Citrin, et al., 1990; Terkildsen, 1993; Sigelman et al., 1995; Reeves, 1997; Sanbonmatsu, 2002; Dwyer et al., 2009; Dolan, 2010).

Most studies concerning stereotypes of African Americans in politics implicitly assume that the stereotypes applied to the general population of this racial group are also uniformly applied to Black politicians. In support of my overarching argument that people are viewed and stereotyped based on the intersection of their socially salient identities, various academics have argued that the single identity approach is not the most accurate or useful one (Hugenberg, Blusiewicz, and Sacco, 2010; Schneider and Boss, 2011). Their evidence demonstrates that businesswomen and Black politicians are subtypes of women and Blacks, respectively. Consequently, there are differing sets of stereotypes that are applied to them that are not applied to the larger groups as a whole. As a result, and as I have demonstrated in earlier chapters, there is support for the idea that stereotypes are applied to differing degrees to “average” and “elite” Blacks and women. While I have provided support for the concept that people engage in
stereotyping in an intersectional manner, there is another specific and largely
unexplored dimension that needs to be addressed more directly in the political context:
skin tone.

5.1.3 Skin tone

Studies concerning the effects of skin tone on perceptions and outcomes for
Blacks have largely focused on socioeconomic issues. Very few have examined skin tone
in the political context in a systematic manner (for exceptions, see Terkildsen, 1993 and
Weaver, 2011). It has long been recognized within the African-American community
that individuals with a lighter complexion have been preferred both within the
community and within the broader society more generally. While most recognize that
Blacks can range nearly the full skin complexion spectrum due to the pervasiveness of
the “one-drop rule” (Davis, 1991), there is also a deeper recognition that various
meanings are also ascribed to these skin tone variations. Hunter (2002) notes that light
skin among Black women predicts higher educational attainment, higher personal
earnings, and higher spousal status. She attributes this to the linking of lighter skin to
beauty for women of color. As such, “light skin works as a form of social capital for
women,” which is often converted to economic, educational, and additional brands of
social capital, all of which is based upon historic colonial racial hierarchies (Hunter,
2002: 177). Further, skin tone is more important for evaluations of the attractiveness of
Black women as compared to Black men, given that light skin is linked to conceptions of
femininity (Hill, 2002).
Consequently, “the social and psychological penalties tied to dark skin are substantially greater for women than for men” (Hill, 2002: 88). This suggests that not only does “gendered colorism” exist within our society for Blacks, but also that it is internalized in ways that are likely to be detrimental (Hill 2002). This colorism “can operate independently from racism; two people in the same racial group can experience different treatment by complexion while both being subject to discrimination by race” (Weaver, 2011: 5). As such, it is possible for racism and colorism to interact to influence how people evaluate non-Whites. Nevertheless, it appears that there are “pronounced cohort declines in educational skin tone differentials, and both cohort and period declines in labor market outcomes” (Gullickson, 2005: 157). As such, there is a real possibility that there is a decline in the socioeconomic effects of skin tone. This would suggest that we should expect fewer differences in socioeconomic status based on skin tone, though these data are far from definitive and not delineated in terms of the effects of gender (Gullickson, 2005).

Two theories as to why we may see a decrease in the ties between socioeconomic outcomes and skin color are: 1) the Civil Rights and “Black is Beautiful” movements have decreased intra-group skin tone valuation and discrimination among Blacks; and 2) with decreased institutional segregation, Whites – rather than light-skinned Black business owners, for example – directly hold more power over educational and occupational life chances for Blacks and it is possible that Whites differentiate, and thus

5 Colorism refers to discrimination and prejudicial judgments based on gradations of skin color and physical features, with lighter complexions favored over dark ones and European facial and body features favored over all others (Harris, 2008; Weaver, 2011).
discriminate, less in terms of Black skin tone (Gullickson, 2005). The first idea suggests that the skin tone hierarchy within the Black community is declining, while the second suggests that this hierarchy may have remained in place, but that it is no longer as influential in the socioeconomic outcomes of Blacks due to shifting institutional structures. While these are both plausible theories, I am reluctant to either a) attribute an overwhelming amount of power to the internal skin tone hierarchy, or b) claim that Whites do not ascribe meaning to Black skin tone variation.

In spite of the fact that we do have empirical evidence concerning the effects of skin tone among Blacks, we have little information on “skin tone preferences among Whites” (Gullickson, 2005: 159). Gullickson claims that Blacks are far more likely and able than Whites to perceive variations in Black skin tone; however, Terkildsen (1993) presents evidence demonstrating that Whites evaluate political candidates with darker skin more harshly. This latter finding may relate back to the creation of a “buffer” class of “mulattoes” in portions of the ante- and post-bellum South (Davis, 1991; Gullickson, 2005). Portions of White society viewed individuals with lighter complexion as more acceptable than those with darker skin; as such, Blacks with lighter skin were allowed to gain various crafting skills that afforded them slightly greater socioeconomic opportunities as compared to other Blacks. As such, this suggests that colorism also exists in terms of how Whites perceive Blacks (Weaver, 2011). In this way, it is likely that skin tone has an effect on how all of society, regardless of race, evaluates racial minorities. Consequently, even if it is the case that skin tone is decreasing in its significance as a predictor of socioeconomic outcomes, this information still sheds little
light on how people perceive and apply stereotypes to Blacks based on their pigmentation, especially in the political context.

As stated above, extant empirical research tells us very little about the connection between Black skin tone variations and electoral outcomes. In spite of Terkildsen’s (1993) findings that skin tone has direct effects on candidate evaluation and vote choice, few researchers have incorporated this important factor into their examinations of race and electoral politics. Terkildsen argues:

…when asked to evaluate a light-skinned Black candidate, the activated stereotype may be more likely to remain in the nonconscious realm because prejudiced voters are unaware that a racial stereotype has been triggered and will play a role in later political judgments, not because they are oblivious to the politician’s ethnicity (1993: 1036). [emphasis added]

In this way, differences in skin color of Black candidates can serve to increase respondents’ awareness that racialized stereotypes are being triggered. As such, the presence of a dark-skinned candidate may activate the need to provide socially desirable responses with regard to stereotypes. In spite of this argument, both Terkildsen (1993) and Weaver (2011) find evidence that fictitious Black candidates with darker skin tones are penalized electorally due to their complexion, and the evaluations of candidates with darker complexion are less positive than those of candidates with lighter pigmentation. As such, there is evidence supporting the idea that colorism has a clear and direct effect on electoral politics.
5.2 Theory and Hypotheses

5.2.1 Candidate Evaluation

As demonstrated above, when people evaluate candidates for political office, they often think in terms of the candidates’ ideologies, traits, and competencies. Given that women and Blacks are viewed as ideologically liberal, it is probable that Black women are seen as even more liberal than either of these groups on their own. As such, I hypothesize that:

H8: Black female candidates will be viewed as more socially and economically liberal than Black male, White female, and White male candidates.

If it is the case that Black women running for political office are considered to be extremely liberal relative to other groups, this may give them an advantage in Democratic primary elections while leaving them at a disadvantage in Republican primaries, due to the preference for ideological extremes within these electoral contests.

As with the stereotypical views of candidates and ideology, there are specific traits and issue competencies that people consider to be connected to the race and gender of particular identity groups. Women are largely seen as compassionate, cooperative, ethical, and trustworthy, while Blacks in elite positions are seen as more compassionate than others, less competent, and less trustworthy. As noted in evidence from chapter 3, elite Black women call to mind feminine traits such as trustworthiness and compassion, to a greater degree than other elites, which may prove to create an electoral advantage for this group if these traits are also applicable to Black female political candidates. Additionally, there are policy areas that people consider to be
gender issues, such as education, healthcare, and ethics, and race issues, such as civil rights and welfare (McDermott, 1998; Gordon and Miller, 2005). Conversely, there are policy issues about which people believe non-Whites and women to be incompetent, e.g. the economy, jobs, national security, and the military (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993b; Dolan, 2005). Consequently, I will test the following hypotheses:

H9: Black female candidates will be rated as more trustworthy and compassionate than their opponents.

H10: Black female candidates will be rated higher than their opponents on race and gender issue competency and lower on policy competencies.

5.2.2 Skin Tone

Given the favored status of lighter skin over darker, it is likely that Black female candidates with lighter complexion will be at an electoral advantage as compared to those with darker pigmentation. Nevertheless, given the more explicit racial cues that may occur due to the presence of darker skin, it is also likely that respondents will not want to be seen as providing biased evaluations. As such, and in line with Terkildsen’s (1993) argument, it is expected that respondents will evaluate the dark-skinned Black female candidate more positively than they do light-skinned candidate, even while they demonstrate a preference for the latter candidate.

H11a: In comparison to one another, light-skinned Black female candidates will be rated lower on trait and competency issues than dark-skinned Black female candidates.

H11b: In comparison to their opponents, light-skinned Black female candidates will be rated more positively on trait and “non-Black” and “non-female” policy competency issues than dark-skinned Black females,
H11c: Light-skinned Black women will perform better electorally than dark-skinned Black women.

5.2.3 Vote Choice

With regard to the electoral prospects of Black female candidates, I argue that the aforementioned stereotypical beliefs that come in the form of race- and gender-based prejudice, voter policy preferences and perceptions of candidate policy competence, and perceptions of personal candidate traits will all influence the probability of voting for a Black woman for political office. As such, I posit the following hypotheses for these three stereotype areas, based upon the previously discussed theories:

Race- and Gender-based Prejudice:

H12: As race- and gender-based prejudice increases, respondents will be less likely to vote for the Black female candidate.

Voter Policy Preference and Candidate Policy Competence:

H13a: Respondents that value economic and security policies the most will be less likely to vote for the Black female candidate.

H13b: Respondents that value race and gender issue policies the most will be more likely to vote for the Black female candidate.

H13c: As Black female candidates are rated as increasingly competent on economic/security and race/gender issues, they will be more likely to receive voter support.

Ideal Candidate Traits:

H14a: Respondents that rate Black female candidates highly on ideal political candidate traits will be more likely to vote for them.
H14b: Respondents that believe Black female candidates will represent the interests of many groups within the constituency will be more likely to vote for them.

5.3 Data and Methods

5.3.1 Candidate Evaluation and Mock Election Instrument

This chapter draws on data from my 2012 Political Candidate Evaluations and Social Beliefs Survey. The survey is designed to examine the ways in which Black female candidates are affected by stereotypes and I examine the degree to which variation in skin color has an effect on those stereotypes. The Qualtrics Survey Panel Management system administered the survey experiment to respondents from February 6-9, 2012. The subject population of 335 respondents is made up of individuals between the ages of 18 and 79, and is relatively representative of the United States population in terms of gender, race, income, education, and geography.6

The survey begins with questions regarding respondents’ personal political policy area preferences and their preferences regarding various traits of political candidates. Respondents are then randomly assigned to one (1) of three (3) candidate pairings in each of two (2) sets of candidate evaluation/mock elections. In Set 1 and Set 2, respondents are randomly assigned into one of the following election-scenarios: 1) Black female vs. White male (Set 1: n=111; Set 2: n=106), 2) Black female vs. White female (Set 1: n=109; Set 2: n=110), 3) Black female vs. Black male (Set 1: n=115; Set 2: n=119).

6 The Qualtrics Survey Panel Management system utilizes an outside survey company, Clearvoice Research, in order to recruit and compensate subjects for the surveys that Qualtrics administers.
The difference between the sets is the skin color of the Black female candidate (Set 1: “light-skin” Black female; Set 2: “dark-skin” Black female). The order in which respondents see “Set 1” and “Set 2” also is randomly sorted. Given this set-up, each respondent participates in two mock elections: one with a dark-skinned Black female and one with a light-skinned Black female.

Within each set, respondents are presented with photographs and biographical histories of two fictitious candidates. In Set 1, respondents see two candidates side-by-side, and these are candidates “A” – a Black woman with a lighter complexion – and “B” – either a White male, White female, or Black male. Set 2 includes candidates “C” – a Black woman with a darker complexion – and “D” – either a White male, White female, or Black male. By holding constant the attributes of the opponents, I am able to extract the intersectional influence of an opponent’s race and gender.

Prior to engaging in the elections and evaluations, subjects choose whether they will participate in a mock Democratic or Republican primary election for a seat in the United States House of Representatives. By utilizing a primary election, I am able to control for the influence of beliefs concerning the presumed party identification and political ideological leanings of Black female candidates. Further, this allows me to

---

7 The format for the biographical histories of the fictional candidates is based on the structure of candidate information broadly disseminated by mail before an election in a local election periodical. The photographs that are used within the study are publicly available (via internet searches) photographs of elected officials and attorneys that are roughly equal in composition (photos of these groups were chosen given that they are the most likely to run for office and to be seen as believable candidates [i.e. elite professionals]). The photographs are of individuals that are not well-known nationally, as to not add existing bias to respondents’ views of the fictitious candidates.

8 The education level, occupation level, and political experience of each candidate are roughly equal. For descriptions of each candidate, refer to Appendix C.
determine the degree to which Black women are favored or disadvantaged by the individuals that are likely to support each party. With regard to the evaluation itself, respondents are asked to evaluate the degree to which they believe each candidate holds a particular set of traits and ideologies, the degree to which they will represent everyone in a constituency, and the degree to which the candidates will be competent on policy issues. At the end of the survey, respondents provide information regarding their personal political engagement, demographics, and political beliefs.

With regard to ideology, respondents were asked to place each candidate on 7-point scales for social and economic issues, with “1” being “liberal” and “7” being “conservative.” The examples provided as social issues were capital punishment, gay marriage, and abortion, and the examples provided for economic issues were government spending and tax policy. Additionally, respondents rated each candidate on the degree to which it was likely that s/he holds each of nine traits, and the degree to which each candidate was likely to be competent concerning nine policy issues. In order to further examine the effects of voter policy preferences and perceptions of Black female candidates’ policy competencies on their electoral prospects, I created Economy/Security and Race/Gender indices for both of these issues. As such, the Economy/Security voter policy preferences index measures the degree to which people

---

9 These traits and policy competencies are directly connected to the earlier questions regarding the respondents’ personal political policy preferences and their preferences concerning the traits of political representatives. The nine traits include: assertive, compassionate, competence, cooperative, diligent/hardworking, ethical, intelligent, responsible, and trustworthy (notably, each of these traits is positive in nature). These traits also correspond with the traits I employed in the 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey, which I utilized in earlier chapters. The nine policy competency areas include: civil rights, economy, education, environment, ethics in government, immigration, jobs, national security/military, and welfare.
placed five economy and national security policies in their top five policies that would influence their vote choice in 2012 elections. I employed the same method to create the Race/Gender voter policy preferences index, with four race and gender issue policies. To create the candidate policy competencies indices, I included the following measures:

**Candidate Economy/Security Competence** = Economy + Jobs + National Security/Military;

**Candidate Race/Gender Competence** = Civil Rights + Education + Ethics + Welfare.

The descriptions of the candidates purposefully omit information that refers to their policy positions and beliefs. By doing this, I am able to avoid the conflation of candidates’ purported views and respondents’ perceptions of them based upon preconceived notions connected to the candidates’ appearances. Additionally, many previous candidate evaluation surveys ask subjects only to provide their perceptions concerning one candidate; however, this survey gives respondents the opportunity to examine two potential candidates side-by-side and make their judgments in a comparative way for both candidates. This allows for greater insight into how people view Black female candidates in comparison to individuals from other groups (Weaver, 2011).

In order to examine the ways in which respondents’ prejudicial views have an effect on candidate evaluation, they will answer questions from racial resentment, explicit racial resentment, and modern sexism scales:

*Racial Resentment:*
Kinder and Sanders (1996) note the waning, though not disappearing, influence of traditional, “old-fashioned” biological racism in social perceptions, and the rising prevalence of “‘subtle hostility’ toward Blacks,” which is largely driven by continuing racial prejudice (106). In order to identify and measure this changing expression of anti-Black sentiment, Kinder and Sanders develop a series of statements to which people may agree or disagree to varying levels – e.g. “It’s really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as Whites” (106).\textsuperscript{10} Respondents rate these statements on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

While the concept of racial resentment is widely accepted as a useful measure of racial prejudice, one of the arguments against this measure is that it conflates ideologies and normative values, such as individualism and fair play, with racism. Kinder and Sanders (1996) note that these ideologies are inherently racialized, but they also demonstrate that the effects of racial resentment measures do not fall away when controlling for ideological measures that are race-neutral.

*Explicit Racial Resentment:*

Wilson and Davis (2011) support the concept of racial resentment as an appropriate indicator of racial prejudice, but they believe that it should be operationalized in a way that can capture better the “resentment” aspect of the concept. In order to do this, they have created a distinct *Explicit Racial Resentment* scale (EXR).

\textsuperscript{10} The other Racial Resentment measures used in this survey can be found in Appendix E.
They note that their measurements “mainly differ from past resentment measures in their explicit connection between the source of the resentful feelings and the targeted racial group” (Wilson and Davis, 2011: 121). In this way, they are able to more directly tie together the degree to which people feel resentment toward African Americans due to the idea that this group gets undeserved special treatment.11

*Modern Sexism:*

Earlier in this chapter I noted that the aforementioned prejudicial views pertaining to race are also applied to gender. Previously, biological sexism was the norm with regard to social perceptions of women, but the acceptability of these views has diminished. In their place scholars have found that more subtle forms of sexism have invaded the public mind:

Thus people, while rejecting old-fashioned discrimination and stereotypes, may believe that discrimination against women is a thing of the past, feel antagonistic toward women who are making political and economic demands, and feel resentment about special favors for women, such as policies designed to help women in academics or work. (Swim et al, 1995: 200)

In this way, people can continue to hold anti-woman viewpoints without feeling as though they hold prejudices specific to gender. In order to measure this phenomenon, Swim et al. (1995) developed the *Modern Sexism* scale. The items within this scale

---

11 The EXR scale consists of the following four statements/questions, each of which is measured on a four-point scale, from no agreement to high agreement (for greater detail, see Appendix E): 1) *I resent all of the special attention/favors that African Americans receive; other Americans like me have problems too.*; 2) *African Americans should not need any special privileges when slavery and racism are things of the past.*; 3) *How concerned are you that the special privileges for African Americans place you at an unfair disadvantage when you have done nothing to harm them?*; 4) *For African Americans to succeed they need to stop using racism as an excuse.*
measure three factors of which attitudes related to modern sexism views are composed: 1) denial of continuing sexism; 2) antagonism toward women’s demands; and 3) resentment about special favors for women (Swim et al, 1995).\textsuperscript{12}

In order to test the aforementioned candidate evaluation hypotheses (H8-10), I utilize t-tests to examine the difference of means between the Black female candidates and their opponents in terms of the evaluation of their ideologies, traits, and competencies. In the case of the latter two, I aggregate the data for the three opponents of the Black female with a lighter complexion and do the same for the opponents of the Black female with a darker complexion. As to evaluate the skin tone hypotheses encompassed in H11, I utilize the aforementioned data. Further, I examine the percentage of the respondents that would vote for the Black female candidate, delineated by skin color, and percentages concerning whether the Black female candidate is most likely to be elected, all delineated by skin tone. Finally, to test the remaining vote choice hypotheses (H12-14), I run three separate logistic regression models for two binary dependent variables: Vote for Dark-skinned Black Female Candidate and Vote for Light-skinned Black Female Candidate. Only the responses of White subjects are utilized for these regressions, particularly given the small number of non-Whites in the dataset. The models are found below:

\textsuperscript{12} Details of the wording of the eight measures of modern sexism that are included within this survey can be found in Appendix E. Respondents rate these statements on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.
Model 1 (Race and Gender Prejudices): This model is designed to test the effects of racial resentment and modern sexism on the likelihood of voting for a Black female candidate. This is designed to test H12:

\[
\text{Vote for Black Female Candidate} = B_1(\text{Racial Resentment}) + B_2(\text{Explicit Racial Resentment}) + B_3(\text{Modern Sexism}) + \text{Constant}
\]

Model 2 (Voter Policy Preferences and Candidate Traits and Policy Competencies): This model is designed to test the effects of respondent policy preferences, attributed candidate traits, and attributed candidate policy competencies on the likelihood of voting for a Black female candidate. This is designed to test H13a-b and H14a-b:

\[
\text{Vote for Black Female Candidate} = B_1(\text{EconSecurPolImport}) + B_2(\text{RaceGenderPolImport}) + B_3(\text{CandidComptEconSecur}) + B_4(\text{CandidComptRaceGender}) + B_5(\text{CandidIdealTraits}) + B_6(\text{CandidRepresent}) + B_7(\text{CandidSocIdeo}) + B_8(\text{CandidEconIdeo}) + \text{Constant}
\]

Model 3 (Full): This is a full model to explain the likelihood of voting for the Black female candidate. It includes all of the prejudice, trait, and competency variables from Models 1 and 2. It also incorporates the following control variables: White, Female, Age, Born in the South, Income, Education, Respondent Social Ideology, Respondent Economic Ideology, and Respondent Party ID. This model is designed to further test H12-H14:
Vote for Black Female Candidate = $B_1$(Racial Resentment) 
+ $B_2$(Explicit Racial Resentment) 
+ $B_3$(Modern Sexism) 
+ $B_4$(EconSecurPolImport) 
+ $B_5$(RaceGenderPolImport) 
+ $B_6$(CandidComptEconSecur) 
+ $B_7$(CandidComptRaceGender) 
+ $B_8$(CandidIdealTraits) 
+ $B_9$(CandidRepresent) 
+ $B_{10}$(CandidSocIdeo) 
+ $B_{11}$(CandidEconIdeo) 
+ $B_{12-19}$(Controls) + Constant

5.4 Results and Analysis

The results found in Figures 17 through 20 provide support for my first hypothesis, which argues that Black female candidates are considered as more ideologically liberal than all other groups at the intersection of race – Black/White – and gender – Female/Male.
5.4.1 Candidate Evaluation: Social Ideology

*\(p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01\)

**Figure 17: Mean Ratings of Social Ideology of Black Female Candidate with Light Complexion**

Figures 17 and 18 demonstrate that Black female candidates are viewed as more liberal than their opponents on social issues such as capital punishment, gay marriage, and abortion. Further, this finding stands regardless of the complexion of the Black female candidate. In order to establish whether the Black female candidates were rated in a way that was distinct from their opponents, I conducted t-tests to determine whether the difference between the mean scores was statistically significant. With regard to the light-skinned candidate, there were two contests in which she was viewed as clearly more liberal in terms of social ideology: the elections against the White male candidate.
and the Black male. While, on average, the Black woman was rated as more liberal than
the White woman, the difference between the two candidates in the context of the
distribution of the responses is not sufficient to claim with certainty that these groups
are viewed as distinct in terms of social ideology. Consequently, based upon this
evidence, when a man runs against a Black female with light pigmentation, she is
perceived to be comparatively ideologically liberal on social matters.

Interestingly, the dark-skinned Black female was only clearly rated as distinctly
more liberal in terms of social ideology in the contest against the Black male candidate.
Regarding the mean scores on their own, this Black female candidate was rated as more
liberal on this scale, but in the contests against the two White candidates, the difference
of means between the Black female and these candidates was not statistically significant.
Of particular note is that there is very little difference between this Black female
candidate and her White male opponent in terms of either social or economic issues, as
seen in Figures 18 and 20. There are two main possibilities in terms of explaining this
phenomenon. The first explanation is that, in support of Terkildsen’s (1993) theory
which is at the base of my H11a, the presence of a darker complexion, particularly in
contrast to a White male, calls forward the recognition that one’s ratings may appear to
be race-based. As such, people may go out of their way to show that they do not differentiate
along the lines of race. While it seems highly unlikely, the other explanation is that there
was some quality within the photograph of the White male candidate that suggested he
was particularly liberal. In that all of the photographs were roughly the same in terms
of physical composition and the apparent age of the candidates, there is no clear reason as to why this second explanation would be plausible.

*\( p < .10; \) **\( p < .05; \) ***\( p < .01 \)

Figure 18: Mean Ratings of Social Ideology of Black Female Candidate with Dark Complexion

5.4.2 Candidate Evaluation: Economic Ideology

Figures 19 and 20 show that Black female candidates are viewed as more liberal than their opponents on economic issues such as government spending and tax policy. Further, this finding stands regardless of the complexion of the Black female candidate. The results concerning ratings of economic ideology are largely similar to those for social ideology. Again, for the light-skinned candidate, the largest difference between the mean scores occurs in the contests against males. In contrast to the ratings of social
ideology, the difference between the Black female and White female candidates is statistically significant in terms of economic ideology.

*Figure 19: Mean Ratings of Economic Ideology of Black Female Candidate with Light Complexion*

*Once again, in the context of the darker Black woman, the only difference of means that is statistically significant is the contest against the Black male. In this way, I argue that the results demonstrate a reluctance to differentiate along the lines of ideology when a darker Black woman is running against a White candidate. Conversely, people are more apt to differentiate between male and female in the context of their perceptions of light-skinned Black female ideological leanings.*
Figure 20: Mean Ratings of Economic Ideology of Black Female Candidate with Dark Complexion

5.4.3 Perceptions of Candidate Traits

The data in Figures 17 through 20 provide results concerning belief stereotypes about Black female running of political office, and these results support my hypothesis, H8, that Black women political candidates are considered to be more socially and economically liberal than White males, White females, and Black males. Tables 19 and 20 provide information on the degree to which people hold various trait stereotypes about Black female politicians. In order to understand better the degree to which particular traits are attributed to Black women in electoral contests, I conducted t-tests to compare the mean scores of the Black female candidates and their opponents. With
regard to the lighter Black woman, there are three traits for which this candidate is considered to be markedly different from her opponents: assertive, intelligent, and trustworthy. The difference of means between the main candidate and her opponents is statistically significant for these three traits. The Black female in these electoral contests is seen as less assertive, more intelligent, and less trustworthy than her opponents. When examining the Black female candidate with darker skin in comparison to her challengers, she is viewed in even more of a negative light. This finding demonstrates that skin tone still matters in terms of how society perceives Black women. The female candidate with a darker complexion is seen as less compassionate, cooperative, ethical, and trustworthy than her opponent. Interestingly, her mean scores on all of the traits are higher than the mean scores for her lighter counterpart. Consequently, these results do not support for my hypotheses H9, and provide tentative support for H11a and H11b, as explained below.

In H9, I argue that Black women running for political office are viewed as more trustworthy and compassionate than their opponents, given that elite Black women are seen as holding these traits to a greater degree than other elites, as shown in Chapter 3. Nevertheless, both of the Black women within the mock elections were rated as significantly less trustworthy than their opponents, and the Black female with darker skin was rated as significantly less compassionate. This finding suggests that on some level, there is a degree of differentiation between Black women that are elites – i.e. the most socially and politically successful – and those that are political candidates. This finding matches an assumption by Schneider and Bos (2011) that Black elites and Black
politicians may be separate subtypes of the larger racial group. Nonetheless, given that
the definition used for “elite” within my survey includes the caveat of political success,
it is reasonable to conclude that “elite” and “political candidate” are largely understood
and evaluated in a similar light in this project.
Table 19: Difference of Means of Trait Ratings of Black Female Candidates and Their Opponents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Light Skin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dark Skin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Female Candidate</td>
<td>Opponent</td>
<td>Diff of means</td>
<td>t =</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Black Female Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01; The difference of means scores may not match the Black female candidates’ and opponents’ scores due to rounding.
In H11a I argue that Black women with a light complexion will be rated lower on traits than those with a dark complexion, due to the likelihood that when people see a darker complexion they will be somewhat more aware of the possibility that their evaluations could be interpreted by society as being based on race (Terkildsen, 1993). As such, this feeling among respondents could encourage them to rate the darker candidate higher in terms of personal traits than they would the lighter candidate. I find support for this hypothesis in that the mean scores for the politician with darker pigmentation were higher than those for the lighter Black woman. Nevertheless, when comparing the Black women with their opponents, the latter candidate is rated lower on fewer traits than the former. This finding supports H11b, which argues that as compared to opponents, the lighter Black female will be rated more positively than her counterpart with darker pigmentation. Further, in terms of comparisons to opponents, the lighter Black woman is also rated more positively in terms of the trait of intelligence, whereas the darker Black woman is not rated higher than her opponent to a significant degree on any of the traits in question. As such, when comparing the two Black female candidates, while the one with a darker complexion has higher ratings than the one with a lighter complexion, the woman with a lighter complexion is rated more positively in comparison to her opponent than is the case for her Black female counterpart.

*65 In spite of implicit racial priming by way of pictures, it is possible that a darker complexion sends a slightly more explicit racial cue, thus resulting in this effect.*
5.4.4 Perceptions of Candidate Policy Competencies

While voters are certainly interested in the personal characteristics of their political representatives, which can be defined by way of the traits they hold, voters are also highly concerned about the degree to which their representatives are competent on a wide variety of policy issues. As noted earlier, particular policy areas such as civil rights, education, ethics, and welfare are often viewed as women’s and African Americans’ issues, while policy areas such as the economy, jobs, and national security and the military are often considered to be issues about which women and racial and ethnic minorities have little to no capacity for competence (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993b; Dolan, 2005). In H10 I argue that Black female candidates will be seen as more competent on the former issues than their opponents and less competent on the latter policy areas due to racialized and gendered stereotyping. The opponent mean scores in Table 20 are composed of aggregated data from the three opponents in each contest.66

As such, I am treating the White male, White female, and Black male candidates as though I expect each of them to have similar ratings in relation to the ratings for their Black female opponent. Further, I expect the direction of the difference of means for the contests for both Black female candidates to be the same.

The data in Table 20 provide uneven support for H10, H11a, and H11b. In terms of race and gender policy area interests and both of the Black women running for office, they are both seen as more competent on the issue of welfare, which is to be expected

66 In this way, I have condensed the Black female v. White male, Black female v. White female, and Black female v. Black male data into Black female v. Opponent.
given the widespread nature of the stereotype that Black women are largely dependent upon welfare. Only the light Black female is seen as more competent on civil rights issues and there is divergence on the applicability of competence on the issue of ethics, in that the lighter Black woman is seen as more competent and the darker Black woman is seen as less competent than their opponents. This last finding reflects the data from Table 19 that show the darker Black woman is seen as less ethical than her challenger. Unexpectedly, neither of the Black women was considered to be more competent concerning issues of education, which is generally viewed as a women’s issue. As such, in the case of this policy area, it is possible that Black women are perceived more in terms of their race than in terms of their gender. Given each of these findings, I can claim that for issues viewed as belonging to Black women, such as welfare, this group is widely seen as competent, and for issues that are viewed mostly in terms of one identity, the results are mixed. With regard to H10, these data partially support this hypothesis in that the lighter Black woman is seen as more competent on the “Black” and “female” policies of civil rights, ethics, and welfare, while the darker Black woman is only seen as more knowledgeable on issues of welfare.
Table 20: Difference of Means of Policy Competency Ratings of Black Female Candidates and Their Opponents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Light Skin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dark Skin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Opponent</td>
<td>Diff of</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Opponent</td>
<td>Diff of</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>-0.59***</td>
<td>-5.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
<td>-3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Military</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>-0.64***</td>
<td>-6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01; The difference of means scores may not match the Black female candidates’ and opponents’ scores due to rounding.
In full support of H10, the Black female candidates are seen as less competent on issues that are highly associated with White males and/or the Republican party, such as the economy, jobs, and national security/military. Black women are furthest from White men in terms of the combination of their racial and gender identities, and Black women are seen as more liberal than the other three groups in this study. Consequently, it is not surprising to find that these facts can help to explain why this group is seen as less adept at handling these issues.

Notably, with the exception of the policy issue of ethics, the mean scores for the dark-skinned Black female were higher than those for the light-skinned Black female on race and gender issues, whereas the reverse is the case for the economy, jobs, and security/military. As such, these data partially support H11a, which assumes that Black women with a darker complexion will be rated higher than their lighter counterparts on all trait and competency issues. Instead, while the former often have higher mean scores, the latter outperform them on issues that are not seen as belonging to Black women. As such, Black women with a stronger physical racial appeal by way of their complexion call to mind a connection between their group and competency on African American and women’s issues, and consequently, a lack of competency on other issues. This result supports the H11b condition that Black women with lighter skin are rated higher on economy and security than those with darker skin; however, the results do not fully support the hypothesis given that they do not stand in the context of comparisons with the Black female candidates’ challengers. Nevertheless, regardless of skin tone,
when compared with electoral opponents, Black women on the whole are mainly seen as more knowledgeable on race and gender policy areas and less competent on those policy areas relating to commerce and security. Overall, with regard to the issue of candidate policy competency, the evaluation of a Black woman’s knowledge, capability, and skill is tied to the types of policies at hand in conjunction with her skin tone, whereas when personal traits are considered, the evaluations are mainly associated with her skin tone rather than the varieties of traits.

5.4.5 Electoral Prospects of Black Female Candidates and Perceptions of Their Electability

In that it is important to understand the degree to which stereotypes drive descriptive underrepresentation for Black women, it is necessary to determine whether and when Black women might have an electoral advantage or disadvantage. In each of the three possible elections with the light-skinned Black female, she was overwhelmingly favored as the candidate of choice, as seen in Figure 21. By contrast, in each contest with the dark-skinned Black woman, she was overwhelmingly rejected as the appropriate candidate for the seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, with her worst performance against the White female challenger (Figure 23). While the White female candidate fared the best against the light-skinned Black woman, the latter still outperformed her electorally by twelve points.

While it is important to understand the electoral prospects for Black female candidates in the context of their skin tone, it is also important to determine what people think that others believe about their electability, as seen in Figures 22 and 24. In terms of
perceptions regarding the viability of Black female contestants for political office, it is apparent that the darker Black female is still at an electoral disadvantage. While generally only slightly lower percentages of respondents believe the light Black woman will be the most likely to win her contest as compared to those saying they would vote for her, much lower percentages believe the darker Black woman would be electable as compared to those saying she would be their choice for office. As noted in earlier chapters, perceptions concerning social views help us to better understand the ways in which society operates and the general stereotypes and views held by society broadly and the individuals close to respondents more specifically. Not only is the darker candidate not favored in her electoral contests while the lighter Black woman wins, but she also is far less likely to be seen as electorally viable.
Figure 21: Percentage of Respondents Voting for Light-skinned Black Female Candidate

Figure 22: Percentage of Respondents Saying the Light-skinned Black Female Candidate is Most Electable
Given that the difference between those voting for the dark-skinned Black woman and those believing she is electable is so large as compared to the difference for the light-skinned Black woman, it would be difficult to argue that skin tone is not a major contributing factor to the former’s lack of success. Consequently, it is apparent that colorism is present in both candidate evaluation and vote choice. Clearly, respondents find that the darker Black female candidate is at a distinct disadvantage in terms of the ways in which society views her with regard to her appropriateness and capability for holding public office. Conversely, this is not the case for the lighter contestant.

---

67 In that there is such a large difference between the electoral success of the lighter Black woman (Candidate A) and the darker Black woman (Candidate C), it is necessary to recognize that possibility that, on the whole, Candidate A was preferable to Candidate B, as well as the possibility that Candidate D was preferable to Candidate C. In order to decrease the likelihood of this possibility, each of these Candidates were given similar levels of education, occupation, and political experience. As such, there is no clear reason as to why any one candidate should be preferred or another, aside from the only factor that was altered, which was the photograph of the candidate.
Figure 23: Percentage of Respondents Voting for Dark-skinned Black Female Candidate

Figure 24: Percentage of Respondents Saying the Dark-skinned Black Female Candidate is Most Electable
H12 states that as race-based and gender-based prejudice increases, respondents will be less likely to vote for the Black female candidate. The results from Model 1, which only includes Racial Resentment, EXR, and Modern Sexism as independent variables, suggest that these prejudicial views have an effect on vote choice. When Model 1 is taken into consideration, modern sexism has an effect on the probability that people will vote for the light-skinned Black female candidate. When respondents hold highly prejudicial views based on modern sexism, they are less likely to vote for the light-skinned Black female candidate; however, when taken into consideration with the full model (Model 3), I find that the effect of gender prejudice falls away and the effects of explicit racial resentment suggest that those with high levels of resentment toward Blacks are less likely to vote for Black female candidate with a higher complexion.  

In the case of the dark-skinned Black female candidate, the only measure of prejudice that had a statistically significant effect was that of racial resentment. Interestingly, when examined in the context of the full model, racial resentment continues to have the statistically significant effect of decreasing the likelihood that respondents will vote for the dark-skinned Black female candidate. Consequently, these

---

1 Tables 27 and 28 in Appendix F include data for all respondents for the models in Tables 21 and 22. Additionally, the full model includes the variable concerning which candidate respondents think is the most electable.
Table 21: Likelihood of Whites Voting for the Light-skinned Black Female in the Context of Prejudices, Attributed Traits and Competencies, and Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: Prejudices</th>
<th>Model 2: Traits / Competencies</th>
<th>Model 3: Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>P&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Resentment</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Racial Resentment</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Sexism</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ/Security Pol Most Important</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender Pol Most Important</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Econ/Security Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Race/Gender Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds Ideal Traits</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Representative</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Party ID</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logistic Regression (Logit): *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01 (only White respondents)

results once again show that skin tone matters in electoral politics. When people hold race-based prejudicial views, they are less likely to vote for a woman with a dark skin
tone, whereas these views do not appear to have an effect on their willingness to vote for a woman with a lighter pigmentation.

5.4.6.2 Voter Policy Preference and Candidate Policy Competence (H13)

Model 2 is designed to test only the effects of voters’ policy preferences and perceptions of candidate traits and competencies on Black female political candidates’ electoral prospects.² H13A states that respondents that value most highly economic and national security policies will be less likely to vote for a Black female candidate. Conversely, H13B states that respondents that value race and gender issue policies the most will be more likely to vote for a Black female candidate. With regard to the candidate with the lighter complexion, the results from Models 2 and 3 refute H13A and do not support H13B. Respondents that valued economic and security policies very highly displayed an increased likelihood of voting for the light-skinned Black female. Unlike the case of the light-skinned Black woman, voters’ policy preferences did not have an effect on the likelihood of voters supporting the female candidate with a darker complexion. As such, it appears that respondents felt as though the candidate with the light skin tone was well prepared specifically to handle policy not traditionally seen as relating to race and gender, to the point that they were more apt to vote for her. Alternatively, voters’ policy preferences, as specified in my models, did not have an

² Model 2 only includes the independent variables for respondents’ policy preferences, the degree to which they believe candidates are competent on economic and security policy and race and gender policy, the degree to which candidates hold the treats of ideal political candidates, and the degree to which candidates will be representative of the entire constituency.
effect on their vote choice in the mock election for the darker Black female candidate, and as such H13a and H13b are not supported in this case.

With regard to H13c, which asserts that Black women will receive electoral support when they are seen as competent on economic/security as well as race/gender policies, the perceived policy competencies of lighter Black female candidates do not have a statistically significant effect on whether a respondent said s/he would vote for this candidate. This result holds for both Models 2 and 3. Table 22 demonstrates that in Model 2, the dark-skinned female candidate is more likely to receive votes if she is seen as competent on race and gender policies, though this effect is not present in the full model. Consequently, there is support for H13c in the case of the darker candidate when policy preferences and policy competencies are the only issues taken into account, and there is no support for this hypothesis in the context of the mock election for the light-skinned Black woman.

5.4.6.3 Ideal Candidate Traits (H14)

H14 claims that Black female candidates will have greater electoral success when they are rated highly on ideal political candidate traits (H14a) and rated highly in terms of the degree to which they will represent their constituency (H14b). With regard to the

---

3 The index of ideal political candidate traits included the following five variables, which were rated on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 10 (extremely): Assertive, Compassionate, Competent, Ethical, and Trustworthy. The degree to which a candidate is seen as “Representing the interests of everyone within the district” was also rated on a 10-point scale, with 1 as “Represent a very few small interest groups” and 10 as “Represent all voters fairly.”
Table 22: Likelihood of Whites Voting for the Dark-skinned Black Female in the Context of Prejudices, Attributed Traits and Competencies, and Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: Prejudices</th>
<th>Model 2: Traits / Competencies</th>
<th>Model 3: Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>P&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Resentment</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Racial Resentment</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Sexism</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ/Security Pol Most Important</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender Pol Most Import</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Econ/Security Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Race/Gender Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds Ideal Traits</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Representative</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Party ID</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logistic Regression (Logit): *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01 (only White respondents)

latter hypothesis, Table 21 demonstrates that the light-skinned Black female candidate is
more likely to be supported electorally if people believe she will be highly representative...
of many groups within the constituency as opposed to only a few groups. In the full model, this effect continues to have a statistically significant effect on vote choice. H14b is not supported for the darker candidate given that her perceived level of representation does not factor into her likelihood of receiving electoral support.

While H14a is not supported for the lighter Black female because of a lack of significance for the measure, this hypothesis is refuted for the darker Black female because the effect is significant and in the opposite direction of that which I asserted. Counter-intuitively, the findings from Models 2 and 3 show that the dark-skinned female candidate is less likely to receive votes if people rate her highly on ideal political candidate traits. *On the surface, this does not make sense.* Nevertheless, by taking into account my earlier analysis explaining that respondents may rate the dark-skinned Black female highly on personal traits so as to not give the appearance of negative racial attitudes, this finding begins to hold water. It is possible that people who do not want to appear to be evaluating her based on negative racial ideas will purposefully attribute positive traits for the dark-skinned Black female candidate while having no intention of voting for her. Taken all together, these results provide tentative support for H12-14, largely varying by skin tone; however, some of this support comes in Models 1 and 2, which have very low predictive value for the dependent variables (Light complexion Pseudo-$R^2$: 0.037 and 0.116, respectively; Dark complexion Pseudo-$R^2$: 0.028 and 0.065, respectively). The full models (Model 3) have Pseudo-$R^2$s of 0.246 and 0.12 (Light and
Dark complexion, respectively). Interestingly, while racial resentment decreases the likelihood of voting for the darker candidate only, whether a voter is a woman is the only factor that increased the likelihood of voting for this candidate.

5.5 Conclusion

There are many important findings that come forward from the results in this chapter. The major take away point from these data is that context matters for the evaluation and electoral prospects of Black women running for political office. In terms of ideological belief stereotypes, it is apparent that regardless of skin tone, Black women in politics are seen as more socially and economically liberal than White men, White women, and Black men. This stereotype can provide an electoral advantage in Democratic primaries and a disadvantage in Republican primaries given primary voters’ propensities toward ideological extremes. It is unclear whether these ideological presumptions concerning Black female politicians would help or hurt their electoral prospects in general, statewide elections, as compared to the mock-primary elections in this study, but it is likely that the level of advantage they would hold based upon these belief stereotypes would depend on the social and economic ideological positions of the median voter. Further, this would also depend on the relative salience of these issues for said median voter.
With regard to perceptions of Black female political candidates’ personal traits and policy competence levels, on the surface the raw mean scores may suggest that darker Black women are viewed more positively than lighter Black women on personal traits. Nevertheless, it is apparent that when compared to their political challengers, light-skinned Black women are viewed in a more positive light in contrast to dark-skinned Black women when they are compared to their opponents on the issue of personal traits. Further, in terms of the five traits included within my survey that are largely attributed to an “ideal” candidate – assertive, compassionate, competent, ethical, and trustworthy – Black women are either seen as holding these traits to the same or a lesser degree than their political challengers. As such, they are less likely to be seen as the candidate that is most able to increase the quality of government institutions (Adams et al., 2011). When this finding is taken into consideration with the finding that the darker Black female is less likely to garner support when she is rated highly on these traits, it becomes apparent that people are merely paying lip service to the race-based political correctness and social desirability in the attribution of personal qualities.

In terms of the degree to which voters believe Black women are competent on policy issues, on the whole they are seen as more competent than their opponents on most race- and gender-based issues and less competent on issues relating to commerce and national security. Further, in that the policy area of welfare is tied in the social mind to Black women, Black mothers more specifically (Gilens, 1999), this stereotype is so
strong that it bypasses the effects of social status, in that it remains tied to Black women that are running for political office. This may be due to the idea that people think Black women in the general population have a specific policy interest in welfare, and therefore this would be a way in which Black female politicians would provide substantive descriptive representation. This issue is so closely tied to perceptions of Black women that it is the only policy area examined in this survey about which people believe that a Black female candidate with a dark complexion would have a heightened level of competence as compared to her competitors.

Further, the data concerning votes and electoral viability continue to demonstrate the effects of colorism. The light-skinned Black female candidate was highly favored over her opponents, while the challengers of the dark-skinned Black female triumphed over her in each contest. Additionally, for this latter candidate, even fewer people believed that she could possibly win an election against any of her opponents. As such, even if there was any internal bias within the survey that would encourage a more favorable evaluation of Candidate D – the challengers – over Candidate C – the dark-skinned Black female – a comparison of the difference between vote choice and electability evaluations shows that dark-skinned Black women are likely to face even greater challenges than others in contests with constituencies that include racial distributions similar to those of the general United States population.
Finally, based on the full model for explaining respondents’ likelihood to vote for Black female candidates, people are most likely to vote for a light-skinned Black female if they find economic/national security policies to be important, if they are women, if they have a higher income, and if they believe she will represent many groups within the constituency. Voters are less likely to vote for the lighter candidate if they are older and if they feel highly resentful toward Blacks. In terms of a dark-skinned Black female candidate, people are only more likely to vote for her if they are also women. Conversely, there is evidence people are less likely to vote for her if they rate highly on measures of racial prejudice and if they claim that she holds the traits of an ideal candidate.

As stated earlier, context and situation have significant effects on the ways in which people perceive Black women running for political office. Their skin tone, perceptions of their ideological leanings, traits, and competencies, as well as voters’ policy preferences all work in varying ways and to varying degrees to influence how people feel about these candidates. As such, much more work needs to be conducted in order to better parse out the degree to which racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes have an effect on the evaluations and electoral prospects of Black women.
6. Conclusion

In working toward examining the issue of identity intersectionality in electoral politics, I begin by framing the issue in terms of the Colored Women’s Clubs movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Largely composed of highly educated Black women, the National Association of Colored Women (NACW) took on the motto “Lifting as We Climb,” which indicated that as they, a subgroup of the Black community, worked toward upward social mobility, they had a responsibility and personal necessity to attempt to increase the degree of social protection, family well-being, and personal dignity of all African Americans. These women did not have any delusions regarding the life chances of their own families as compared to those for other Blacks who did not have the same access to greater economic and educational opportunities. There was, and continues to be, a constant struggle and conflict between two ways of viewing Black elites: 1) Viewing them as a separate group from, or subtype of, Blacks as a whole, with comparatively more positive traits attributed to them based upon the perception of their assimilation with the mainstream values of the U.S.; and 2) Viewing them in a more traditional manner, i.e. as no different from all other Blacks in that they are a cohesive, monolithic, and unvarying group that is undeserving, un-American, and dangerous to the U.S. if they obtain power. The women participating in this movement recognized the ubiquity of the latter viewpoint and, as per Dawson’s (1994) argument regarding the Black utility heuristic, understood that their fate was
linked to that of all other Blacks, and as such, the course of action that was best for the entire community was the one that was in their own best interests.

The purpose of the “Lifting as We Climb” frame is to demonstrate that there is an historical basis for the examination of the influence of intersectional stereotyping. Although it is apparent that society engages in ascribing characteristics to groups that are composed of more than one salient identity, such as Black women, this intersectional approach is rarely taken when researchers examine the connections between identity and stereotyping, especially in the context of politics. On the whole, the question becomes: To what degree and in what ways has the stereotyping issue this movement fought to address evolved? Additionally, how do current perceptions of Black women influence this group’s prospects for descriptive political representation? If anything, it may be argued that now we find greater differentiation between Black women in the general population and Black women that have enjoyed higher levels of socioeconomic incorporation and success, as evidenced by the findings in Chapter 3 that report that stereotypes are attributed to the two groups to differing extents. In spite of this, it is apparent that all Black women are still subject to negative stereotypes tied to the gendered racism and gendered colorism that is aimed at this group (Foster, 2008). In all, the main take away message from this work is that the degree to which society views Black women that run for political office in terms of racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes varies based on the context of the issues and situations at hand.
6.1 Findings

One of the issues that I address for this project is whether stereotypes are applied in differing ways at various intersections of race and gender. This investigation is necessary due to the lack of empirical evidence relating to this matter. The data in Chapter 2 demonstrate that society does differentiate among groups that are composed of more than one salient identity by way of applying stereotypes to varying extents in terms of gender, race, and social status. In terms of mean scores of “average” groups, the extent to which “positive” traits, such as “compassionate” and “trustworthy,” are applied to White women stands firmly above the midpoint of the scale, while ratings of Black men fall well below this point. The opposite is the case in terms of “negative” traits such as “irresponsible.” This is largely due to the fact that White women and Black men are seen as polar opposites in many ways, as they each fit the prototype of “woman” and “Black” respectively.

Interestingly, just as these two groups do not have any overlap at the intersection of race and gender, Black women and White men find themselves in the same situation with regard to a lack of shared identity. Nonetheless, these latter two groups are rated in relatively similar, rather than opposite, terms on the “positive” and “negative” traits, with mean scores near the midpoint of the scale. I believe they receive similar ratings for different reasons. The data suggest that the average Black woman is largely rated near the middle of the scale on many traits because her sex and race interact in a way
that moderates views concerning her on these issues. On the other hand, the White man fits the prototype for two single identity groups, i.e. “men” and “White,” while the Black woman fits none. As such, the White male is not rated overly high or low on these particular measures because they are not strongly tied in high degrees to his identities.

Another finding of particular interest in Chapter 2 is that, on the whole, elites are rated as relatively the same on most traits. In terms of traits that are looked down upon by society, such as “irresponsible,” elite status decreased the degree to which these traits were applied to both Black groups, while the opposite is true of traits such as “hardworking,” “intelligent,” and “trustworthy.” Overall, elite status increased positive perceptions and decreased negative perceptions of Black women. Nevertheless, in Chapter 3, the data demonstrate that while elite Black women are seen in a different light from average Black women, both groups continue to be mainly conceived of in terms of their race. Elite status has the effect of moving perceptions concerning White women and Black men further away from the prototypes of “woman” and “Black,” and consequently closer to one another; however, the influence of elite status on Black women has a smaller magnitude than it does for the other two groups. As such, there is somewhat less differentiation between social perceptions of average and elite Black females, resulting in the slightly greater influence of traditional racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes for this group than is the case for the former two groups.
Accordingly, this leads to the assumption that perceptions concerning Black women in the political sphere would be prone to race- and gender-based stereotype influence.

In that it appears likely that views concerning elite Black women are subject to traditional stereotypes regarding both Blacks and women, it is necessary to determine the degree to which negative stereotypes can be primed. Chapter 4 directly addresses this issue by way of an examination of the extent to which intersectional stereotyping can influence perceptions of average and elite Black women. One of the major findings from this chapter is that people’s understandings of social perceptions regarding elite Black are not greatly swayed by negative stereotypical messages concerning average subsets of the population, regardless of the message’s position at the intersection of race and gender. In spite of the lack of influence of “average” negative primes on elite Black women, of particular interest is the finding that as society applies racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes to the general population of Black women, they also apply these to greater degrees to elite Black women. Based on these two findings taken together, there is evidence that these two groups are viewed in distinct ways, but they are not seen as so different as to erode all connections between them in terms of how people apply stereotypes.

Also of particular importance is the finding in Chapter 4 that there may be a trend toward fewer positive, though not more negative, evaluations of elite Black females when people are primed with negative messages relating to Black males. This
would mean that when traditional negative racial stereotypes are primed via negative messages specific to the Black prototype image, i.e. Black men, elite Black women are less likely to be seen as possessing positive traits; however, they are not more likely to be viewed as possessing negative traits. This relationship is tentative in that the results for this finding miss the standard for statistical significance; however, the trend is one that begs further investigation in the name of greater clarity regarding the possible effects of intersectional priming.

With regard to the degree to which these sorts of social perceptions have an effect on Black women in politics, the results vary greatly. Of particular interest and importance is the demonstration of the effects of colorism. The data in Chapter 5 demonstrate that the skin tone hierarchy that exists for Blacks has a clear and direct effect on the ways in which people evaluate them and perceive their suitability for political office. Voters appear reluctant to express negative views regarding a darker Black female candidate while at the same time they have little reluctance in voting against her. The evidence for the first part of this assertion comes in the form of lower ratings for the dark-skinned Black female candidate on personal traits and policy competencies as compared to her opponents in conjunction with higher mean scores on these same traits and competencies than her light-skinned counterpart, who fared slightly better when she is compared to her opponents.
Given these findings, it seems likely that people do not want to appear to have negative views of a Black woman with a relatively dark complexion, in that her skin tone may make people more aware that race will be presumed to be a factor in their evaluations. As such, respondents go out of their way to rate her in a positive manner, consequently proceeding to go further out of the way to rate her opponent even higher on the traits and policy competencies in question. In this way, respondents are able to demonstrate that they do not hold negative racialized attitudes concerning this candidate while simultaneously providing justifications for not supporting her electorally. Conversely, the candidate with the lighter complexion, while still evaluated in the context of racialized, gendered, and intersectional stereotypes, receives greater electoral support due to more positive perceptions of her character and abilities based upon her skin tone.

6.2 Implications

The implications of my work reach into many facets of political study, and the results herein can encourage shifts in the ways in which we approach our research topics. On the whole, we know that much of the research in Political Science, as well as many other fields, overlooks the importance of salient identities and the ways in which identity and its social meanings and implications influence the topics we examine (McClain and Stewart, 2010). This is particularly important because many of the
theoretical frameworks that researchers develop do not fully take into account the ways in which those theories may not hold in the context of different races, genders, classes, and so on. As such, we are left without a clear understanding of the ways in which the political world works, which is precisely the purpose of most of our efforts. My work builds upon the example available within Gay and Tate’s (2008) work, which demonstrates that intersectional identity can be examined with large-N, empirical data. Additionally, the results from my work further demonstrate that while we ought to encourage parsimony in political science theorization and empirical research and methods, it is essential that we work to increase the analytic and empirical utility of our research (Gerring, 2001).

6.2.1 Identity Research

Within my project, I argue that it is essential to understand and study the topics of identity and stereotypes intersectionally. My rationale behind this argument is that people categorize and make generalizations based on more than one observable aspect because this process provides increased information about an object one encounters, without costing a great deal more effort and resources. In that there are some physical means by which to readily identify and separate groups of people, such as gender, skin tone, and age, it is easy to see how people can unthinkingly apply a socially accepted trait to an individual from one of those groups. Nevertheless, there are some physical
features, such as eye color and height, which rarely lend themselves to the application of social stereotypes. This can be explained by way of the McClain, et al. (2009) argument that mere membership within a group does not an identity make. Instead, there must be some degree of feelings of attachment among the group members in order for there to be an identity group that is socially recognizable. It is for this reason that researchers choose to examine socially salient identities; however, there is little recognition of the overlapping of socially salient identity groups, the resulting subgroup identities that develop from this intersection, e.g. Black women, and society’s purposeful ascription of meaning to intersectional identities.

While my work emphasizes that it is possible to examine whether and the degree to which groups at various points of the intersection of identities are viewed by society as separate or in some way different, my data also demonstrate the importance of recognizing that not all stereotypes that are attributed to identity groups work to their detriment. For example, elite Black women are seen as more compassionate and trustworthy than the three other groups in question in my first study. This is a positive stereotype that is being applied to this group. As such, in moving forward, it is important for us to think of stereotypes in terms of their effects on the groups they are attributed to, rather than thinking in terms of whether they are positive or negative at face value.
In an interesting twist here, despite the fact that these “positive” stereotypes, which also happen to be some of the traits of an “ideal” political candidate, are applied to these groups, the data from Chapter 5 demonstrate that when running against another political opponent, all Black women seeking political office are seen as less trustworthy, and the Black woman with a darker complexion are additionally seen as less compassionate, than her opponents. The reason for these major differences in ratings is somewhat unclear; however, it is possible that people view elite Black females and the individuals from that group that actually seek political office in differing ways. Consequently, when these results are considered simultaneously, they further show that the effects of stereotypes and the contexts in which we examine them are vital areas for further examination in the field of identity research.

6.2.2 Political Representation and Political Actors Research

In that I find significant differences in the ways in which stereotypes are attributed to various groups at the intersection of race and gender, it is reasonable to expect further that the differences in evaluation on this level can lead to differences in evaluation on others, such as perceptions concerning political candidates, vote choice, and policy preferences. In that my results show that there are several personal traits and policies competencies for which Black women are rated as significantly different from their opponents, it is apparent that perceptions concerning particular groups have a
direct effect on the ways in which they are evaluated as political candidates. This is an important finding that should be considered in future research on candidate evaluation. Without understanding the ways in which various identities interact to influence perceptions, it is difficult to determine the causes of the candidate evaluation results that researchers gather.

Additionally, the results from this research should encourage a closer examination of the ways in which we investigate the effects of priming. Valentino (1999) demonstrates the ways in which messages from news coverage can prime attitudes, and Valentino, Hutchings, and White (2002) show that political advertisements have the ability to prime racial attitudes as well. This sort of work is vital to our understanding of the ways in which the messages we constantly receive have an effect on how we think of politics. My research demonstrates that highly targeted primes are the most effective in terms of influencing social perceptions of stereotypes relating to Black women. Furthermore, the data show a lack of priming effects of stories based on stereotypes that are specific to “average” members of a group on the “elite” members of that same group. This finding flies in the face of conventional wisdom about priming, which is that the presence of most messages that are at least tangentially related to the priming target can have an effect on perceptions and evaluations concerning that target group.

As is evidenced with the effectiveness of the 1988 Willie Horton ad, this conventional wisdom does have a foundation upon which to stand. Nevertheless, this
idea does not hold for my research. As such, it is likely that there is some highly effective aspect of negative political advertisement priming that manages to tie negative priming messages to candidates. These are areas of study that need much more work so as to understand better whether this is an anomaly specific to Black women, or if priming messages specific to intersectional identities are actually the most effective. Further, more work needs to be conducted with regard to the degree to which primes specific to one point at the intersection of multiple identities have an effect on a target at another point of this intersection.

Finally, the results in Chapter 5 demonstrate that there are statistically significant inverse relationships between both social ideology and economic ideology as compared to various dependent variables, such as the Welfare Queen trait attribution index. This result suggests that the traditional examination of ideology solely as one measure of “liberal” vs. “conservative” does not allow us to examine what is likely to be a much more nuanced picture of the influence of people’s values and beliefs. As such, it is much more likely than not that we do not pay close enough attention to the important details of social difference that are readily available to us, and that our research can be stronger if we choose to slow down and seek the salient topics and issues.


6.3 Future Work

There are many important topics that I am unable to cover within this project that are highly interrelated and in great need of attention. Firstly, this study does not examine the ways in which candidates may work toward combatting prevailing stereotypes concerning Blacks, women, and Black women. Given the argument that society views Black women as somewhat different from “Blacks” and “women”, it is reasonable to assume that Black women, as a part of society, know and recognize the characteristics and stereotypes that are attributed to them. Consequently, as strategic political candidates, Black women will work toward highlighting, downplaying, and/or directly negating certain stereotypes in order to appeal to their constituencies. Those from majority-Black districts will feel less of a need to negate the stereotype that they are only concerned with “Black” interests and “female” interests, such as education, civil rights, and poverty, given that these constituencies are more likely to find these issue positions more desirable in candidates.

Conversely, districts with few racial minorities will have constituencies that will be less interested in these issues; consequently, Black female candidates in these districts will work toward countering these issue position stereotypes, and they will highlight issues that are viewed as “non-traditional” for Black women, e.g. taxation, the economy, the environment, national security, and the like. If Black women can successfully disseminate these ideas to these two types of districts, they will be electorally successful.
On the other hand, they will have a much more difficult time in more racially-diverse/balanced districts. This will be due to the type of deracialized campaigns they will have to run. In heavily majority-White districts, they will be able fully to deracialize their campaigns; however, in a more diverse district, these candidates will have to run deracialized campaigns while working toward appealing to Black constituencies as well. This is a much more difficult task to accomplish, which will result in lower rates of electoral success for Black women in these districts.

Additionally, it is important to investigate further the influence of skin tone on electoral prospects. Future work should include examinations of how Black women of varying complexions fare electorally against one another. Furthermore, the scope of this project only allowed for the examination of the Black/White paradigm, but given the nation’s tumultuous history with issues of race and ethnicity and given the ever-changed demographics in the United States, it is essential to examine the issues addressed herein in the context of intersectionality and other racial and ethnic groups. Finally, in future work I would like to examine how the intersectional identities of respondents affect perceptions of Black women. The sample populations within my surveys are too small for this sort of analysis, but this is a crucial next step in the examination of the effects of stereotyping on various groups in politics.

I have sought to examine in great detail the issue of the effects on intersectional stereotyping on Black women, given that I argue that this is one of several underlying
causes of the descriptive underrepresentation of Black women in national and state legislative bodies. By way of developing a stronger understanding of how and why this phenomenon of stereotyping persists, people will have the ability to create strategies that focus on its root causes, which in turn may encourage and establish an alteration to the status quo of evaluating these candidates based on faulty and inappropriate assumptions rather than their actual policy preferences and competencies, personal character traits, and political beliefs. This research on stereotypes of Black female legislative candidates and the effects of those stereotypes on candidate evaluations should encourage further research into stereotypes regarding groups at various intersections of identity, in addition to research on the general effects of stereotyping on candidate evaluations and electoral support.
Appendix A: Question Wording for Measuring Stereotypes

In order to measure stereotype attribution for “average” and “elite” Black women, White women, White men, and Black men, the 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey asks the following questions. Respondents were presented with a sliding scale from 1 (Not at all) to 10 (Extremely) to indicate their ratings for each trait:

Q4.1 In the next set of questions, you will be asked to provide information on the degree to which certain traits (for example, emotional, trustworthy, smart) apply to each of several groups in general. The first set of questions relates to how society as a whole views particular groups, while the second set relates to your personal views. Make sure to read the instructions for each question carefully.

Please give the response that first comes to your mind for each trait, and answer as quickly as possible. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and your responses are confidential:

**SOCIAL VIEWS:** What do others think?

Based on common societal views, to what degree do these characteristics apply to the average person from this group? (Provide an answer for each trait.):

### **White Women:**

____ Aggressive (1)
____ Bossy (2)
____ Compassionate (3)
____ Emotional (4)
____ Hardworking (5)
____ Intelligent (6)
____ Irresponsible (7)
____ Trustworthy (8)
____ Unethical (9)
Q4.3 Based on common societal views, to what degree do these characteristics apply to the most socially and politically successful individuals from this group? (Provide an answer for each trait):

**Elite White Women:**
- _____ Aggressive (1)
- _____ Bossy (2)
- _____ Compassionate (3)
- _____ Emotional (4)
- _____ Hardworking (5)
- _____ Intelligent (6)
- _____ Irresponsible (7)
- _____ Trustworthy (8)
- _____ Unethical (9)
Appendix B: Priming Treatments and Control

Below are the control and the priming treatments for the 2011 Social Cognition and Evaluation Survey. The control group received Q2.1 and Q3.1 prior to answering questions regarding social perceptions of groups at the intersection of race and gender. The treatment groups received the following prior to answering those questions: White male treatment: Q2.2 and Q3.1; White female treatment: Q2.3 and Q3.1; Black female treatment: Q2.4 and Q3.1; and Black male treatment: Q2.5 and Q3.1. All respondents answered two attention check questions after reading the two articles they were assigned (Q3.2 and Q3.3):
Q2.1 Hazing: Confronting the problem by Jane Hansworth

College fraternity and sorority hazing may be seen as a rite of passage, but it is certainly no laughing matter. University administrations around the country are attempting to crack down on hazing practices after several unfortunate incidents that occurred this past year at colleges across the nation.

At least 43 students were admitted to hospitals for problems ranging from severe dehydration, fatigue from sleep deprivation, and alcohol poisoning from forced underage drinking after hazing incidents. One university official at Darington University claims that the effects of hazing rituals reach far beyond physical pain: "These practices are mentally and emotionally scarring. Students need to be able to focus on their studies in a safe environment."

Next week, 125 colleges and universities will sign a binding pledge to suspend any fraternity or sorority for at least 5 years if it is found to be in violation of hazing policy.
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Q2.2 Arrest for Tax Evasion and Corruption  by Jane Hansworth

Local businessman and philanthropist, James Brubaker, pleaded not guilty Thursday in Federal Court to a new indictment accusing him of tax evasion. Brubaker is charged with filing fraudulent tax returns that falsely reported hundreds of thousands of dollars in business expenses from the Canton Community Development Agency, Brubaker’s nonprofit community development and mentoring firm that operated just outside of Sarasota.

He is also charged with conspiracy to commit wire fraud in connection with an alleged bid-rigging plan for a watershed management contract, according to the earlier indictment. Brubaker was arrested last February on corruption charges. Last month, prosecutors announced that there would be additional charges.

He is charged with embezzling more than $300,000 from the community development center - which receives federal funds - to pay for tickets to theatre shows, concerts, sporting events, and meals in restaurants. The trial is scheduled to begin July 24 before Federal Judge Joseph Garvin. Brubaker was his usual jovial self at the courthouse: "We're excited, we're blessed and we're fully ready for trial."

Photo Source: Daniel Acker/Bloomberg/Landov; money.cnn.com
Q2.3 Wife to be Charged for Injuring Husband by Jane Hansworth

A man was seriously injured after his wife, 29-year-old Meredith Forrest, apparently intentionally ran over him with her car during an argument in southwest Mecklenberg County late Tuesday night, authorities said. The incident occurred in the 9000 block of Willow Spring Drive near James City about 11:15 p.m., according to the Mecklenberg County Sheriff’s office.

Wesley Hardin Forrest, 31, was rushed to a nearby hospital, where he remains in serious condition. Mrs. Forrest has been charged with assault with a deadly weapon with intent to kill. Witnesses told investigators that the woman and her husband had been having marital problems and were arguing.

Witnesses also said the woman drove her car into the man and knocked him down, then she intentionally rolled over him several times with the car. Deputies found the car in the middle of the road and saw the woman behind the wheel and her husband lying under the car. Thus far, Mrs. Forrest has not been cooperating with authorities.
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Q2.4  Mother Caught Red-Handed by Jane Hansworth

While thousands of shoppers were out at Sunrise Mall in search of bargains on Black Friday, LaShonda Briggs was more interested in steals than deals, according to police. Briggs, 24, is accused of trying to take more than $4,000 in merchandise from Shilling’s department store.

According to Montgomery police, Briggs stuffed high-priced designer clothing into a stroller and shopping bags from other stores. She also grabbed a stuffed animal from a display and handed it to her 2-year-old daughter. Security officers stopped the woman at the exit and searched her belongings. Briggs had pliers, a pair of scissors and a device that removed security sensors.

The Montgomery County district attorney is reviewing the case and will determine the charges against Briggs later this week. If shoplifting charges are brought against Briggs, this will be her fourth similar charge in the past 3 years.  
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Q2.5  Arrest of Suspect in Theft and Assault  by Jane Hansworth

A self-employed musician has been charged with first-degree robbery and assault after police say he pulled a gun on a woman in Lexington City and stole her wallet and cell phone. The incident happened about 7:20 a.m. near Northeast 111th Street and 9th Avenue Southeast.

A woman was walking to work when a black Ford Focus pulled up beside her. One man, Shaun Jones, allegedly got out of the car with a handgun and demanded the victim's belongings. The victim gave up her wallet and cell phone. Jones then struck the victim, got back in the vehicle and fled, but the victim called 911 from another phone and she provided a suspect description and vehicle information, as well as the license plate.

Patrol Officer John Richter saw the car when it was stopped at a red light. He followed it until backup units arrived, at which point they conducted a high-risk felony stop, where officers approach with guns unholstered. "We located the victim's wallet in the passenger seat, and her cell phone was found on the driver's seat" Detective J.C. Hansworth wrote in a probable cause document. Police didn't find a gun. Jones is being held on $75,000 bail. He will be arraigned later this month.
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Q3.1 Animal Rescue and Adoption  by Susan Trent

A new study suggests that most Americans are unaware that animal abuse is a major problem, and that there are many people working to remedy the problem. Often, individuals know that abused pets may be removed from homes, but they do not know much about the shelters they are sent to.

Animal rescue centers are arriving in new cities every day with the purpose of caring for and rehabilitating abused animals. Additionally, these centers work toward finding good homes for these pets. Foster programs are also increasingly an option for people who want to help, but cannot take on the responsibility of an animal in the long term. Some local politicians in cities across the nation have been working for years to find more funding for these rescue centers, but this has been a harder task in the past few years with the economic downturn.

Photo source: Rodrigo Pena; pe.com

Q3.2 Which of the two articles provided the most detailed information?

Q3.3 Which of the two articles was the most memorable?
Appendix C: Candidate Pictures and Biographies

There were two mock elections in the 2012 Political Candidate Evaluation and Social Beliefs Survey. In Set 1, a light-skinned Black female (Candidate A) runs against either a White male, White female, or Black male (Candidate B). In Set 2, a dark-skinned Black female (Candidate C) runs against either a White male, White, female, or Black male (Candidate D):

Set 1: Stephanie Carter competes against either Eric Colson, Janice Ingles, or Henry Sutton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stephanie Carter</th>
<th>Eric Colson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong>: Columbia University, BA; Tulane University, JD</td>
<td><strong>Education</strong>: UCLA, BA; USC Marshall School of Business, MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation/Employment</strong>: former State District Attorney</td>
<td><strong>Occupation/Employment</strong>: Financial Consultant and Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong>: Board Member of Salvation Army, American Bar Association</td>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong>: U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Local Kiwanis Club Vice-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Career</strong>: 3-term State House Representative</td>
<td><strong>Political Career</strong>: 4-term County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carter Statement**: "I look forward to the opportunity to use my expertise and experience to represent the many interests of the citizens of our great state."
Colson Statement: "I will work toward ensuring that the strong voice of the individuals of our state will find a home in the policies of the Congress."

Set 2: Kristen Peterson competes against either Michael Jeffries, Catherine James, or Robert Vines

---

**Michael Jeffries**

**Education:** UNC-Chapel Hill, BA; UNC-Chapel Hill School of Law, JD

**Occupation/Employment:** District Court Judge

**Organizations:** Vice-President of Juvenile Crime Prevention Association, American Bar Association

**Political Career:** 3-term District Court Judge

**Jeffries Statement:** "I will work to ensure that the policies of our national government improve the lives of all the citizens of our state."

---

**Kristen Peterson**

**Education:** Reed College, BA; UVA School of Medicine, MD

**Occupation/Employment:** current Pediatric Surgeon

**Organizations:** Treasurer of American Medical Association, Rotary Club

**Political Career:** 3-term Member of State Board of Health

**Peterson Statement:** "I am proud to be a member of this great state and will use the experience I have gained to represent the varied interests of our citizens."
Photos for other opponents of Stephanie Carter:

Janice Ingle:  
![Janice Ingle](image)

Henry Sutton:  
![Henry Sutton](image)

Photos for other opponents of Kristen Peterson:

Catherine James:  
![Catherine James](image)

Robert Vines:  
![Robert Vines](image)
Appendix D: Candidate Evaluation and Vote Choice

In the 2012 Political Candidate Evaluation and Social Beliefs Survey, after viewing the pictures and biographies concerning the candidates within an election, respondents answered the following questions. The candidates were presented in alphabetical order based on their last names:

To what degree do you think Stephanie Carter/ Kristen Peterson is likely to be: (10-point sliding scale)

_____ Assertive (1)
_____ Compassionate (2)
_____ Competent (3)
_____ Cooperative (4)
_____ Diligent/Hardworking (5)
_____ Ethical (6)
_____ Intelligent (7)
_____ Responsible (8)
_____ Trustworthy (9)

To what degree do you think (Opponent) is likely to be: (10 point sliding scale)

_____ Assertive (1)
_____ Compassionate (2)
_____ Competent (3)
_____ Cooperative (4)
_____ Diligent/Hardworking (5)
_____ Ethical (6)
_____ Intelligent (7)
_____ Responsible (8)
_____ Trustworthy (9)
Representation: Do you think these candidates will work toward representing the interests of everyone within the district, or will they only represent the special interests of a few groups? (10-point sliding scale)

____ Stephanie Carter/ Kristen Peterson (1)
____ (Opponent) (2)

Place each candidate on the following ideological scale, based on social issues (for example, capital punishment, gay marriage, abortion, etc): (7-point sliding scale)

____ Stephanie Carter/ Kristen Peterson (1)
____ (Opponent) (2)

Place each candidate on the following ideological scale, based on economic issues (for example, government spending, tax policy, etc): (7-point sliding scale)

____ Stephanie Carter/ Kristen Peterson (1)
____ (Opponent) (2)

To what degree do you believe Stephanie Carter/ Kristen Peterson is qualified to make competent decisions regarding the following issues? (10-point sliding scale)

____ Civil Rights (1)
____ Economy (2)
____ Education (3)
____ Environment (4)
____ Ethics in Government (5)
____ Immigration (6)
____ Jobs (7)
____ National Security/Military (8)
____ Welfare (9)

To what degree do you believe (Opponent) is qualified to make competent decisions regarding the following issues? (10-point sliding scale)

____ Civil Rights (1)
____ Economy (2)
____ Education (3)
____ Environment (4)
____ Ethics in Government (5)
____ Immigration (6)
____ Jobs (7)
____ National Security/Military (8)
____ Welfare (9)
Which candidate would you vote for on Election Day?
☑ Stephanie Carter / Kristen Peterson (1)
☑ (Opponent) (2)

Which candidate is most electable and likely to win?
☑ Stephanie Carter / Kristen Peterson (1)
☑ (Opponent) (2)

To what degree are the candidates handsome/beautiful? Please rate the attractiveness of each candidate: (10-point rating scale)
_____ Stephanie Carter / Kristen Peterson (1)
_____ (Opponent) (2)
Appendix E: Racism and Sexism Measurements

After respondents participated in the candidate evaluations for both mock elections in the 2012 Political Candidate Evaluation and Social Beliefs Survey, they answered the following questions on the racial resentment, modern sexism, and explicit racial resentment scales:

**Racial Resentment Measures:** (Responses: Strongly Disagree/ Disagree/ Neither Agree nor Disagree/ Agree/ Strongly Agree)

“The degree to which racial inequality continues to exist in the U.S. is still much debated. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement:”

1) It’s really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if Blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as Whites.

2) Irish, Italian, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same.

3) Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

4) Over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve.

**Modern Sexism Measures:** (Responses: Strongly Disagree/ Disagree/ Neither Agree nor Disagree/ Agree/ Strongly Agree)

“The degree to which gender inequality continues to exist in the U.S. is still much debated. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement:”

1) Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States.

2) Women often miss out on good jobs due to sexual discrimination.

3) It is rare to see women treated in a sexist manner on television.

4) On average, people in our society treat husbands and wives equally.
5) Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement.

6) It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America.

7) It is easy to understand why women's groups are still concerned about societal limitations of women's opportunities.

8) Over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of women than is warranted by women's actual experiences.

**Explicit Racial Resentment Measures:** (Responses: Strongly Disagree/ Disagree/ Agree/ Strongly Agree)

“*To what degree do you agree with the following statements (for the third question, indicate your level of concern)*?”

1) I resent all of the special attention/favors that African Americans receive; other Americans like me have problems too.

2) African Americans should not need any special privileges when slavery and racism are things of the past.

3) How concerned are you that the special privileges for African Americans place you at an unfair disadvantage when you have done nothing to harm them?

4) For African Americans to succeed they need to stop using racism as an excuse.
Appendix F: Additional Data and Results

There were several instances in which it was not practical to include various tables and full models within the body of the dissertation. As such, Appendix F includes much of this information:

Table 23: Mean Stereotype Scores of Social Views of the “Average” Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>White Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossy</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Mean Stereotype Scores of Social Views of “Elites”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Women</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>White Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossy</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 25 and 26 correspond with Tables 15 and 16, and their models include a measurement to examine the degree to which the ratings of one social status group are correlated with the ratings of the other group.
Table 25: OLS Regressions for the Priming Effects of Black Female Treatment on Perceptions of Society’s Views of the Average Black Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Racialized Index</th>
<th>Gendered Index</th>
<th>Mammy Index</th>
<th>Welfare Queen Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female Treatment</td>
<td>1.62**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.82*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized Index (Elite)</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered Index (Elite)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammy Index (Elite)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Queen Index</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.16**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Soc. Ideo.</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Econ. Ideo.</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Party ID</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj-R2</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01
Table 26: OLS Regressions for the Priming Effects of Black Female Treatment on Perceptions of Society’s Views of the Elite Black Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racialized Index</th>
<th>Gendered Index</th>
<th>Mammy Index</th>
<th>Welfare Queen Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Female Treatment</strong></td>
<td>Coef.</td>
<td>P&gt;</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racialized Index (Avg)</strong></td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gendered Index (Avg)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammy Index (Avg)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare Queen Index (Avg)</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born South</strong></td>
<td>1.42**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.24**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.30**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Soc. Ideo.</strong></td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Econ. Ideo.</strong></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.60**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Party ID</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N | 462 | 462 | 462 | 462 |
| Adj-R2 | 0.222 | 0.338 | 0.365 | 0.353 |

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01
Tables 27 and 28 correspond to Tables 21 and 22. The tables below include all respondents and include the variable concerning which candidate is most electable in the full model.

Table 27: Likelihood of Voting for the Light-skinned Black Female in the Context of Prejudices, Attributed Traits and Competencies, and Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: Prejudices</th>
<th>Model 2: Traits / Competencies</th>
<th>Model 3: Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>P&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Resentment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Racial Resentment</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Sexism</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ/Security Pol Most Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender Pol Most Important</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Econ/Security Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Race/Gender Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds Ideal Traits</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Representative</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Electable</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Party ID</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logistic Regression (Logit): *p > .10; **p > .05; ***p > .01
Table 28: Likelihood of Voting for the Dark-skinned Black Female in the Context of Prejudices, Attributed Traits and Competencies, and Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: Prejudices</th>
<th>Model 2: Traits / Competencies</th>
<th>Model 3: Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>P&gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Resentment</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Racial</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Sexism</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ/Security Pol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender Pol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ/Security Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender Pol</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds Ideal Traits</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Representative</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid Electable</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born South</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Soc Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Econ Ideo</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respon Party ID</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logistic Regression (Logit): *p > .10; **p > .05; ***p > .01
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