

Race and Gender in the 2008 Democratic Primary

Maria Wilson

mwilson8@unm.edu

Senior Thesis

1 University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001

Abstract

The 2008 primary election between Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama is an historic one for many reasons. Both candidates were minorities, Clinton for her gender and Obama for his race, and the African American community mobilized and voted at unprecedented rates. Given the minority statuses of both candidates, I attempt to examine the way Black and White women evaluated these candidates. Using data from the ANES 2008-2009 Panel Study, I examined the attitudes of White women and Black women and looked for discrepancies between the two groups. I hypothesized that Black women would rate Obama more favorably than White women due to a strong sense of racial identity and that White women would rate Clinton more favorably due to the lack of a racial group consciousness and the potential ability to relate to Clinton as a White woman. Further, I examined the way Black and White women viewed Clinton and Obama in terms of their “typicality” as an attempt to examine if and how women are able to relate to the candidates on a basis of gender and race.

Introduction

The 2008 Democratic primary election was historic, both in terms of gender and race. Given the fact that both African Americans and women are underrepresented in American politics and that neither a woman nor African American man had ever come so close to being nominated in a national election prior to 2008, it is an important election to examine. Previous literature on candidate evaluation has focused on “typical” elections (Stockey, 2008), which are those with two white male candidates; however, when racial or gender minority candidates arise, the factors which identify them as minorities shape the opinions of the electorate in many nuanced ways. Both Obama and Clinton were minorities in some respect, and the way they were able to appeal to a diverse American electorate underscores the relationship between race and gender and their effect on candidate evaluation and potentially vote choice. Pew Research Center data shows that Obama led Clinton among Black voters with 67% of the vote after two Super Tuesday primary contests and 80% by the end of the primaries. In the end, African Americans overwhelmingly favored Barack Obama in the 2008 national election with a near unanimous rate of 96% (Pew Research Center, 2008).

Given the gender of Hillary Clinton, examining the difference between White and Black women is critical to understand better what motivates not only women in general to support a candidate, but specifically women with multiple intersecting identities; in this case, Black women. Though the reasons for Black women voting for Obama over Clinton may seem intuitive, it is important to spend time examining what these reasons were and how they differ, if at all, from White women in order to gain a better understanding of the

complexity of Black female identity. This paper will attempt to identify and explain differences between White and Black women when evaluating Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton during the 2008 Democratic primary election. After reviewing existing literature, I hypothesize that White women and Black women will assess the typicality of Clinton and Obama on the basis of race, and that White women will find Clinton to be more typical than Black women will, while Black women will find Obama to be more typical. Additionally, I pose the hypothesis that White women will view Hillary Clinton more favorably than Black women will.

The results of the this show that Black women do, in fact, evaluate Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton differently than their White counterparts. This indicates that more research should be conducted on the effect of intersecting identities when it comes to candidate evaluations and voter decision making. Existing literature that focuses on intersectionality tends to examine race and gender at the macro-level; however men and women of different races differ from each other as well as from White men and women.

Literature Review

Heuristics are widely used cognitive shortcuts which humans use to draw conclusions; in a political context, they are used to help process the vast amounts of political information (Lau & Redlawsk 2001). Heuristics include race, gender, perceived personality traits, and political party. When it comes to evaluating political candidates, multiple personality traits come into play. While qualities like empathy and ability to lead tend to be important for candidates to possess (Funk, 1999), the ways in which voters

evaluate candidates and determine if they are viable for office vary among groups and election contexts. Partisanship, individual election contexts and the candidates that come with them, and the relationship of political parties to domestic and foreign affairs (Stokes, 1966; Stockley, 2008) all shape the way voters evaluate candidates. The importance of certain traits in a candidate varies between Democrats and Republicans; Hayes (2005) found that Democrats tend to value empathy and compassion in candidates, while Republicans favor strong moralistic leaders.

There are variations between which traits voters find most important in political candidates; however, the literature within this broad category of candidate evaluation extends beyond partisanship and personal characteristics; heuristic-driven, visual attributes about candidates also affect the way people perceive and assess candidates. There is existing literature about how the physical appearance of candidates affects vote choice (see Bailenson, et al 2008; Olivola & Todorov, 2010). Voters use facial features, gender, race, and other visual cues to create heuristics by which they make decisions and assumptions about candidates. In the case of the 2008 democratic primary election, the most prominent visual cues that voters could draw from were gender and race since the choice was between a White woman and a Black man.

When examining gender and race, there are variations among voters and the way they view minority candidates. Women are still largely underrepresented in electoral politics, and female candidates are in turn evaluated differently than their male counterparts. Sigelman and Welch (1984) found that White men were as likely as White women to support female candidates, and Black women were even more likely to support

female candidates than other groups. While this study holds empirical importance, voters' evaluations of female candidates are more nuanced. Gender stereotypes, while they do not necessarily affect vote choice, play a role in candidate evaluation. Female candidates are perceived to be more competent in areas associated with "compassion," such as healthcare and childcare; men on the other hand are associated more with "masculine" aspects of politics, such as foreign policy and economic matters (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). This gender bias is not universal, however, and political context matters. Lawless (2004) found that these stereotypes came into importance in the post-9/11 political atmosphere, with voters viewing women as less competent in matters regarding military and conflict. Further than these stereotypes, incumbency status and partisanship play a role in how voters evaluate female candidates. Alexander & Anderson found that when the candidate is well known, gender is irrelevant and incumbency status matters more. Similarly, Dolan (1997) found that women only supported female candidates at higher rates in a hypothetical scenario when there was no mention of party affiliation; when partisanship was known, there was less variation between male and female participants in their evaluation of the female candidate.

Just as women are underrepresented in electoral politics, African Americans are also underrepresented (Philpot & Walton, 2007). There is strong empirical evidence that shows that African Americans strongly unite behind Black candidates. A sense of group identity and linked fate, concepts on which I will elaborate more as this paper progresses, are driving forces for Black people turning out to vote for candidates of their same racial identity. Though African Americans have varying political views, backgrounds, political

knowledge, and connections with the African American identity, Black voters are still overwhelmingly more likely to support and trust Black and biracial candidates over white candidates (Sullivan & Arbuthnot, 2009). Black people are also more likely to project their own ideological beliefs onto Black candidates, indicating that their sense of shared identity translates across the political scape (Lerman & Sadin, 2016). Further, in districts with heavy Black populations, qualified Black candidates are more likely to surface in Congressional primaries, and those races are more likely to be competitive as the amount of qualified candidates rises (Branton, 2009). While Black candidates typically have the support from other African Americans, White voters exhibit different attitudes toward them. Lerman and Sadin (2016) found, in addition to the fact that Black voters were more likely to project their ideologies onto Black candidates, that White democrats were more likely to believe that Black candidates are generally more liberal candidates.

In the 2008 Primary, both Clinton and Obama faced challenges as minorities; Obama's US citizenship was questioned and he was at times awkwardly somewhere between "too black" or "not black enough." White voters regardless of party were less likely to support Obama, indicating that his race was a central aspect of his candidacy. Jackman and Vavreck (2010) highlight the reluctance from white voters to support Obama existed as early as 2007. Even in the general election, Obama faced symbolic racism and race-based opposition from white voters; Krupnikov and Piston (2015) found that White voters who strongly identified as Democrat and also exhibited racial biases had a decrease in turnout in the 2008 national election between Obama and McCain. Piston (2010) also found in a separate but similar study that strong, White democrats who believed negative

stereotypes about African Americans were less likely to vote for Obama as well. This is supported by the fact that Obama won a the majority of Black and Latino votes, but failed to secure even half of the White vote (Piston, 2010).

Clinton, on the other hand, faced the experience of running for office as a woman (Hancock, 2009). Despite the fact that she had solid support from White democrats, Lawless (2009) reported that a Pew Research survey found shortly after Clinton lost the nomination that 51% of Americans did not think the country was ready for a female president. When it comes to parsing through the demographics of Clinton supporters, the question of whether race or gender mattered more is one that cannot be ignored. Obama had the support of 96% of African American voters, and Clinton was only able to secure half of the female vote (Stockley, 2008). Women in politics have a harder time proving their viability as candidates compared to their male equals (Fox and Lawless 2004), and the media covers women candidates differently than men as well (Uscinski & Goren, 2010). While Clinton did face instances of sexism from multiple sources throughout her campaign, there is little evidence to suggest that her gender was a factor that turned Democratic voters away from her. Though she faced sexism throughout the course of her campaign, it can be inferred from previous research that her position as a well known Democrat may have played a bigger role in voter choice than her gender did.

Theory

Due to the unprecedented nature of the 2008 primary, it is the ideal case to study in terms of what motivated black women to vote for Barack Obama over Hillary Clinton in

overwhelming numbers. The interaction between race and gender needs to be studied from an intersectional viewpoint.

Studies researching the strength of Black identity suggest that a Black heuristic is a driving force among Black voter behavior (Dawson, 1994); further descriptive representation has a strong impact on the political mobility and participation of African Americans (Griffin & Keane, 2006; Whitby, 2007). Sullivan and Arbuthnot (2009) found that Black respondents were more likely to trust and support candidates who were either Black or biracial than White candidates. Though the authors note that Black people who connect their fate back to Africa specifically had less positive views of the biracial candidate, there was still a stronger support for the Black candidate. The results of this study are demonstrated in real life contexts as well. At the city council level, Whitby (2007) found that the presence of African American representatives increased levels of voter turnout among African American voters. This increase in turnout from descriptive representation is not universal, however, and liberal African Americans are more likely to vote when descriptively represented, while conservative African Americans are demobilized (Griffin & Keane, 2006). Linked fate is the idea that an individual within a group feels a close tie to other individuals within the group and that the experiences of those individuals is inextricably related to oneself (Dawson, 1994). This concept of linked fate is arguably exclusive to the Black community due to the historic context through which African Americans have experienced group-based discrimination. Further, the African American community is relatively homogenous, unlike Asians or Latinos- groups that are

comprised of pan-ethnic identities with varying languages, cultures, and histories (McClain, et al., 2009).

When studying women voters and the effect of descriptive representation, the presence of women in politics is important in increasing positive perceptions of female politicians among adolescents (Campbell & Wolbrecht 2006), however it does not necessarily translate to political attitudes or actions (Lawless, 2004). This can be potentially explained by the fact that “woman” is not a homogenous category; the lived experiences of one woman might not be the same for others due to race, religion, or sexual orientation. While there is a strong, proven sense of linked fate among African Americans, there is a weaker sense of collective identity among women as a general category. Women of different groups prioritize different parts of their identities, such as race, age or status in the workforce (Gurin 1985). This fact has remained true over time, and recent literature finds that women are divided still by race, but also on which aspects of women’s issues they find to be most important (Huddy & Carey, 2009). The variance among female voters in 2008 further proves the lack of solidarity between women as a group; those who supported Clinton tended to have a stronger concern for women’s issues, however, the lack of a unanimous group, gender ended up not influencing the race in Clinton’s favor the way race did (Huddy & Carey, 2009).

The strength of Black decision-making combined with the lack of a unanimous group identity for women creates the potential for differences in political decision-making between White and Black women. Black women, who are “doubly-bound” (Gay and Tate, 1998) by gender and racial oppression differ from White women due to the nature of their

racial and gender identities. Philpot and Walton (2007) found, in both a hypothetical scenario and in an electoral context, that not only are Black people more likely to vote for Black female candidates than Whites, but Black women are more likely to support Black female candidates than Black men. The study found a difference between Black and White voters when it came to evaluating a female candidate on the basis of race; however even more so, they found that as that between a black man and a Black woman, female voters were more likely to support the Black female candidate. Philpot and Walton theorize that these findings are due to a sense of double linked fate among Black women. Black women not only face race based discrimination, they are subjected to gender based discrimination as well. Historically, Black women were often pushed to the margins by Black men during the civil rights movement, while simultaneously not having their concerns heard by the white voices of the women's rights movement. This double oppression, in turn, leads to a sense of double linked fate. Simien (2005) elaborates on the intricacy of Black female identity, noting that the Black church has patriarchal ideas rooted in its foundation and concurs that Black women have racial and gender identities driving their decision-making. However, unlike Philpot and Walton, Simien finds that gender and race are separate mechanisms, rather than a complex identity that cannot be disentangled. Gay and Tate's (1998) findings, however, also support the idea that gender and race are inseparable in the case of Black women's identities; Black women who strongly identified with their race also tended to support women's issues that were salient to them, and their identification with their gender strengthened when their racial identity strong.

Applying these findings to the context of the 2008 primary election, the question remains whether or not gender has a role to play when evaluating a Black man and a White woman. Philpot and Walton assert, “by the nature of their status in American society, Black women have created an identity that is greater than the sum of its parts. This, in turn, guides their political decision making whereby they evaluate candidates based on the potential benefit yielded to black women rather than blacks and/or women.” Since there is no presidential election context where a Black woman was running against a White man, there is no way to replicate their study at a national level; however, by examining the differences in candidate evaluations between White women and Black women in the 2008 primary, perhaps it will be possible to get a better understanding of what motivated Black women to support Obama at such overwhelming numbers, and whether or not these can reveal more findings that show the differences between White and Black women.

Though extensive research has been done on the effect of race on candidate evaluation and the differences between Black and White voters, the differences between women of different races has not been asked enough. It is known that Obama won a majority of the Black female vote in 2008, but it is important to study in what ways the decision-making process of Black women differs from that of White women who remained loyal to Clinton, and if race acted as a heuristic for evaluating the two candidates differently for Black women. This theory of intersectionality between race and gender motivates the following hypotheses that will be discussed in the second half of this paper.

Hypothesis 1a: White women will rate Hillary Clinton as a more typical woman than Black women will.

Hypothesis 1b: Black women will Rate Barack Obama as a more typical man than White women will.

Hypothesis 2a: White women will rate Hillary Clinton as a more typical White woman than Black women will.

Hypothesis 2b: Black women will rate Barack Obama as a more typical Black man than White women will.

Hypothesis 3a: Black women will assess Hillary Clinton less favorable than White women will.

Hypothesis 3b: Black women will assess Barack Obama more favorably than White women will.

Data & Methods

The goal of this paper is to identify what, if any, differences exist in how Black and White women evaluate candidates who are both minorities. Using the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Survey, I look at the attitudes of White women and Black women toward Barack Obama as well as how they feel about Hillary Clinton. The ANES Panel Survey was conducted between January 2008 and August 2009, and consisted of twenty waves. Of the 2,288 respondents, 343 voted for Barack Obama in the primary and 312 voted for Clinton, making them the most and second most voted for candidate from the sample, respectively. The majority of respondents voted for Democratic candidates in the primary, with a minority of 465 respondents voting for a Republican candidate. The sample was largely ethnically White as well, with 1,967 of the respondents self identifying as White. The second largest ethnicity among respondents was African American with 188. Additionally, there were 1,311 women in the sample and 977 men.

The panel survey was administered in waves, with the first wave beginning in January of 2008 and the final wave, wave 21, ending in August of 2009. The questions varied between political and apolitical topics in order to avoid conditioning. The

non-political survey questions examined racial bias and lifestyle preferences of respondents. Participants were recruited via landlines, but were instructed to complete the survey online. Those without internet access were provided with a computer and internet access during the months they completed the surveys. Each month, the participants would complete a thirty minute survey online. The number of participants varied per wave; the first wave had a 42% response rate and the lowest response rate was 26%. The number of respondents fluctuated throughout the waves and a \$30 incentive for returning among those who had dropped out remedied the lower response rates .

Instead of consolidating the results of each wave into one variable, I have decided to examine a pre-primary wave (wave 2), and one after the general election (wave 20). The first two hypotheses rely on the data from wave 20, which was collected in August 2009. The third hypothesis uses data from wave 2, which was administered in February of 2008. This wave was chosen because of its proximity to the Democratic primary. Not all questions were asked in each wave; as a result, of the participants for wave 20, 1,247 were women and 906 were men. For wave 2, the sample was even smaller with 606 women and 453 men.

To test the first hypothesis, I measure the degree to which Black and White women view Hillary Clinton as a typical woman and view Barack Obama as a typical man. The specific questions were “how typical is Clinton/Obama of most women/men.” The response choices were “extremely typical,” “very typical,” “moderately typical,” “slightly typical,” and “not typical at all.” The questions were asked in wave 20 of the survey, which took place in August of 2009, eight months after Obama’s inauguration. This question is used as a

measure of candidate evaluation because it examines the judgement of women of different races to identify candidates of different genders by what they consider to be “typical” or relatable to them.

For the second hypothesis, the question used to evaluate the first hypothesis was asked again, but it was altered to examine how typical each candidate is of their race. Asking “how typical is Hillary Clinton of White women” and “how typical is Barack Obama of Black men” provides the opportunity to try and explain how connected respondents feel to a candidate of their own race, and whether or not they view each candidate as a representation of their racial identity.

For both the first and second sets of hypotheses, the goal is for “typicality” to act as a measure for a sense of shared identity for gender and race (gender for women and for African Americans, linked fate). As Lerman and Sadin (2016) discuss, African Americans tend to project their own ideologies onto candidates with a shared race, making them more likely to view the candidate as matching their views. While women are less homogenous as a category, using “typicality” as a measure will still be able to test the differences between Black and White women because if differences exist, one possible explanation could be the sense of shared identity and linked fate that exists among Black women that is discussed in the above theory section.

To test the third hypothesis, a third model is used to examine the views of Black and White women on Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. I utilize a question from wave two of the survey, which simply asked “do you like Barack Obama/Hillary Clinton.” Wave two was chosen because of it was administered in February of 2008, which is when a majority of the

Democratic primaries were taking place and as a result, respondents were most likely being exposed information regarding Clinton and Obama during this time. The results of this are expected to align with actual election results, with a greater percentage of White women favoring Clinton over Black women. However, there is still a possibility for variation due to the fact that Black women's voting for Obama instead of Clinton does not necessarily mean they negatively evaluated Clinton, just that they found the racial connection to Obama to be more important when deciding for whom to vote.

To test the attitudes toward each candidate using the aforementioned measures, I created models based on the three dependent variables. I then ran four separate Chi-Squared tests of independence for each; I separated each model by gender to compare White women to Black women and White men to Black men. Using a Chi-Squared test is ideal because it will measure how related the independent variable and dependent variables are as well as the strength of that relationship. Though the focus of this paper is on women, I included the results of White and Black men in order to get a holistic view of what differences occur between African American and White respondents.

Results

The results of all three models were surprising. For hypothesis 1a, regarding how typical Hillary Clinton is of most women, the Chi-Squared model was statistically significant at the 0.00 level, and the Pearson Chi-Squared number was 54.1 but the results were opposite of what was expected. 27% of Black women said that Hillary Clinton was "very typical," contrasted with only 10% of White women identifying Clinton as "very typical."

Both White and Black women largely found Clinton to be “moderately typical of women, with 35% of White women and 29.5% of Black women reporting this view. The model for men showed similar trends, however the model was statistically insignificant, meaning that race and this variable measuring candidate evaluation do not have a strong relationship for the male sample.

Black women also found Obama to be more typical of men, with 20% of Black women finding him to be “very typical” of men and 10% “extremely typical.” Nearly half of White women, on the other hand, found him to be “moderately typical” of most men, and only 1.6% found him to be “extremely typical.” This model was also significant at the 0.00 level, and the Chi-Squared number was 54.15, confirming hypothesis 1b. Unlike the Clinton model, the Obama model for men was also significant with a P-Value of 0.008. Interestingly, there was little variation between White and Black men; men of both races found Obama to be either “moderately typical” or “very typical” of most men.

[Tables 1 & 2 about here]

Both models for the second dependent variable, are significant. In terms of hypothesis 2a, the results were the opposite of what was expected. While I hypothesized that White women would find Clinton to be more typical of white women than Black women would, they rated Clinton less typical than Black women did. The majority of both White and Black women said she was “moderately typical” of White women, however 26.6% of Black women said she was “very typical” compared to 11.5% of White women.

When asked about how typical Obama is of black men, an almost equal amount of white and black women (31.1%, 32.3%) thought that Obama was “moderately typical.” A larger percent of Black women (17.3%) than White women (9.1%) thought he was “very typical.” This model was significant, and rejects hypothesis 2b. Though it rejects the hypothesis, it is still notable because there does not seem to be a difference between how White and Black women view Barack Obama as a Black man. The model for men was insignificant, showing no relationship between gender and perception of Obama as being “typical” for his race.

[Tables 3 & 4 about here]

For the final models, which measured whether or not respondents liked Clinton and Obama, all four Chi-Squared tests were significant; however, all four had smaller Chi-Squared numbers, meaning the association between the independent (race) and dependent (whether or not respondent likes Clinton and Obama) variables is weaker. For the Clinton model, 59.4% of Black women said they liked Clinton, compared to 43.9% of White women. This rejects hypothesis 3a, that postulated White women would be more likely to favor Clinton, since that would reflect the demographics of the actual 2008 primary vote. For men, the gap between Black and White men was even wider; 61% of Black men reported that they liked Clinton, which was 30% higher than the number of White men. For the Obama model, 79.7% of Black women reported that they liked Obama, while 18.8% were indifferent about him. Most notable about this model is the fact that

94.5% of Black men said they liked Obama, which could possibly support the idea that a sense of linked fate impacted the evaluations of Black men since Obama shares a race and gender identification.

[Tables 5 & 6 about here]

Even though Clinton gained a large portion of the White vote, a few potential explanations exist as to why the results consistently show White women as responding less positively to Clinton than Black women. Theorizing on the basis of gender alone, these results could be explained by Hayes' (2005) findings that Democratic voters value empathy and compassion when evaluating candidates. Additionally, female candidates are typically stereotyped as being more "compassionate" than male candidates, and Clinton has long been criticized for her more "masculine" demeanor as a politician (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993). Clinton has struggled as a politician when it comes to charisma and appealing to the emotions of voters, while Obama ran a remarkably enthusiastic and charismatic campaign leading up to the 2008 primary (Sinclair & Price, 2008). However, this explanation does not explain why Black women would feel more positively toward Clinton.

Other possible explanations for these results are more nuanced and specific to the candidates and electoral context of 2008. As Alexander and Anderson (1993) found in their study on candidate evaluation, gender is irrelevant to voters' candidate evaluations when the candidate has a well known name, making other aspects of the candidates more influential on evaluations such as policy decisions. Hillary Clinton is a widely known public

figure, especially in contrast to Obama who rose to the forefront of the Democratic primary after a budding career as an elected official. Lawless (2009) provides examples of prominent female Democratic senators and activists who supported Obama and noted that those who had more progressive agendas were probably more concerned with policy issues of which they were more critical toward Clinton. Sigelman and Welch (1984) found that Black women were more likely than other groups to have positive feelings toward female candidates. My results reflect this finding despite the fact that a majority of Black women voted for Obama. Lawless (2009) cites the feminist group New York Feminists for Peace, who endorsed Obama, as saying that “supporting Obama was not an easy decision.” Lawless also recalls Oprah Winfrey’s endorsement of Obama, where she claims her support of Obama does not equal being against Clinton. These examples, which do not necessarily reflect the views of the ANES sample, are potential explanations for why the results of this paper are counterintuitive to the proposed hypothesis.

Discussion & Conclusion

The purpose of this research is to focus more precisely on the ways women evaluate candidates in an election with a candidate who is a racial minority against a candidate who is a gender minority. Using Philpot and Walton’s (2007) claim that gender and race are inseparable for African American women, this paper attempts to explore the views of White and Black women through a lens of intersectionality and how the intersecting factors of race and gender influence Black women in contrast to the candidate evaluations of White women.

While this paper is unable to explain the candidate evaluations of Black women as coming from a sense of “double linked fate” as proposed in the theory section, the results of this study are nonetheless surprising and create more questions than answers regarding the differences between Whites and Blacks as racial categories as well as the differences between Black and White women. It can be inferred that Black women were able to respond enthusiastically to Clinton because of the gender similarity, but have ultimately cast their votes for Obama due to a strong connection to race.

This study was limited in the following two ways. Firstly, the sample size was relatively small, and the number of Whites was double the number of African Americans. Secondly, this was a panel survey administered over the course of a year and not every question was asked in every wave. As a result, the sample size for wave 2 was smaller than ideal and had a different amount of respondents than the wave 20 sample did.

Despite the limitations, this paper addresses and attempts to better understand an understudied topic that is worthy of further exploration; the Democratic primary of 2008 specifically should be explored more thoroughly due to the diverse identities of the candidates and the unprecedented mobilization of African American voters. Future research should continue to analyze candidate evaluation (as well as voting behavior), as the results of the Clinton models are counterintuitive but statistically significant. Further, when studying electoral politics through a gendered lens, instead of viewing women as a homogenous category, researchers should search for and consider potential differences among women of different ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations, and other groups that could influence the opinions and behaviors of women that extend beyond gender

identification. In doing so, the growing political science literature focusing on women can be more inclusive and mindful of women who come from and are influenced by a wide range of backgrounds and lived experiences.

References

- The American National Election Studies (ANES; www.electionstudies.org). The ANES 2008-2009 Panel Study [dataset]. Stanford University and the University of Michigan [producers].
- Alexander, Deborah, and Kristi Andersen. 1993. "Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits." *Political Research Quarterly* 46 (3): 527–45. doi:10.2307/448946.
- Branton, Regina P. 2009. "The Importance of Race and Ethnicity in Congressional Primary Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 62 (3): 459–73. doi:10.1177/1065912908319606.
- "Clinton Backers Cool to Obama- White Female Support in Question." Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (May 29, 2008)
<http://www.people-press.org/2008/05/29/section-1-the-general-election/>, accessed Dec. 5, 2016.
- Dolan, Kathleen. 1997. "Gender Differences in Support for Women Candidates." *Women & Politics* 17 (2): 27–41. doi:10.1300/J014v17n02_02.
- . 2014. "Gender Stereotypes, Candidate Evaluations, and Voting for Women Candidates What Really Matters?" *Political Research Quarterly* 67 (1): 96–107.
 doi:10.1177/1065912913487949.
- Dolan, Kathleen, and Timothy Lynch. 2013. "It Takes a Survey: Understanding Gender Stereotypes, Abstract Attitudes, and Voting for Women Candidates." *American Politics Research*, September, 1532673X13503034. doi:10.1177/1532673X13503034.
- Fox, Richard L., and Jennifer L. Lawless. 2004. "Entering the Arena? Gender and the Decision to Run for Office." *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (2): 264–80.
 doi:10.1111/j.0092-5853.2004.00069.x.

- Funk, Carolyn L. 1999. "Bringing the Candidate into Models of Candidate Evaluation." *The Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 700–720. doi:10.2307/2647824.
- Gay, Claudine, and Katherine Tate. 1998. "Doubly Bound: The Impact of Gender and Race on the Politics of Black Women." *Political Psychology* 19 (1): 169–84.
doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00098.
- Gurin, Patricia. 1985. "Women's Gender Consciousness." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 49 (2): 143–63.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2009. "An Untraditional Intersectional Analysis of the 2008 Election." *Politics & Gender; Cambridge* 5 (1): 96–105.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X09000075.
- Hayes, Danny. 2005. "Candidate Qualities through a Partisan Lens: A Theory of Trait Ownership." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (4): 908–23.
doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2005.00163.x.
- Huddy, Leonie, and Tony E. Carey. 2009. "Group Politics Redux: Race and Gender in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primaries." *Politics & Gender* 5 (1): 81–96.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X09000063.
- Huddy, Leonie, and Nayda Terkildsen. 1993a. "Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (1): 119–47.
doi:10.2307/2111526.
- . 1993b. "The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office." *Political Research Quarterly* 46 (3): 503–25.
doi:10.2307/448945.

- Jackman, Simon, and Lynn Vavreck. 2010. "Primary Politics: Race, Gender, and Age in the 2008 Democratic Primary." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 20 (2): 153–86.
doi:10.1080/17457281003697156.
- Krupnikov, Yanna, and Spencer Piston. 2015. "Racial Prejudice, Partisanship, and White Turnout in Elections with Black Candidates." *Political Behavior* 37 (2): 397–418.
doi:10.1007/s11109-014-9268-2.
- Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 951–71. doi:10.2307/2669334.
- Lawless, Jennifer L. 2004. "Women, War, and Winning Elections: Gender Stereotyping in the Post-September 11th Era." *Political Research Quarterly* 57 (3): 479–90.
doi:10.1177/106591290405700312.
- . 2009. "Sexism and Gender Bias in Election 2008: A More Complex Path for Women in Politics." *Politics & Gender* 5 (1): 70–80.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X09000051.
- Lerman, Amy E., and Meredith L. Sadin. 2016. "Stereotyping or Projection? How White and Black Voters Estimate Black Candidates' Ideology." *Political Psychology* 37 (2): 147–63.
doi:10.1111/pops.12235.
- Olivola, Christopher Y., and Alexander Todorov. 2010. "Elected in 100 Milliseconds: Appearance-Based Trait Inferences and Voting." *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 34 (2): 83–110. doi:10.1007/s10919-009-0082-1.

- Philpot, Tasha S., and Hanes Walton. 2007. "One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 49–62.
- Piston, Spencer. 2010. "How Explicit Racial Prejudice Hurt Obama in the 2008 Election." *Political Behavior* 32 (4): 431–51. doi:10.1007/s11109-010-9108-y.
- Sigelman, Lee, and Susan Welch. 1984. "Race, Gender, and Opinion Toward Black and Female Presidential Candidates." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48 (2): 467–75.
- Simien, Evelyn M. 2005. "Race, Gender, and Linked Fate." *Journal of Black Studies* 35 (5): 529–50. doi:10.1177/0021934704265899.
- Sinclair-Chapman, Valeria, and Melanye Price. 2008. "Black Politics, the 2008 Election, and the (Im)possibility of Race Transcendence." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41 (4): 739–45.
- Stockley, Joshua. 2008. "Social Forces and the Primary Vote: Examining Race, Gender, Age, and Class in the 2008 Presidential Primaries." *Race, Gender & Class* 15 (3/4): 32–50.
- Stokes, Donald E. 1966. "Some Dynamic Elements of Contests for the Presidency." *The American Political Science Review* 60 (1): 19–28. doi:10.2307/1953803.
- Sullivan, Jas M., and Keena N. Arbuthnot. 2009a. "The Effects of Black Identity on Candidate Evaluations: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Black Studies* 40 (2): 215–37.
- . 2009b. "The Effects of Black Identity on Candidate Evaluations: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Black Studies* 40 (2): 215–37.
- Uscinski, Joseph E., and Lily J. Goren. 2010. "What's in a Name? Coverage of Senator Hillary Clinton during the 2008 Democratic Primary." *Political Research Quarterly*, September, 1065912910382302. doi:10.1177/1065912910382302.

Table 1a **How Typical is Hillary Clinton of Most Women (% of Women)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.54 (6)	1.81 (20)	10.74 (119)	35.74 (396)	31.41 (348)	19.77 (219)	100.00
Black	.72 (1)	7.91 (11)	27.34 (38)	29.5 (41)	20.14 (28)	14.4 (20)	100.00
Total	.56 (7)	2.5 (31)	12.6 (157)	35.04 (437)	30.15 (376)	19.17 (239)	(1247)

Chi-Square= 54.07***

***p<0.0001

Table 1b **How Typical is Hillary Clinton of Most Women (% of Men)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.35 (3)	1.4 (12)	10.74 (92)	33.37 (286)	28.94 (248)	25.2 (216)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	2.04 (1)	20.41 (10)	40.82 (20)	20.41 (10)	16.33 (8)	100.00
Total	.33 (3)	1.43 (13)	11.26 (102)	33.77 (306)	28.48 (258)	24.72 (224)	(906)

Chi-Square= 7.58

Table 2a **How Typical Is Barack Obama of most Men (% of Women)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.54 (6)	1.62 (18)	12.36 (137)	40.43 (448)	27.35 (303)	17.69 (196)	100.00
Black	.72 (1)	10.79 (15)	20.14 (28)	33.09 (46)	15.11 (21)	20.14 (28)	100.00
Total	.56 (7)	2.65 (33)	13.23 (165)	39.62 (494)	25.98 (324)	17.96 (224)	(1247)

Chi-Square= 54.15***

***p<0.0001

Table 2b **How Typical is Barack Obama of Most Men (% of Men)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.23 (2)	1.87 (16)	15.52 (133)	35.01 (300)	25.67 (220)	21.70 (186)	100.00
Black	2.04 (1)	8.16 (4)	16.33 (8)	40.82 (20)	16.33 (8)	16.33 (8)	100.00
Total	.33 (3)	2.21 (20)	15.56 (141)	320 (35.32)	25.17 (228)	21.41 (194)	(906)

Chi-Square= 15.59**

**p<0.05

Table 3a **How Typical Is Clinton of White Women (% of Women)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.81 (9)	2.53 (28)	11.46 (127)	34.84 (286)	32.13 (356)	18.23 (202)	100.00
Black	1.44 (2)	10.07 (14)	26.62 (37)	33.81 (47)	12.95 (18)	15.11 (21)	100.00
Total	.88 (11)	3.37 (42)	13.15 (164)	34.72 (433)	29.99 (374)	17.88 (223)	(1247)

Chi-Square= 58.86***

***p<0.001

Table 3b **How Typical Is Clinton of White Women (% of Men)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.47 (4)	1.75 (15)	10.04 (86)	33.96 (291)	30.81 (264)	22.99 (197)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	6.12 (3)	22.45 (11)	44.90 (22)	14.29 (7)	12.24 (6)	100.00
Total	.44 (4)	1.99 (18)	10.71 (97)	34.55 (313)	29.91 (271)	22.41 (203)	(906)

Chi-Square= 19.58**

**p<0.05

Table 4a **How Typical is Obama of Black Men (% of Women)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.81 (9)	3.34 (37)	9.12 (101)	31.14 (345)	32.40 (359)	23.19 (257)	100.00
Black	1.44 (2)	10.79 (15)	17.27 (24)	32.37 (45)	17.27 (24)	20.86 (29)	100.00
Total	.88 (11)	4.17 (52)	10.02 (125)	31.28 (390)	30.71 (383)	22.94 (286)	(1247)

Chi-Square= 34.75***

***p<0.0001

Table 4b **How Typical is Obama of Black Men (% of Men)**

Racial Identification	No Answer	Extremely Typical	Very Typical	Moderately Typical	Slightly Typical	Not Typical	Total
White	.23 (2)	4.08 (35)	9.92 (85)	27.65 (237)	31.62 (271)	26.49 (227)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	8.16 (4)	18.37 (9)	30.61 (15)	22.45 (11)	20.41 (10)	100.00
Total	.22 (2)	4.30 (39)	10.38 (94)	27.81(252)	31.13 (282)	26.16 (237)	(906)

Chi-Square= 7.15

Table 5a Does Respondent Like Hillary Clinton (% of Women)

Racial Identification	No Answer	Like	Dislike	Neither Like nor Dislike	Total
White	1.11 (6)	43.91 (238)	38.75 (210)	16.24 (88)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	59.38 (38)	14.06 (9)	26.56 (17)	100.00
Total	.99 (6)	45.54 (276)	36.14 (219)	17.33 (105)	(606)

Chi-Square= 16.87**

**p<0.01

Table 5b Does Respondent Like Hillary Clinton (% of Men)

Racial Identification	No Answer	Like	Dislike	Neither Like nor Dislike	Total
White	.23 (1)	31.26 (136)	54.02 (235)	14.48 (63)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	61.11 (11)	16.67 (3)	22.22 (4)	100.00
Total	.22 (1)	32.45 (147)	52.54 (238)	14.79 (67)	(453)

Chi-Square= 10.08*

**p<0.05

Table 6a Does Respondent Like Barack Obama (% of Women)

Racial Identification	No Answer	Like	Dislike	Neither Like nor Dislike	Total
White	1.11 (6)	51.29 (278)	21.77 (118)	25.83 (140)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	79.69 (51)	1.56 (1)	18.75 (12)	100.00
Total	.99 (6)	54.29 (329)	19.64 (119)	25.08 (152)	(606)

Chi-Square= 22.26***

***p<0.0001

Table 6b Does Respondent Like Barack Obama (% of Men)

Racial Identification	No Answer	Like	Dislike	Neither Like nor Dislike	Total
White	.23 (1)	48.74 (212)	27.59 (120)	23.45 (102)	100.00
Black	0.00 (0)	94.44 (17)	0.00 (0)	5.56 (1)	100.00
Total	.22 (1)	50.55 (229)	26.49 (120)	22.74 (103)	(453)

Chi-Square= 14.58**

**p<.01