Expanding Categorization at the Intersection of Race and Gender:
"Women of Color" as a Political Category for African American, Latina,
Asian American, and American Indian Women

Pei-te Lien
Department of Political Science
Mail Code 9420
UC Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9420
Phone: 805-893-4983
Email: plien@polsci.ucsb.edu

Carol Hardy-Fanta
Center for Women in Politics & Public Policy
John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies
University of Massachusetts Boston
100 Morrissey Blvd.
Boston, Massachusetts 02125-3393
Phone: 617.287.5546
Email: carol.hardy-fanta@umb.edu

Dianne M. Pinderhughes
Department of Political Science
University of Notre Dame
441 Decio Hall
Notre Dame, IN 46556
Phone: 574.631.7129
Email: dpinderh@nd.edu

Christine Marie Sierra
Department of Political Science
MSC 05 3070
1 University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001
Phone: 505.277.1098
Email: csierra@unm.edu

Expanding Categorization at the Intersection of Race and Gender: "Women of Color" as a
Political Category for African American, Latina, Asian American, and American Indian Women

Abstract: Although the term "women of color" literally refers to all groups of women who share
the attribute of being nonwhite, it was, for many years, synonymous with Black women because
of their pioneering and leadership role in expanding the concept of feminist ideology beyond
white women. Reflecting the general patterns of research on race and ethnicity in the United
States, the small but budding present-day literature about the political status of nonwhite women
continues to center on African American women and their experience of gendered racism of the
socioeconomically disadvantaged. With the current experiences of U.S. women of color located
in disparate socioeconomic and demographic strata, and with Latinas replacing Black women as
the largest group of U.S. nonwhite women today, we question whether a scholarship based in
large part on observations of Black women can still hold true now that the field is more diverse
and larger. Another question is whether there exists a particular sociopolitical bond among
"women of color" due to the discrimination and structural oppression many face that may have
the potential for coalition building across race/ethnicity. In this paper, we attempt to move
beyond a black-white dichotomy and expand knowledge about the content and political
significance of the category "women of color" by examining the aggregate structural conditions
and individual attitudes and opinions of four nonwhite groups of political women. Using both
U.S. Census data and a first-of-a-kind survey that includes over 500 women of African
American, Latino, Asian American, and American Indian descent (as well as over 800 men of
color) who served as popularly elected officials at state and local levels nationwide in 2006–7,
we consider if and how these women can be treated as a political category.

**Expanding Categorization At the Intersection of Race and Gender:
"Women of Color" as a Political Category for African American, Latina, Asian American,
and American Indian Women**

Although the term "women of color" literally refers to all groups of women who share the attribute of being nonwhite, it was, for many years, synonymous with Black women because of their pioneering and leadership role in expanding the concept of feminist ideology beyond white women (hooks, 1981; Collins 2000). Reflecting the general patterns of research on race and ethnicity in the United States, the small but budding present-day literature about the political status of nonwhite women continues to center on African American women and their experience of gendered racism of the socioeconomically disadvantaged. However, with the rapid and on-going expansion of cultural diversity in the U.S. population in the post-1965 era, questions of theoretical relevance and generalizability of traditional usage and understanding of the term "women of color" arise when the population covers more than U.S. native-born black women and includes persons who may not share commonly examined characteristics of this population.

The urgency to expand thinking and research on the content and significance of "women of color" is evident in the latest U.S. Census statistics. U.S. women who are Black (alone or in combination with other races) accounted for no more than 40% of the 52 million of nonwhite women who are of either Black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, American Indian and Alaskan Native (AIAN), and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) origin[1] in the 2006 American Community Survey (ACS). (Of course, there is an inherent contradiction here – and in recent Census reporting – where Latinos/as are typically included in the category of "people of color," despite the fact that they can be of any race. Also, the 40% may not include Latinos who are racially Black but do not self-identify as such. Including them in the category of "Black women" would increase the Black share of the nonwhite female population somewhat. To complicate matters even further, the term "women of color" typically include Latinas who would self identify racially as white.)

In this paper, we also suggest that moving analysis of "women of color" beyond a black-white dichotomy is important because of the socioeconomic diversity among U.S. women of color. Table 1.1 presents this diversity for five major racial/ethnic origins. These groups of women not only differ in size and share of the population, with Latinas being the largest and NHOPI women being the smallest, but they vary by nativity rate, with as high as 63% of Asian American women but less than 4% of AIAN women who are foreign-born. In part due to their high foreign-born status and selective migration of the elite class from East and South Asia, Asian American women lead in the rates of college graduates, holding management, professional, and related occupations, and median earnings. In contrast, Latinas lag behind other groups on these same indicators. Asian women also score the highest, and Black women score the lowest, in terms of marriage rates—with a gap of 30 percentage points between the two

---

[1] Alone or in combination with other racial backgrounds.

groups. Both Latinas and AIAN women report higher poverty rates than other women of color in single female-headed households and especially in those with children under 18 years of age. Although NHOPI women report the highest, and Latina report the lowest, rate of civilian labor force participation, the gap between the two groups are no more than eight percentage points--the smallest of all the racial gaps reported in this table.

With the current experiences of U.S. women of color located in disparate socioeconomic and demographic strata, and with Latinas replacing Black women as the largest group of U.S. nonwhite women today, it is time to examine whether a scholarship based in large part on observations of Black women can still hold true now that the field is more diverse and larger. Another question is whether there exists a particular sociopolitical bond among "women of color" due to the discrimination and structural oppression many face that may have the potential for coalition building across race/ethnicity. In essence, we suggest that, just as scholars have been urged to move past a focus on the supposed "sisterhood" among women based on the experiences of white women of a certain social class during the 1960s and 1970s (which left out Black women in many ways), it is time to move beyond a Black/white dichotomy, By using an approach based on the theoretical lens of intersectionality, we can then see the extent to which the perspectives and experiences of black women represent the experiences of other women of color in the United States.

In this paper, we attempt to move beyond this dichotomy and expand knowledge about the content and political significance of the category "women of color" by examining the aggregate structural conditions and individual attitudes and opinions of four nonwhite groups of political women. Using both U.S. Census data and a first-of-a-kind survey that includes over 500 women of African American, Latino, Asian American, and American Indian descent (as well as over 800 men of color) who served as popularly elected officials at state and local levels nationwide in 2006–7, we consider if and how these women can be treated as a political category.

To identify conditions and boundaries where ordinary and political women of color of the 21st century converge or diverge in their experiences and views, we examine census data on their socioeconomic, demographic, and political participation status. Relying on the Gender and Multicultural Leadership (GMCL) survey, we compare racial differences among women of color officeholders in terms of a series of indicators that help illustrate how they emerge as political leaders serving at state and local levels. We then investigate the intersectional effect of race and gender on each group of women of color as compared to men of color in their likelihood of running for a higher office while controlling for possible confounding factors.

Studying Categories at the Intersection of Race and Gender

Our journey to help deconstruct and reconstruct the contemporary meanings of being women of color begins with an appreciation of the intersectional approach to studying the political experiences of the "intersectionally marginalized" (Crenshaw 1989, 1991). Like their male counterparts, the present-day women of color in the United States come from communities that have survived historical mistreatment due to policies of enslavement, colonization, depopulation, exclusion, annexation, and global imperialism (Glenn 2002). Additionally, they experience various forms of marginalization associated with being nonwhite women. Concurring with the argument made by an increasing number of intersectionality scholars (for an excellent review, see Manuel 2006), we contend that their experiences cannot be fully comprehended by traditional theories that rely on a single axis of identity such as gender or race. Women of color are not just women or nonwhites or minority women. Women of color experience the confluence or the multiplicative effect of being women and nonwhite that tends to subordinate them to lower social strata than their male counterparts (Chow, Wilkinson, and Baca Zinn 1996; Landry 2006). Their identities and experiences are situated within socially constructed and interlocking systems of power that do not distribute political resources equally nor solely along lines of race, gender, class, sexuality, and other markers of identity and difference (Zinn and Dill 1996). To study their experiences intersectionally is to help promote social justice by unveiling distinctive understandings of inequality as it pertains to previously excluded communities and multiply oppressed groups (Dill and Zambrana 2009). Many of the exemplary works addressing these issues are discussed in the special issue on intersectionality in *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, published in 2006 (Bedolla 2007; Hancock 2007; Jordan-Zachery 2007; Simien 2007; White 2007). Two of the most recent examples are Dara Strolovitch's (2007) path-breaking research on social justice advocacy in U.S. interest group politics and Nikol Alexander-Floyd's (2007) critical analysis of the masculinist gender power among the Black community in the context of the Million Man March.

Just like one should reject treating race and racism or gender and sexism as pure categories unmarked by difference, conflict, or complexity, we should resist treating the category of women of color as static and undifferentiated. All groups of women of color are vulnerable to social and structural discrimination, but they may not experience them in equally salient or similar ways. Junn and Brown (2008) maintain that, in order to produce interpretations that more accurately reflect the complex reality of women's lives and to expand the theoretical reach of the study of gender and politics, gender is a dynamic category that intersects at multiple locations with other identity markers and can be at turns intractable, and at others transitory. Adding further complexity is a rising number of women of color in present-day America who have crossed this nation's borders from other countries, with or without proper documentation and with a variety of prior socialization and life skills. Their experiences may complicate the extant intersectional research and problematize the assumption of a common bond forged as a result of oppression among women of color. In the example of Asian American immigrant women, for example, those who come with college degrees, desirable skills, and familiarity with

the English language and culture may escape some aspects of social marginalization that tend to accompany other immigrant women who lack similar education, job skills, and cultural advantage. Nevertheless, even highly achieving Asian American women cannot escape gender-based discrimination in society and the job market (Xu and Leffler 1996; Woo 2000). Thus, although statistics in Table 1.1 show that the median earnings for full-time, year-round Asian female workers well exceeded those of other women of color, their earnings were only 77% of what their male counterparts earned in 2005.[2] Similar gender disparities are found in other groups. The median earning of Black women was 88%, Latina 90%, AIAN women 82%, and NHOPI women 87% of what earned by their male counterparts in 2005. Women in these non-Asian communities earned less, even if they were better educated and had higher occupational prestige, than their male counterparts.

Exploring whether "women of color" provides a meaningful theoretical concept or category, requires a further examination of the position of Asian American women in relation to other nonwhite women. For example, the idea of the "super-achieving," "model-minority" Asian American women comes under question when subgroup diversity along ethnic lines is taken into account. Because the Asian category includes persons of Asian Indian, Bangladeshi, Cambodian, Chinese (Taiwanese), Filipino, Hmong, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Pakistani, Thai, Vietnamese, and other Asian descents, not all immigrants arrive voluntarily and with similar preparations. Southeast Asians typically arrive as political refugees or, in recent years, family members of refugees. Table 1.2 reports the statistics of three such communities whose social characteristics vary from each other and differ greatly from those of Asian Americans as a whole. Particularly worth mentioning is the Hmong population, whose mean age is only 19 and whose population is mostly US-born. The college education rates of women in these three Asian American communities are below, while the poverty rates of families with female householder are sometimes above, the average figures for other nonwhite communities. Their median earnings are no more than two-thirds of the Asian average and are higher only than that of an average Latina. In fact, their educational attainment, occupational prestige, and median earnings fall far behind indicators of those in another refugee community--the Cubans. Here, data in Table 1.2 regarding three of the 19 major Latino communities[3] identified by the 2006 ACS showcase the extreme diversity among Latina groups—some are majority foreign-born but not others, some are more socioeconomically challenged than others. Nevertheless, the most telling part of these statistics is that, regardless of racial and ethnic origins, and despite the generally better education and higher occupational prestige associated with females in these

---

[2] Comparisons by race and gender are complicated, however, by what category is the norm; because Asian *men* earn 122% of what *all* men earn, Asian women actually earn 93% of what all men earn, whereas, because black men earn just 82% of what all men earn, black women make just 72% of all men; Latinas just 60% (see Kelly 2008).

[3] Major Latino subgroups identified by the Census are Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Central American (Costa Rican, Guatemalan, Honduran, Nicaraguan, Panamanian, Salvadoran), South American (Argentinian, Bolivian, Chilean, Colombian, Ecuadorian, Peruvian, Venezuelan), Spaniard, and Other Hispanic or Latino.

communities of color, the median earnings of these women of color are only between 80% to 88% of what is earned by their male counterparts.

Finally, while not included in this table, it is essential to discuss, at least briefly, that fact that there is also increasing diversity among blacks as well due to increased immigration from both Africa and the Caribbean. While this may have the greatest impact on the East Coast and the percent of the Black population that is foreign born is still small compared to the other groups discussed here, there is a need for increased scholarship on the increasing socioeconomic diversity among Blacks—and its impact on political relationships by gender and race.

Possibility of a Multicultural Coalition among Women of Color?

The above analysis of sociodemographic characteristics consuggests mixed prospects for solidarity among women of color. There are profound intergroup differences in socioeconomic achievement and other indicators of social status that cannot be easily bridged. Examining their voting participation rates reveals a different set of diversity and status order (Table 2.1). In the latest presidential election of 2004, Black women voted at a rate nearly double those for Latinas and Asian women. Naturally, these differences are largely due to very large differences in nativity and citizenship rates between Blacks and groups with large percentages of foreign-born. Some of the differences may also be attributed to the differences in socialization of Black women, their long history in the U.S., and the civil rights movement, , in comparison to Latinas and Asian women, many of whom migrated to the U.S.[4] Nevertheless, nativity and citizenship rates do not explain the lower voting rates of AIAN women compared to Black women. When voting rates are calculated only among those who are citizens, Latinas trail all groups of women of color in their turnout rates. When voting rates are calculated only among those who registered to vote, Black women continue their lead, but Asian and NHOPI women closely follow, while Latina and AIAN women lag behind in their turnout rates. Table 2.1 also shows that Black women who are citizens and registered have voting turnout rates very close to those of non-Latino white women. Frasure and Williams (2009) observe a greater degree of racial and ethnic disparity in political participation beyond voting. They attribute the sources of disparity not only to economic inequality but also to constrictive immigration policy, systemic bias, and political mobilization bias.

Looking into multiracial data on political representation provides a clearer picture, nevertheless, of why women of color from diverse origins and backgrounds may still be considered together in one meaningful political category: Women of color as a whole suffer from

---

[4] Sergio Wals compared differences in political participation of difference generations of Mexican Americans in order to explore socialization differences in Mexico to possible variations in political participation in the US. "Does What Happens in Los Mochis Stay in Los Mochis? Explaining Post-Migration Political Behavior". American Political Science Association, August 2008.

substantial underrepresentation in elective offices. They do not compare well either to their male counterparts or to white women or men. Although women of color are currently 34.2% of US women, they are only 23.0% of the 88 women serving in the 110th US Congress, 5.4% of the 74 women serving in statewide elective executive offices, and 20.3% of the 1,746 women state legislators serving nationwide in 2008 (Center for American Women and Politics 2008). A recent study of descriptive representation by race and gender shows widespread disparity in elective office holding by men and women of color nationwide (Hardy-Fanta, Lien, Pinderhughes, and Sierra 2006). Race and gender parity "[in political representation is measured by the extent to which women of color elected officials have reached a share of a given level of office proportionate to their share in the population. The authors find that, at both congressional and state legislative levels, women of any race are associated with parity ratios that are substantially below the 1.0 that would indicate representation that matched their share of the population, while their white male counterparts report parity ratios that are well above the 1.0 benchmark. Table 2.2 report findings using the same methodology but with updated and more complete data. In the 110th Congress, Black women lead in descriptive representation among women of color. Their parity ratio of .32 is higher than that of Latinas at .18, Asian women at .16, and American Indian women at .0 (and slightly higher in this one instance than non-Hispanic white women, whose parity ratio is .30) At the state legislative level, the parity ratios increase for Black women and American Indian women but not for Latinas and Asians. Here, Black women again have the highest ratio (0.40) followed by American Indian women (0.14), Latina women (0.13), and Asian women (0.12). All these parity ratios for women of color are lower than those associated with their male counterparts in each nonwhite community.

Census statistics presented and analyzed in the preceding tables show that women of color, despite apparent disparity within, share a common experience of economic subordination and political marginalization that may not be obvious to all unless one examines the statistical data intersectionally. Women of color from all origins and backgrounds suffer from structural subordination in economic and political spheres. Can this be grounds for building a multicultural coalition based on the intersection of gender and race?

If women of color are to be successful in improving their socioeconomic and political status, proponents of multicultural feminism have maintained that they need to recognize difference within difference and to build coalitions based on the common need for social change (Moraga and Anzaldua 1983; Martinez 1998). The nature of solidarity among women of color comes from the fact that, regardless of differences that divide women of color, all are affected by intersecting oppressions of race, gender, and class. Yet, "[t]ranscending such barriers by forming coalitions," notes Roth (2004) at the end of her seminal study of the Black, Chicana, and white feminist movements in the 1960s and 1970s, "is always difficult, inasmuch as it requires the recognition of inequality, the negotiation of real, experiential difference, *and* knowledge of common cause" (p. 220, emphasis original). Moreover, coalition building among women of color may come at the expense of internal group solidarity. A study of those who joined the Third World Left in Los Angeles as part of the Black Power, Brown Power, and Yellow Power

movements discovers dissension among sisterhood due to their different attitudes towards patriarchy and the white women's movement (Pulido 2006, p. 183). The author notes that "[t]he precise nature of gender dynamics and tensions varied from group to group, depending upon a group's class position, political ideology, and racialization experience" (p. 180). More important to the purpose of this study, the author was forced to exclude American Indians from the analysis because of the different geographic basis and issue interests of the Red Power movement. In addition, Hardy-Fanta, Sierra, Lien, and Pinderhughes 2005 found little evidence of geographical overlap by race/ethnicity (Los Angeles happens to be one of the very few locations where three major nonwhite groups have some overlap in terms of political representation), so that, combined with the considerable socioeconomic, socialization, racial, ethnic and cultural histories of these groups, it may be too much to expect a great deal of coalition building across race/ethnicity for women of color.

In the end, we see that although women of color are structurally and theoretically situated to bond together for collective empowerment, real barriers exist to dampen their prospect of building a sustainable multiracial coalition. This prompted a former Combahee member to conclude that "the best kind of cross-racial ethnic organizing was situational, provisional, and issue-specific" (Roth 2004, p. 221). Do different groups of women of color in the present-day share the same consciousness and issue concerns? A recent study that seeks to understand the level of identity and solidarity among Black, Latina, Asian, and Native American women finds mounting challenges ahead in terms of anticipating a multiracial coalition among ordinary women of color. Lian's (2005) research based on 24 in-depth interviews of women of color in New York City and Los Angeles show that these ordinary women of color do not specifically plan to work together with each other, and they are active only about matters that affect family members and in some cases, their own community or neighborhood. They do not see their identity as fitting discreetly into one of the four racial categories, but they do see themselves as minorities who are disadvantaged in one or more ways. Will we find greater evidence of solidarity among women of color who are politically active, i.e., the elected officials in our study? In the sections to follow, we address the issue of identity and difference by comparing the experiences and voices of a large-scale sample of political women of color who govern at state and local levels nationwide.

How Do Different Groups of Women of Color Political Leaders Emerge?

Aggregate level findings discussed in the preceding section suggest that, in US electoral politics, women of color as a whole have achieved a lower level of descriptive representation than their male counterparts, while both groups do not do well when compared to their white counterparts at the congressional and state legislative levels. Among women of color, however, Black women appear to distinguish themselves by doing much better than other groups of women in political participation and descriptive representation. If political success is determined mainly by sociodemographic resources, the relative success of Black women and the relative absence of Asian American women (or Latino/as or American Indians) in elective office-holding

is puzzling. How distinctive is the experience of Black women? How distinctive is the experience of women in each of the other groups in our research? What may explain the different experiences between Black and other groups of women of color?

In her extensive review appraising the intersectional approach to studying political leadership and public policy outcomes, Manuel (2006) makes the argument that an intersectional lens could be particularly useful in illuminating 1) the conditions under which different groups of women of color emerge as leaders and gain the legitimacy of their constituents, 2) how they identify, articulate, and advocate the needs of the constituents, and 3) how they affect and are affected by public policymaking (190). We take this as a marching order for advancing empirical research on intersectionality by analyzing the attitudes and behavior of women of color leaders in the GMCL data. The rest of the paper reports the first of these efforts by focusing on understanding how Black, Latina, Asian, and American Indian women emerge as political leaders, by analyzing their responses to the GMCL survey. We hope a focus on this dimension may help clarify, although it is unlikely to solve, the puzzle of racial disparity among women of color in their political experiences.

We are not aware of a theory that focuses on explaining the electoral fate of multicultural women of color at state and local levels. However, a number of theories exist in explaining why there are not more women elected to public offices. Stevens (2007) observes that women's underrepresentation is a worldwide phenomenon except in Nordic countries. She summarizes factors affecting women's level of representation as falling into three categories: socioeconomic or social structural, political or politico-structural, and cultural or ideological. Political elites tend to be drawn disproportionally from among highly educated, gainfully employed, professional people (Kentworthy and Malami 1999). Socioeconomic factors influence the size of the eligibility pool or the supply of women able and willing to become political candidates. They are, nevertheless, insufficient reasons to account for the proportion of women representatives. Mateo Diaz (2005) examines data collected from 15 West European countries and finds that the longer men and women have enjoyed voting rights in these countries, the higher the proportion of female representatives. Leftist parties tend to promote the election of women representatives, while incumbency and single-member districts tend to obstruct their chances of success. Clear party nomination procedures benefit women while a system that relies on patronage network may not. The European Union has implemented proportional representation requirements of 40% for women in national legislative bodies.

Focusing on the cultural aspect, Fox and Lawless (2005a) and Lawless and Fox (2008) attribute the lack of women in elective offices to the lack of female candidates. They note that women consistently show lower levels of political ambition than men. They attribute the persistent gender gaps to long-standing traditions of sex-role socialization that features a masculinized ethos, traditional family role orientations for women, and a gendered psyche that propels men into politics but relegates women into the margins of electoral politics. In their innovative Citizen Political Ambition Survey, women are found to be less willing than men to endure the rigors of a political campaign. They are less likely than men to be recruited to run for

office. They are less likely than men to have the freedom to reconcile work and family obligations with a political career. They are less likely than men to think they are "qualified" to run for office. And they are less likely than men to perceive a fair political environment. In their exploration of nascent political ambition (the initial decision to run for office), Fox and Lawless (2005b) find minority group status (women, Blacks) alone may be associated with a lower likelihood of considering a candidacy and of seeking higher-level offices, while those who perceive themselves as qualified and were brought up in political families may be associated with a higher likelihood,. Women, even highly achieving ones, are found to use a harder yardstick to gauge their qualifications for office than men. Curiously, none of the indicators of structural/contextual variables used by the authors is found to be significant. This may be due to the absence of subjective measures of political structure in modeling political ambition.

Explaining the lack of women in higher offices, some attribute it to the lack of women entering the pipeline in the first place.[5] There are simply too few high-level women in the positions of "feeders" to a political career (Fox and Lawless 2004). However, this theory has been challenged. Deckmen (2004), for example, finds most school board candidates do not believe gaining political experience for a run for higher office is an important reason for their local office-seeking, even if more men than women would indicate this intention. In her study of male and female state legislators in five states 1993-2002, Mariani (2008) does not find these elected officials to enter the pipeline for congressional offices under similar circumstances. Earlier, using the "desirability thesis," Darcy, Welch, and Clark (1994, p. 44) suspected that the higher rates of women than men in local offices at the city and county levels may have something to do with the higher amount of power associated with higher level offices. They believe the more power the office has, the less likely a woman is to be elected. Others cite campaign costs as key. Seeking lower level offices does not require as much money and other resources as seeking higher-level offices. Again, none of these studies focuses on women of color.

The literature suggests that women's likelihood to seek a public office in the first place or a higher office may be influenced by a number of factors at the individual and contextual levels. For women of color elected officials serving at the state and local levels, we hypothesize that their political ambition to achieve higher office may be influenced by factors such as their current level of office, prior socialization, initial political motivation, perceptions of biases or fairness in the political structure, and sociodemographic and political characteristics. Below we first describe the survey data and basic characteristics of the respondents by race, gender, and level of office (Table 3). Then, we assess the effects of race and the intersection of race and gender on their political outlook and prospect for greater empowerment by conducting cross-tabulation (Tables 4-6) and multivariate analyses (Table 7). Selected question wording and coding scheme can be found in the Appendix.

---

[5] For a critique of the "pipeline" theory, please see Hardy-Fanta, Lien, Pinderhughes, and Sierra (2007).

Perspectives from the Gender and Multicultural Leadership Survey

The GMCL survey is a systematic telephone survey of the nation's elected officials of color holding state and local offices across the 50 states of America. Telephone interviews of 1,354 elected officials of color were conducted between June 5, 2006, and March 21, 2007, by the Institute for Public Policy (IPP) at the University of New Mexico. The population consists of a comprehensive list of nonwhite elected officials of African American, Latino, Asian Pacific American, and American Indian[6] origins holding elected positions at state and local levels of government including state legislators; county commissioners, members of boards of supervisors, county council members; mayors; city/town/village council members; and local school board members. The GMCL project team prepared the population database by enlisting support from national organizations and research centers that had published rosters of popularly elected officials of their respective racial/ethnic community.[7] The survey response rate as a percentage of the total successful contacts is 72%, the cooperation rate is 77%, and the refusal rate is 22%. The average length of interviews is 44 minutes. To the extent that the survey approximates a probability sample of the nation's elected officials of color at sub-national levels of office, we estimate the margin of error at the 95% level of confidence to be ±3%. The margin of error is larger, when the sample is broken down into subgroups.

Participants in the survey represent 13% of the nation's total number of 10,078 nonwhite elected officials serving at the sub-national levels in 2006-07. They include 96 Asian American elected officials or 28% of the universe of 342; 27 American Indian or Alaskan Native (AIAN) elected officials--18 of them are state legislators or 39% of the universe of 46; 722 Black elected officials or 12% of the universe of 5,980; and 509 Latino elected officials or 14% of the universe of 3,710. Among the total N of 1,354 survey respondents, 53 percent are Black, 37 percent are Latino, 7 percent are Asian, and 2 percent are American Indian/Alaskan Native. About half (47 percent) hold positions at the municipal level, 26 percent at the school board level, 16 percent at the county level, and 11 percent hold positions at the state legislative level of governance.

Table 3 reports the breakdown for each level of office by race and gender. The top rows show that females occupy over one-third of all the positions examined in this study; black women report the highest percentage share at 43%, followed by AIANs at 41%, while both Latinos and Asians report an equal percentage share of 31% each. Viewed by their level of office holding, a larger share of both female and male respondents serve at the municipal level than at the school board level, which is higher than in other levels. Contrary to common perceptions which suggest that women in general are more likely to be found at the school board

---

[6] Due to the lack of a national directory of American Indian elected officials, we rely on a national roster of state legislators prepared by the National Council of State Legislators to prepare our database of American Indians. Because of the predominance of American Indians serving at the state legislative level in our database, caution should be taken to analyze and interpret results regarding this population.

[7] See Hardy-Fanta et al. (2006, pp. 11-12) for more details on the construction of the database.

level than state legislative or municipal, our data show that, when analyzed by share of level of office, 11 percent of both women and men of color serve as state legislators. For both black and Asian women, a higher percentage of them serve at the municipal level than the school board level. For Latinas, however, the highest share of office holders is at the school board level, but municipal officeholders also account for one-third of all officeholders. Three-fourth of AIAN women in our study serve as state legislators, with the rest serving at the municipal level, but data limitations inherent in our original sampling frame make this higher percentage at the state legislative level likely to be an artifact of sampling.[8] When we analyze gender ratios within each race by level of office, we find an overall male advantage across racial groups and office levels; and in each of the racial groups (except AIANs).   Women of color receive the best representation at the school board level and the least at the county level. Although among all elected officials of color gender gaps seem to be smallest at the school board level, there are sharp differences across racial groups. Viewed from the perspective of the intersection of race, gender, and office, the smallest gender gap among school board members is among Latinos at 10 percentage points, while that among Asians is at 22 percentage points. Interestingly, while some of the smallest gender gaps are found at the state legislative level among blacks and AIANs, the gender gaps among Latino and Asian state legislators are at 48 and 56 percentage points, respectively. The wide range of gender dynamics among elected officials of color across race and level of office is disguised unless the data are being analyzed intersectionally by these attributes.

Cross-tabulation Findings: Where and How Does Race Matter?

In the GMCL survey, one set of indicators that allows us to examine the context from which state and local women of color elected officials emerge is their political socialization, sociodemographic and political resources, and social network. In Table 4, cross-tabulation results show that the four groups of women of color differ significantly from each other in terms of all these attributes. In particular, we see that as high as 40% of Asian women, while only 9% of Latinas, and less than 1% of black and AIAN women are foreign-born. Asian women also are distinguished by their very high educational and income status as well as by the percentage of having a white spouse. Latinas are distinguished by their coming from political families and are the second highest in the rate of having a white spouse and married to public officials, even if they report the smaller percentage of college graduates and have the shortest average years in public office. About four in 10 black women were also raised in political families and they report the second highest college graduates rate and the second longest years in public office. However, black women also report the lowest percentage of having high household income as well as the lowest in marital rate and being married to whites or public officials. Every four in 10 AIAN women in the survey also report being raised in a political family. They report the

---

[8] In contrast to the other racial/ethnic groups, there is no organization that collects and disseminates a directory of American Indian elected officials; we originally intended to provide analysis at the state legislative level only but discovered that 25% of the AIAN elected officials listed as state legislators self identified as municipal officials.

highest rate of having less than $50k in household income but also the highest rates of being married and to public officials as well as the longest years in public office. Although a large majority of these women of color are Democrats by partisanship, black and AIAN women report much higher levels of Democratic partisanship than that of Latinas. Asian women report the lowest level of Democratic partisanship and the highest levels of Independent and Republican partisanship. They do not differ much from black women and Latinas in their political ideology. Remarkably, as high as 50% of AIAN women report being somewhat or very conservative, which is 21 percentage points higher than the next highest group, Latinas.

The lower portion of Table 4 shows that the relative disadvantage of black women in income and marital resources is compensated by their consistently high involvement in a variety of civic organization and groups prior to their first run for an elective office. AIAN women register the second highest rate of prior civic engagement in five of the nine types of organizations and groups. Latinas register the second highest of prior involvement in political parties and business groups. However, they only eked out the second place from AIANs by a tiny margin. All except AIANs register the highest level of involvement with neighborhood or community organizations followed by that with PTA/Os. The reverse order is true for AIAN women. The third highest ranked group or organization with which women elected officials of color were involved is civil rights organizations for blacks, election campaign organizations for both Latinas and AIANs, and women's organizations for Asians. The social network that helps prepare each group of women of color for successful public office holding differs in degree and type, but all report the lowest degree of involvement with labor unions.

Another set of indicators to help us understand the context of the political rising of state and local elected officials of color is their motivation to seek public office in the first place. When asked about the reasons why they first decided to run for a political office, all four groups of women of color give similar patterns of answers in Table 5. (See Appendix for question wording and coding scheme.) They all mention the need to address an issue, to serve the community, and to provide better representation as the top three reasons. Asians are the only group where a higher percentage of respondents mention the desire to serve the community rather than to address an issue. To satisfy one's own political interest is the least mentioned reason for all groups except Latinas. For the latter, strategic considerations was the least mentioned reason. Overall, community- and issue-based motivations rather than political recruitment or self-interested motivation and political calculation explain why state and local women of color elected officials ran for a political office in the first place. When asked about their political ambition, these women do not differ significantly in their self-reported likelihood to run for a higher office even if a higher score is associated with AIAN women who mostly serve as state legislators. A different story describes men of color in their political ambition. Asian men register a higher score than Latinos who register a higher score than black men. Curiously, unlike their female counterparts, AIAN men register the lowest ambition score of all groups.

Past research shows that perceived opportunity structure in the political context may affect expressed political ambition. When asked to report the obstacles they faced during their first bid for the current office as measured by a battery of seven items, entries in Table 6 show that women respondents generally share similar assessments of comparative campaign disadvantages. The only exception is on gauging support from other political organizations than parties where Asian women report the lowest, while AIAN women report the highest, level of agreement to the statement that they receive less support than other candidates from these organizations. Among the seven statements of perceived campaign disadvantages, greater perceived difficulty in raising money and lower perceived support from political parties are among the top three statements agreed by all groups of women. However, both Latinas and Asian women register their highest level of agreement to the statement that they tend to receive greater scrutiny on personal qualifications than other candidates. Nevertheless, except for the top three items of agreement by AIAN women, generally no more than 40% of women of color in each group express agreement to any of the listed personal campaign disadvantages. The fact that these women are all winners rather than losers of election campaigns may explain their lack of awareness of biases against themselves in the system.

A very different picture emerges when women of color respondents are asked to assess the chances for minority women and women in general to get equal opportunities for employment and careers in politics. The middle part of Table 6 shows that a significantly higher percentage of Latinas than other groups of women of color in general perceive greater barriers for minority women than minority men to get elected or appointed to public offices, or to be accepted as a professional, or to obtain a suitable job to their education and training than other women of color. Black women generally perceive a higher level of structural barriers along these lines than Asian women. However, a slightly higher percentage of Asian women than black women perceive it harder for minority women than minority men to get a job suitable to their education and training. A much smaller percentage of AIAN women than other groups of women perceive getting a suitable job as harder for women of color, but they register as high a percentage as Latinas in perceiving a greater electoral barrier for women of color than men of color.

When asked to assess whether it is harder for women than men in general to access these career opportunities, the last part of Table 6 shows that respondents of all colors generally agree that it is much harder for women than for men to acquire these prized opportunities. However, a significantly higher percentage of Latinas (86%) perceive the gender-based obstacles to getting a suitable job, while AIAN women exceed other women in perceiving gender-based barriers to elective offices but trail behind other women in perceiving the same regarding appointment to public office. We suspect this not only reflects a universal understanding of substantial sexism that works against women's advancement in U.S. society and politics among all women of color, but it also reflects their understanding of the effect of racism affecting men and women of color

which provides some ground for narrowing the gender gaps among people of color. From responses to both questions, women of color, especially Latinas, generally perceive higher gender-based barriers to career opportunities in society and politics than men of color. This may help explain women of colors' severe underrepresentation in U.S. national, state, and local politics.

Multivariate Analysis on Political Ambition: How Does the Intersection of Race and Gender Matter?

The preceding analysis shows that, at the aggregate level, the four groups of women of color elected officials differ significantly in their socialization experiences, sociodemographic background, and group-based social networks. Each group of women of color also differs from each other on perceived disadvantages for women of color to get ahead in society and politics. However, all groups of women of color are largely similar in their political motivation for the first office and the extent of ambition for a higher office. Neither do they have significantly different perspectives among themselves on systemic biases against their own political campaign or gender-based discrimination against the advancement of women in general. Thus, despite substantial interracial differences among these individuals in their sociodemographic background and politicization experiences prior to their running for an elected office, they seem to be able to be characterized in large part as a coherent political body in their political motivation, political ambition, and assessment of biases in the campaign structure, but not in their assessment of the fairness in the opportunity structure for women of color.

We further interrogate the question of how much these political women of color can be considered as an internally cohesive political category with an ordinary least-squares analysis using the likelihood of running for a higher office as the dependent variable. To capture the significance of women of color being at the intersection of race and gender, we create three interactive terms of Asian American women, Latina, and American Indian women, with the slope coefficient of "Female" being that for Black women and the slope coefficient for each race being that of males. The purpose is to better specify whether black women have a distinctive experience compared to Latina, Asian, and AIAN women, after controlling for possible confounding factors such as level of office, prior socialization, initial political motivation, perceptions of biases or fairness in the political structure, and certain personal characteristics.

To facilitate the multivariate analysis, a summed index of prior civic engagement is created by taking the average of the sum of all nine indicators reported in Table 4 (α=.82). A summed index of perceived personal campaign disadvantages is created by taking the average of the sum of all seven items reported in the top part of Table 6 (α=.76). A summed index of perceived chance for minority women than minority men to obtain equal career opportunities and get ahead in politics is created by taking the average of the sum of the four items reported in the middle part of Table 6 (α=.82).

Results in Table 7 show that, everything else being equal, black female elected officials stand out as having a significantly lower, while Latino male elected officials stand out as having a significantly higher, likelihood of running for a higher office than black male elected officials of equal qualifications.   In nine of ten chances, equally qualified Asian male elected officials may have a higher level of political ambition compared to their black male counterparts. However, neither AIAN male elected officials nor any of the other women of color elected officials may have statistically significantly lower levels of political ambition compared to equally qualified black male elected officials. The size and direction of the standardized slope coefficient for black women reveal a most disadvantaged position of black women in their likelihood of seeking a higher office as compared to that of other women of color or any group of men of color elected officials. In this respect, black women do have a distinctive political experience. However, this individual-level finding about the relative disadvantage of black women in political advancement is unexpected when statistical data are examined only at the aggregate level or only among ordinary citizens and voters.

Looking at the possible correlates of minority political ambition, other entries in Table 7 show that being at the lowest level of office as school board members may be associated with a lower likelihood of running for a higher office. This finding challenges the assumption of a pipeline running from lower to higher levels of office among elected officials of color. The positive but insignificant slope coefficient for the foreign-born means that being an elected official with immigrant background may not provide enough drive for higher office-seeking. Although being raised in a political family may help, but it does not explain the ambition for higher office seeking. On the other hand, being involved with civic organizations or groups may significantly facilitate one's likelihood for seeking a higher office. Among reasons that motivate one to run for the first public office, we find that only those that are issue-based or that originate out of a concern for the community (however defined) may help propel one to seek a higher office.

On the impact of perceived personal disadvantages in campaigning for the current office, those who report a higher level of discrimination in the system actually are found to have the highest likelihood to run for a higher office[9]; while those who observe in general a harsher environment for minority women than minority men to receive equal job opportunity and treatment or to be elected or appointed to a public office may be potentially discouraged from seeking a higher office. We believe the reason that perceiving a more challenging political opportunity structure from one's campaign experience can be a facilitator rather than a deterrent in higher office-seeking is because we are dealing with a group of respondents who have championed the game. Their observation of a more challenging political environment may

---

[9] This finding provides further support of Manuel (2006) – that while discrimination can lead to structured subordination, it can also serve as a grievance that propels some into political action. See also Jacobs (2002).

signify a greater awareness of the structure *and* the ability to overcome the biases in the system. Finally, in terms of personal characteristics, being associated with a minority party among elected officials of color may have the potential of discouraging someone from seeking a higher office. Although having a college degree which tends to correlate with having a higher socioeconomic status may not increase one's likelihood of seeking a higher office, being married in and by itself as well as spending longer years in public service can be significant deterrents for one to consider moving up to a higher level of office. Thus, ironically, this exercise shows that some of the "resources" in political participation become liabilities for higher office seeking.

To further explore the relative distinctiveness of black women, we conduct similar but reduced multivariate models for black women and Latina women elected officials respectively. We find that black women's seeking a higher level of office may be significantly associated with a higher level of involvement in civic organizations or groups prior to their holding an elective office as well as seeing a greater level of campaign disadvantage when they first ran for the current office. However, being recruited or encouraged to run for a political office in the first place is associated with a lower likelihood to run for a higher office. All other possible correlates of political ambition are not found to be significant for black women. Among Latinas, seeing a greater level of campaign disadvantage when they first ran for the current office is also associated with a higher level of political ambition. However, the same cannot be said of prior civic engagement. Neither is being recruited to office negatively associated with greater likelihood of higher office seeking. Nevertheless, a motivation to serve the community in their first run for office may be associated with a higher likelihood of running for a higher office. As the results for black women, neither the level of office nor any of the personal characteristics may be used to predict political ambition among Latinas. This exercise shows that, despite the distinctive experience of black women, there are still are more commonality than differences between black and Latina women in the correlates for higher office-seeking. However, the small size of Latina elected officials and even smaller sizes of Asian and AIAN women in the survey prevent us from making more general observations.

Conclusion

In this sweeping but preliminary review of the social and political status of contemporary women of color, we examine the extent to which the perspectives and experiences of black women represent the experiences of other women of color in the U.S. This is especially important given that, with the rapid growth of international migration and other factors, black women are no longer the majority of U.S. women. We caution against treating the category of women of color as static and undifferentiated. And we find sharp interracial differences at the aggregate level in terms of socioeconomic achievement and other indicators of social and political status between black and other groups of women of color. However, we also find a remarkable and troubling consistency in the subordination of blacks and all other groups of women of color in the economic and political spheres. Moreover, although black women may be

socioeconomically disadvantaged and Asian American women in general may not be, their positions are reversed when looking at the voting participation rates and political representation ratios of the two.

How distinctive is the contemporary experience of black women? What explains the interracial differences between black and other groups of women of color? Focusing on the experiences of a large-scale national sample of female and male elected officials of color serving at state and local offices, we find substantial interracial differences among political women of color in their sociodemographic background and politicization experiences prior to their running for an elected office as well as their assessment of the fairness in the opportunity structure for women of color. However, we also find a remarkable amount of similarity across all groups of women of color in their political motivation, political ambition, and assessment of biases in the campaign structure. Nevertheless, when possible correlates of political ambition in the example of seeking for a higher level of office are controlled, we find that black women elected officials are severely disadvantaged in their political advancement when compared to similarly qualified black men and other groups of men and women of color.

Our findings caution against lumping together of women (and men) of color elected officials as one political category and raises the possibility that what motivates and empowers black or Latino or Asian male elected officials may not be expected to have the same effect on their female counterparts. Because the finding of the relative disadvantage of black women in rising through the political ranks is not uncovered until the statistical data are analyzed at the individual level and through multivariate analysis when we are able to control for confounding factors, we conclude that, in order to correctly understand the situation of women of color in general and black women in particular in US society and politics, we not only need to examine data collected from both ordinary people and political elites but we need to analyze them from the intersectional lens and at both the aggregate and individual levels.

References

Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G. 2007. *Gender, Race, and Nationalism in Contemporary Black Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baca Zinn, Maxine, and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism*," Feminist Studies* 22(2): 321-31.

Bedolla, Lisa Garcia. 2007. "Intersections of Inequality: Understanding Marginalization and Privilege in the Post-Civil Rights Era." *Politics & Gender* 3: 232-248.

Center for American Women and Politics. 2008. "Facts on Women of Color in Elective Office" http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/women_of_color/documents/color.pdf

Chow, Esther Ngan-ling, Doris Wilkinson, and Maxine Baca Zinn. 1996. *Race, Class, & Gender: Common Bonds, Different Voices.* Thousand Oaks, CA*:* Sage Publications.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 39: 139-67.

-----. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6): 1241-1299.

Dawson, Michael. 2001. "A Vision of Their Own: Identity and Black Feminist Ideology." In *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Deckman, Melissa. 2004. "Women Running Locally: How Gender Affects School Board Elections." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37(1): 61-62.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton, and Ruth Enid Zambrana. 2009. *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. (forthcoming)

Fox, Richard, and Jennifer Lawless. 2005a. *It Takes A Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

-----. 2005b. "To Run or Not to Run for Office: Explaining Nascent Political Ambition." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 642-59.

Frasure, Lorrie Ann, and Linda Faye Williams. 2009. "Racial, Ethnic and Gender Disparities in Political Participation and Civic Engagement." In *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice* eds., Dill and Zambrana. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. (forthcoming)

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2002. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. "Intersectionality as a Normative and Empirical Paradigm." *Politics & Gender* 3: 248-254.

Hardy-Fanta, Carol, Christine Marie Sierra, Pei-te Lien, Dianne M. Pinderhughes, and Wartyna
       L. Davis. 2005. "Race, Gender, and Descriptive Representation: An Exploratory View
       of Multicultural Leadership in the United States." Paper presented at the 2005 Annual
       Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 1-4.

_____, Pei-te Lien, Dianne M. Pinderhughes, and Christine Marie Sierra. 2006. "Gender,
       Race, and Descriptive Representation: Findings from the Gender and Multicultural
       Leadership Project." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 28(3/4): 7-21.

_____. 2007. A New Look at Paths to Political Office: Moving Women of Color from the
       Margins to the Center. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political
       Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, 30 August – 2 September.

hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism.* Cambridge, MA: South End
       Press.

Jacobs, Glenn. 2002. "Educational Grievance and Latino Mobilization: Chelsea," Ch. 1 in Latino
       Politics in Massachusetts, ed. Carol Hardy-Fanta and Jeffrey Gerson, pp. 25-49. New
       York: Routledge.

Jordan-Zachery, Julia S. 2007. "Am I a Black Woman or a Woman Who Is Black? A Few
       Thoughts on the Meaning of Intersectionality." *Politics & Gender* 3: 254-263.

Junn, Jane, Nadia Brown. 2008. "What Revolution? Incorporating Intersectionality in Women
       and Politics." Pp. 64-78 in Christina Wolbrecht, Karen Beckwith, and Lisa Baldez eds.
       Political Women and American Democracy. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University
       Press.

Kelly, Kacie. 2008. "Call to Action: A Pay Equity Resource Guide." Fact Sheet produced by the
       Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy, University of Massachusetts Boston
       (June). Downloaded on 18 August 2008 from http://www.mccormack.umb.edu/
       centers/cwppp/documents/payequityjune2008.pdf

Kenworthy, Lane, and Melissa, Malami. 1999. "Gender Inequality in Political Representation: A
       Worldwide Comparative Analysis." *Social Forces* 78(1): 235-69.

Landry, Bart. 2006. *Race, Gender, and Class: Theory and Methods of Analysis.* Upper Saddle
       River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lawless, Jennifer, and Richard Fox. 2008. "Why Are Women Still Not Running for Public
       Office?" The Brookings Institute Issues in Governance Studies no. 14.

Lian, Pearson. "Multicultural Feminism and Sisterhood among Women of Color: Catalyst or Encumbrance to Social Change Dialogue." Paper presented at the 2005 annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Sheraton New York, New York City.

Mariani, Mack D. 2008. "A Gendered Pipeline? The Advancement of State Legislators to Congress in Five States." *Politics & Gender* 4: 285-308.

Martinez, Elizabeth. 1998. *De Colores Means All of Us: Latina Views for a Multi-Colored Century*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Manuel, Tiffany. 2006. "Envisioning the Possibility of a Good Life: Exploring the Public Policy Implications of Intersectional Theory." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 28(3/4): 173-203.

Mateo Diaz, Mercedes. 2005. *Representing Women? Female Legislators in West European Parliaments.* Colchester, UK: ECPR Press.

Moraga, Cherrie, and Gloria Anzaldua. Eds. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color.* Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.

Pulido, Laura. 2006. *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Roth, Benita. 2004. *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America's Second Wave*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Simien, Evelyn. 2007. "Doing Intersectionality Research: From Conceptual Issues to Practical Examples." *Politics & Gender* 3: 264-271.

Stevens, Anne. 2007. *Women, Power, and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Strolovitch, Dara Z. 2007. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Xu, wu, Ann Leffler. 1996. "Gender and Race Effects on Occupational Prestige, Segregation, and Earnings." Pp. 107-124 in Esther Ngan-ling Chow, Doris Wilkinson, and Maxine Baca Zinn, eds. *Race, Class, & Gender: Common Bonds, Different Voices.* Thousand Oaks, CA*:* Sage Publications.

White, Julie Anne. 2007. "The Hollow and the Ghetto: Space, Race, and the Politics of

Poverty." *Politics & Gender* 3: 271-280.

Woo, Deborah. 2000. *Glass Ceilings and Asian Americans: The New Face of Workplace Barriers.* Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, a division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Appendix: Selected Question Wording and Coding Scheme

Likelihood of Running for Higher Office. Q34. Using a scale from zero to ten, where zero means not at all likely and ten means extremely likely, how likely is it that you will run for a higher level of office when you leave your current position?

Raised in a Political Family. Q180. Would you describe yourself as having been raised in a political family? 1=yes, 0=otherwise

Prior Civic Engagement. Qs20-28. On a scale from zero to ten, where zero means not at all involved and ten means extremely involved, how involved were you in activities with each of the following groups before you first ran for elected office? (Response list includes: political parties, labor unions, business groups, parent teacher's organizations or associations, election campaigns, civil rights organizations, faith-based organizations, community or neighborhood organizations, women's organizations)

Initial Political Motivation. Q33. Elected officials have a variety of reasons for why they first decided to run for a political office. We are interested in the most important factor that influenced your decision to run for public office the very first time. Briefly, what was the most important reason influencing your decision to run for public office the very first time?

To address an issue: Have a passion or interest regarding a particular issue and/or problem.

To serve the community. Focus is on the community, not on an issue, what they can do, comments about representation, etc. They want to improve the community, give back to the community, etc. In general, responses that mentioned community were coded here.

To provide better representation. Includes anyone who is dissatisfied with current representation, wants to increase the number of minorities in the political office, or finds a need for more/better representation for a particular group of people.

To make a difference/promote change. References to wanting to influence change or to make a difference externally, as in the community, in government, or in the city.

Strategic Considerations. Run when prospect is most favorable to winning (i.e. qualified, could win, no one else ran) Demonstrates "response outcome expectations" by running for office. Includes political efficacy, meaning that they believe that they are competent or qualified to participate.

Personal ambition or interest. A reference to self and/or family. Includes mentions of emotion or personality trait as driving force, including political ambition.

Being encouraged/recruited/appointed. Includes anyone who was appointed to the position or encouraged by anybody to run.

Own political interest. Show interest in politics. Interested in being a part of politics, a part of the decision-making process.

Perceived Campaign Disadvantages. Qs42-54. Some people believe that minority candidates have to overcome special obstacles when they run for elected office. For the next several questions, please tell me whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree that you faced any of the following obstacles during your first bid for your current office. How would you rate your level of agreement with the following statement?

Q42. I received less support from political parties than other candidates.
Q44. I received less support from other political organizations than other candidates.
Q46. I faced more questions about my qualifications and/or electability than other candidates.
Q48. I had a harder time raising money than other candidates.
Q50. I received less attention from the mainstream media than other candidates.
Q52. More comments were made about my personal appearance than about my opponents'.
Q54. My family's background received greater scrutiny than that of other candidates.

1=strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, 4= strongly agree

Perceived chance of women than men. Q75. Do you think it is easier or harder for women to get a suitable job to their education and training? Q76. Do you think it is easier or harder for women to get ahead in elective politics than it is for men? Q77. Do you think it is easier or harder for women to get accepted as a professional member? Q78. Do you think it is easier or harder for women to get appointed to public office than it is for men?
1=easier, 2=about the same, 3=harder

Perceived chance of minority women than minority men. Q71. Do you think it is easier or harder for minority women to get a suitable job to their education and training? Q72. Do you think it is easier or harder for minority women to get ahead in elective politics than it is for minority men? Q73. Do you think it is easier or harder for minority women to get accepted as a professional member? Q74. Do you think it is easier or harder for minority women to get appointed to public office than it is for minority men?
1=easier, 2=about the same, 3=harder

Table 1.1 Women of Color in the United States: A Sociodemographic Profile, 2006

	Black	Latina	Asian	AIAN	NHOPI
Female Population	20,476,428	21,373,850	7,562,810	2,208,197	401,856
% of all women of color	39.4	41.1	14.5	4.2	0.8
% Foreign-born	7.7	38.2	63.0	3.6	12.9
% Having Bachelor's degree or higher, female 25 years and over	18.3 (15.6)	13.1 (11.5)	45.6 (51.6)	16.4 (14.9)	17.3 (15.8)
% in Civilian labor force, females 16 years and over	62.2	57.3	59.0	56.9	64.7
% in Management, professional, and related occupa., of employed female civilians	31.2 (21.3)	22.5 (13.7)	44.0 (47.8)	31.8 (22.7)	29.2 (19.5)
Median earnings (dollars) full-time, year-round female workers	$30,443 ($34,586)	$24,738 ($27,490)	$38,245 ($49,759)	$28,864 ($35,364)	$31,831 ($36,420)
% Married, females 15 years and over	27.1	46.6	57.8	38.6	44.0
% in Poverty of families with female householder	36.1	38.6	18.6	38.0	27.2
--- With related children under 18 years	43.0	45.5	25.4	45.4	32.1

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006 American Community Survey. Table complied by authors.

Note: Each population includes persons who are race alone or in combination with other races. AIAN = American Indian and Alaskan Native. NHOPI = Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander. Entries in the parentheses are comparative figures for males.

Table 1.2 Women of Color in the United States: A Sociodemographic Profile of Selected Asian and Latino Groups, 2006

	Cambodian	Hmong	Laotian	Cuban	Dominican	Mexican
Female Population	123,055	104,723	103,408	757,097	657,301	13,376,175
Mean Age (of all)	25.9	19.1	27.8	41.2	29.7	25.7
% Foreign-born	60.8	45.3	59.5	61.8	63.9	37.4
% Having Bachelor's degree or higher, female 25 years and over	11.3 (16.4)	10.1 (15.2)	12.0 (10.2)	25.3 (25.6)	15.1 (13.2)	9.0 (7.7)
% in Civilian labor force, females 16 years and over	60.1	56.5	63.7	52.7	61.3	55.5
% in Management, professional, and related occupa., of employed female civilians	18.4 (22.1)	21.4 (18.6)	18.0 (14.9)	34.1 (28.4)	19.1 (14.8)	19.8 (10.7)
Median earnings (dollars) full-time, year-round female workers	$25,568 ($32,096)	$25,751 ($29,264)	$25,998 ($31,864)	$30,455 ($36,371)	$23,637 ($28,586)	$22,913 ($26,096)
% Married, females 15 years and over	42.4	48.7	51.4	46.4	33.7	49.6
% in Poverty of families with female householder	29.4	44.9	21.1	24.1	41.9	41.1
--- With related children under 18 years	36.9	46.5	27.8	34.1	48.1	47.8

Source and Note: (See Table 1.1).

Table 2.1 Voting Turnout by Race among US Women in the November 2004 Elections

	Black	Latina	Asian	AIAN	NHOPI	White
% Foreign-born	9.2	54.6	79.0	2.3	38.0	5.6
% US Citizen	95.1	62.6	66.6	98.9	85.1	97.8
% Voting among voting age persons	60.6	30.6	31.4	56.9	46.8	66.9
% Voting among voting age citizens	63.7	49.4	47.1	57.5	55.0	68.4
% Voting among the registered	88.2	82.4	87.0	82.6	86.8	89.8

Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY, NOVEMBER 2004: VOTER SUPPLEMENT FILE [Computer file]. ICPSR04272-v1. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census [producer], 2005. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-01-16.

Note: Entries are for voting-age persons, except where noted, who can be solely or partly of the racial origin except for Latinos who can be of any race. Each racial category is also mutually exclusive of each other. Thus, Asians stands for non-Latino Asians, Blacks for non-Latino Blacks, Whites for non-Latino Whites, AIAN for non-Latino American Indians and Alaskan Natives, and NHOPI for non-Latino Native Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders.

Table 2.2 Parity Ratios by Race and Gender at the State Legislative and Congressional Levels

	Black		Latino		Asian		AIAN	
Gender	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Congress (110th)	12	29	7	18	2	6	0	1
% among Congress	2.2	5.4	1.3	3.4	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.2
% among U.S. Population (2006)	6.8	6.2	7.1	7.8	2.5	2.4	0.7	0.7
Congressional Parity Ratio	0.32	0.87	0.18	0.44	0.16	0.46	0.00	0.26
State Legislature (2006)	200	334	70	159	24	60	9	37
% among All State Legislators	2.7	4.5	0.9	2.2	0.3	0.8	0.1	0.5
% among U.S. Population (2006)	6.8	6.2	7.1	7.8	2.5	2.4	0.7	0.7
State Legislative Parity Ratio	0.40	0.73	0.13	0.28	0.12	0.33	0.14	0.71

Source: The Gender & Multicultural Leadership Project, 2006-07.

Table 3. GMCL Survey Respondents by Race, Gender, and Office										
Race	Black (722)		Latino (509)		Asian (96)		AIAN (27)		ALL (1354)	
Gender	F (308)	M (414)	F (159)	M (350)	F (30)	M (66)	F (11)	M (16)	F (508)	M (846)
% in All Offices	43	57	31	69	31	69	41	59	38	62
% in Each Level of Office within Each Race/Gender										
State Legislature	11	9	6	8	13	21	73	62	11	11
County	13	25	7	15	0	6	0	6	10	19
Municipal	52	51	34	47	47	44	27	25	45	48
School Board	25	15	53	29	40	29	0	6	34	22
% Female and Male within Each Race/Level of Office										
State Legislature	46	54	26	74	22	78	44	56	38	62
County	27	73	17	83	0	100	0	100	24	76
Municipal	43	57	25	75	33	67	43	57	36	64
School Board	56	44	45	55	39	61	0	100	48	52

Source: Gender & Multicultural Project Survey, 2006-07.

*Note: While we included American Indians in the survey, they are mostly drawn from state legislators and the result for other offices may not reflect the distribution in the population.

Table 4. Percentage Distribution by Race among Women and Men of Color

	Women of Color (n=508)				Men of Color (n=846)			
	Black	Latino	Asian	AIAN	Black	Latino	Asian	AIAN
Political Socialization, Sociodemographic, and Political Characteristics								
Foreign Born [a,b]	1	9	40	0	1	8	42	0
Raised from a Political Family	39	43	25	40	32	30	16	43
Education (College Degree or more) [a,b]	64	48	83	54	57	43	86	50
Household Income in 2005[a,b]								
Less than $50k	34	30	15	50	24	23	7	50
$150k or more	5	9	31	12	8	9	30	0
Marital Status [a,b] (Married)	46	62	68	80	76	83	88	86
Race of Spouse (White)[a]	4	23	37	12	3	18	18	18
Married to a Public Official[b]	12	16	12	30	8	3	10	0
Years in Office [a,b]	12.5	9.4	10.2	13.6	15.4	12.2	9.1	12.8
Political Partisanship [a,b]								
Democrat	89	74	62	90	83	74	54	79
Independent	8	11	17	0	13	9	17	0
Republican	1	14	17	10	2	14	28	14
Political Ideology [b]								
Very/SW Liberal	47	39	45	20	32	24	20	14
Very/SW Conserv.	23	29	17	50	27	41	34	64
Prior Engagement with Civic Organizations & Groups (mean)								
Neighborhood/ Community Org. [a,b]	7.9	6.9	7.0	6.0	7.8	6.5	7.1	6.7
PTA/O[b]	7.3	6.4	6.4	6.6	6.3	4.9	4.5	6.1
Civil Rights Org. [a,b]	6.7	3.4	3.2	4.7	7.1	3.2	3.1	5.1
Faith-based Org. [a,b]	6.4	3.9	2.9	4.0	6.1	3.9	3.2	4.4
Women's Org. [a,b]	6.4	4.5	5.0	4.0	2.6	1.7	2.1	1.9
Political Party[a,b]	6.1	5.1	3.9	5.0	6.5	5.1	4.2	6.1
Election Campaign[b]	5.8	5.4	4.8	5.7	6.5	5.1	4.7	5.4
Business Group[a,b]	5.3	4.2	4.0	4.1	5.4	4.6	4.5	4.3
Labor Union [a,b]	3.1	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.4	3.0	2.1	1.6

Source and note: (See Table 3)
[a] Racial differences among women of color is significant at .05 level.
[b] Racial differences among men of color is significant at .05 level.

Table 5. Percentage Distribution by Race among Women and Men of Color								
	Women of Color (n=508)				Men of Color (n=846)			
	Black	Latino	Asian	AIAN	Black	Latino	Asian	AIAN
Reasons for Running the First Office (% of mentions)								
To address an issue[b]	50	59	41	46	43	58	42	50
To serve the community	46	49	52	36	50	52	60	44
To provide better representation	27	30	38	46	30	28	37	25
Personal ambition or interest	24	24	31	18	18	19	20	50
Being encouraged or appointed[b]	22	13	17	27	19	12	6	6
To make difference/ promote change	20	22	10	9	21	21	17	19
Strategic considerations[b]	16	10	10	18	19	11	20	25
Do public service[b]	16	15	10	27	24	19	9	12
Own political interest	11	13	7	9	12	9	8	6
Political Ambition (mean)								
Likelihood of running for higher office[b]	3.8	3.9	3.2	5.2	4.3	4.9	5.4	3.3
Source and Note: (See Table 4)								

Table 6. Percentage Distribution by Race among Women and Men of Color								
	Women of Color (n=508)				Men of Color (n=846)			
	Black	Latino	Asian	AIAN	Black	Latino	Asian	AIAN
Perceived Campaign Disadvantages (% agree or strongly agree that, in their first run for office, they receive----- than other candidates)								
Harder times raising $[b]	39	30	31	56	46	28	30	75
Less support from parties [b]	37	32	32	60	46	36	42	60
Less support from other political org.[a,b]	34	25	9	56	43	33	42	60
Greater scrutiny on Qualifications [b]	29	36	37	37	36	42	49	60
Less media attention	28	28	15	20	32	30	19	62
More attention to personal appearances	10	14	15	20	19	17	16	16
More scrutiny on family	12	14	18	10	20	24	18	27
Perceived chance of minority women than minority men to --- (indicating that it is *harder* for *minority women*)								
get ahead in elective office [a]	64	73	53	73	62	65	52	62
get appointed to public office [a,b]	64	74	47	64	56	60	50	56
Be accepted as a professional member [a]	61	71	50	54	52	56	56	56
Get a suitable job to their education and training [a,b]	54	77	57	36	46	68	61	56
Perceived chance of women than men to --- (indicating that it is *harder* for *women*)								
get ahead in elective office [b]	84	86	67	91	73	65	50	75
get appointed to public office [b]	79	80	60	46	69	59	50	56
Be accepted as a professional member [b]	74	73	57	64	61	52	52	69
Get a suitable job to their education and training [a,b]	77	86	77	73	57	62	67	75
Source and Note: (See Table 4)								

Table 7. Ordinary Least Squares Estimations of the Likelihood of Running for a Higher Office for Local and State Elected Officials of Color

	b	s.e.	B	t	Sig.
Race (ref.=Black)					
Latino	.923	.356	.117	2.593	.010
Asian	1.054	.636	.072	1.656	.098
AIAN	-1.059	1.317	-.034	-.805	.421
Race x Gender					
Female (Black women)	-1.033	.347	-.132	-2.974	.003
Latina	-.091	.536	-.008	-.169	.866
Asian Female	-.863	1.037	-.032	-.832	.405
AIAN Female	1.416	1.987	.030	.713	.476
Level of Office (ref.=Municipal)					
State Legislature	.502	.421	.042	1.194	.233
County	-.430	.351	-.042	-1.227	.220
School Board	-.649	.316	-.075	-2.054	.040
Prior Socialization					
Foreign Born	.591	.513	.040	1.150	.250
Raised in a Political Family	-.179	.259	-.022	-.691	.490
Prior Civic Involvement	.202	.061	.119	3.337	.001
Initial Political Motivation					
Issue-Based	.446	.259	.059	1.724	.085
Community-Based	.425	.250	.056	1.701	.089
Recruited or Encouraged	-.476	.341	-.046	-1.396	.163
Perceived Opportunity Structure					
Personal Campaign Disadvantages	1.026	.230	.145	4.459	.000
Harder Chance for Minority Women	-.227	.169	-.043	-1.344	.179
Personal Characteristics					
Partisanship (Republican)	-.665	.418	-.053	-1.589	.112
College Graduate	.382	.257	.049	1.486	.138
Married	-.600	.273	-.073	-2.200	.028
Years in Public Office	-.069	.015	-.148	-4.482	.000
(Constant)	2.662	.841		3.165	.002
Adj. R-sq=.10, F=6.35, N=995					

Source: The Gender and Multicultural Leadership Survey, June 2006-March 2007.

Note: b=unstandardized regression coefficients, s.e.= standard errors, B=standardized regression coefficients