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**Table OA1. Determinants of Black Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates - Full results**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 5.09 \*\* | 3.65 \*\* | 4.65 \*\* | -0.06 \* |
|  | (0.60) | (0.57) | (0.60) | (0.03) |
| **Beliefs about**  **Latino**  **discrimination** | 4.93 \*\*  (0.83) | 5.12 \*\*  (0.82) | 5.65 \*\*  (0.84) | -0.05  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | -4.55  (2.57) | 0.24  (2.43) | -0.87  (2.54) | 0.09  (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -28.61 \*\* | -26.37 \*\* | -22.91 \*\* | 0.27 |
|  | (3.73) | (3.78) | (3.71) | (0.18) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 12.89 \*\* | 8.40 \* | 12.25 \*\* | 1.07 \*\* |
|  | (4.26) | (4.18) | (4.34) | (0.21) |
| **US-born** | -1.91 | -4.41 | -2.28 | 0.22 |
|  | (2.50) | (2.52) | (2.40) | (0.14) |
| **Home language** | -7.46 \*\* | -3.94 | -5.34 \* | 0.26 \*\* |
|  | (2.34) | (2.26) | (2.37) | (0.10) |
| **Party identification** | 1.17 \*\* | 0.35 | 0.59 | 0.10 \*\* |
|  | (0.42) | (0.40) | (0.43) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | -1.04 | -0.49 | -1.09 | 0.26 \*\* |
|  | (0.87) | (0.84) | (0.88) | (0.04) |
| **Age** | 0.15 \*\* | 0.06 | 0.20 \*\* | -0.02 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 0.08 | 1.56 | 0.69 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.85) | (0.84) | (0.82) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | 0.58 \* | 0.27 | 0.35 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 16.59 \*\* | 22.33 \*\* | 13.30 \*\* | 1.83 \*\* |
|  | (5.11) | (4.98) | (4.96) | (0.26) |
| **N** | 1677 | 1677 | 1677 | 1638 |
| **R2** | 0.21 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.15 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA2. Determinants of Latino Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates - Full results**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 4.05 \*\* | 3.01 \*\* | 3.99 \*\* | 0.18 \*\* |
|  | (0.75) | (0.75) | (0.74) | (0.04) |
| **Beliefs about Black discrimination** | 5.92 \*\*  (0.86) | 6.54 \*\*  (0.85) | 5.51 \*\*  (0.90) | -0.05  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip code)** | 5.28  (2.94) | -1.50  (3.03) | 0.05  (3.23) | 0.27 \*  (0.13) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -24.16 \*\* | -15.91 \*\* | -20.48 \*\* | 0.30 |
|  | (4.08) | (4.15) | (4.02) | (0.19) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 10.40 \* | 8.72 | 8.26 | 0.48 \* |
|  | (4.73) | (4.69) | (4.89) | (0.22) |
| **US-born** | 3.11 | 2.60 | 1.64 | 0.12 |
|  | (1.76) | (1.79) | (1.81) | (0.08) |
| **Home language** | -0.45 | -0.43 | -1.88 | 0.40 \*\* |
|  | (1.68) | (1.74) | (1.70) | (0.08) |
| **Party identification** | 1.17 \*\* | 1.14 \*\* | 1.32 \*\* | 0.11 \*\* |
|  | (0.41) | (0.42) | (0.42) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | 0.43 | 0.40 | 1.26 | 0.16 \*\* |
|  | (0.98) | (1.00) | (0.99) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.09 | 0.18 \*\* | 0.10 | -0.01 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 1.85 \* | 1.85 \* | 1.27 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.81) | (0.81) | (0.84) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | -0.13 | 0.04 | -0.03 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.26) | (0.27) | (0.27) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 6.44 | 3.01 | 7.20 | 1.38 \*\* |
|  | (5.66) | (5.82) | (5.80) | (0.26) |
| **N** | 1522 | 1522 | 1522 | 1459 |
| **R2** | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.17 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA3. Determinants of Black Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – Controlling for “Black & Latino”**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 5.09 \*\* | 3.64 \*\* | 4.64 \*\* | -0.06 \* |
|  | (0.59) | (0.57) | (0.60) | (0.03) |
| **Beliefs about Latino**  **discrimination** | 4.98 \*\*  (0.83) | 5.23 \*\*  (0.82) | 5.71 \*\*  (0.84) | -0.04  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | -4.81  (2.56) | -0.23  (2.42) | -1.17  (2.54) | 0.09  (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -28.59 \*\* | -26.34 \*\* | -22.89 \*\* | 0.27 |
|  | (3.72) | (3.75) | (3.70) | (0.18) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 12.98 \*\* | 8.55 \* | 12.35 \*\* | 1.07 \*\* |
|  | (4.26) | (4.15) | (4.33) | (0.21) |
| **US-born** | -1.95 | -4.50 | -2.33 | 0.21 |
|  | (2.51) | (2.54) | (2.41) | (0.14) |
| **Home language** | -8.43 \*\* | -5.73 \* | -6.50 \*\* | 0.25 \* |
|  | (2.43) | (2.35) | (2.45) | (0.11) |
| **Party identification** | 1.15 \*\* | 0.32 | 0.57 | 0.10 \*\* |
|  | (0.42) | (0.40) | (0.43) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | -1.06 | -0.53 | -1.12 | 0.26 \*\* |
|  | (0.87) | (0.84) | (0.88) | (0.04) |
| **Age** | 0.15 \*\* | 0.07 | 0.20 \*\* | -0.02 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 0.12 | 1.63 | 0.73 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.85) | (0.83) | (0.82) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | 0.55 \* | 0.21 | 0.32 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.01) |
| **Black & Latino** | 6.66 | 12.19 \*\* | 7.92 \* | 0.09 |
|  | (3.64) | (3.89) | (3.56) | (0.17) |
| **Intercept** | 16.35 \*\* | 21.89 \*\* | 13.01 \*\* | 1.83 \*\*\* |
|  | (5.09) | (4.96) | (4.94) | (0.25) |
| **N** | 1677 | 1677 | 1677 | 1638 |
| **R2** | 0.21 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.15 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA4. Determinants of Latino Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – Controlling for “Black & Latino”**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 4.02 \*\* | 3.00 \*\* | 3.96 \*\* | 0.18 \*\* |
|  | (0.75) | (0.75) | (0.74) | (0.04) |
| **Beliefs about Black**  **discrimination** | 5.93 \*\*  (0.86) | 6.55 \*\*  (0.85) | 5.53 \*\*  (0.90) | -0.05  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | 5.08  (2.99) | -1.64  (3.07) | -0.17  (3.28) | 0.23  (0.13) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -24.24 \*\* | -15.96 \*\* | -20.57 \*\* | 0.29 |
|  | (4.09) | (4.15) | (4.02) | (0.19) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 10.36 \* | 8.69 | 8.22 | 0.47 \* |
|  | (4.74) | (4.69) | (4.90) | (0.22) |
| **US-born** | 3.02 | 2.54 | 1.55 | 0.10 |
|  | (1.77) | (1.80) | (1.82) | (0.08) |
| **Home language** | -0.48 | -0.45 | -1.91 | 0.39 \*\* |
|  | (1.69) | (1.74) | (1.70) | (0.07) |
| **Party identification** | 1.15 \*\* | 1.13 \*\* | 1.30 \*\* | 0.11 \*\* |
|  | (0.41) | (0.42) | (0.42) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | 0.41 | 0.39 | 1.24 | 0.15 \*\* |
|  | (0.99) | (1.00) | (1.00) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.09 | 0.18 \*\* | 0.10 | -0.01 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 1.86 \* | 1.85 \* | 1.28 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.81) | (0.81) | (0.84) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | -0.14 | 0.04 | -0.04 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.26) | (0.27) | (0.27) | (0.01) |
| **Black & Latino** | 2.32 | 1.58 | 2.48 | 0.47 \*\* |
|  | (3.98) | (3.87) | (3.77) | (0.16) |
| **Intercept** | 6.55 | 3.09 | 7.32 | 1.41 \*\* |
|  | (5.68) | (5.83) | (5.82) | (0.26) |
| **N** | 1522 | 1522 | 1522 | 1459 |
| **R2** | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.18 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA5. Determinants of Black Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – Excluding those “Black & Latino”**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 5.31 \*\* | 3.70 \*\* | 4.72 \*\* | -0.06 \* |
|  | (0.60) | (0.58) | (0.61) | (0.03) |
| **Beliefs about Latino**  **discrimination** | 4.56 \*\*  (0.85) | 4.91 \*\*  (0.83) | 5.48 \*\*  (0.86) | -0.06  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | -4.12  (2.62) | 0.37  (2.47) | -0.82  (2.60) | 0.08  (0.12) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -27.82 \*\* | -26.81 \*\* | -22.76 \*\* | 0.32 |
|  | (3.86) | (3.85) | (3.82) | (0.18) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 12.55 \*\* | 8.61 \* | 12.02 \*\* | 1.10 \*\* |
|  | (4.37) | (4.24) | (4.44) | (0.22) |
| **US-born** | -1.60 | -4.57 | -2.37 | 0.25 |
|  | (2.54) | (2.60) | (2.47) | (0.14) |
| **Home language** | -7.10 \*\* | -4.95 \* | -6.34 \* | 0.31 \*\* |
|  | (2.57) | (2.45) | (2.60) | (0.11) |
| **Party identification** | 1.32 \*\* | 0.36 | 0.71 | 0.10 \*\* |
|  | (0.43) | (0.41) | (0.44) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | -1.38 | -0.65 | -1.17 | 0.26 \*\* |
|  | (0.89) | (0.85) | (0.89) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.17 \*\* | 0.07 | 0.21 \*\* | -0.02 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 0.36 | 1.96 \* | 0.97 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.88) | (0.85) | (0.84) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | 0.46 | 0.10 | 0.24 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.24) | (0.25) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 15.46 \*\* | 22.42 \*\* | 12.50 \* | 1.74 \*\* |
|  | (5.24) | (5.08) | (5.11) | (0.27) |
| **N** | 1599 | 1599 | 1599 | 1561 |
| **R2** | 0.21 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.15 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA6. Determinants of Latino Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – Excluding those “Black & Latino”**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 4.23 \*\* | 3.05 \*\* | 4.02 \*\* | 0.18 \*\* |
|  | (0.76) | (0.77) | (0.76) | (0.04) |
| **Beliefs about Black**  **discrimination** | 5.75 \*\*  (0.87) | 6.22 \*\*  (0.87) | 5.28 \*\*  (0.93) | -0.05  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | 4.59  (3.05) | -2.18  (3.15) | -0.36  (3.38) | 0.24  (0.14) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -23.18 \*\* | -15.90 \*\* | -20.28 \*\* | 0.34 |
|  | (4.21) | (4.28) | (4.16) | (0.20) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 10.04 \* | 9.06 | 8.15 | 0.45 |
|  | (4.84) | (4.83) | (5.05) | (0.23) |
| **US-born** | 3.57 \* | 2.83 | 1.75 | 0.13 |
|  | (1.78) | (1.82) | (1.85) | (0.08) |
| **Home language** | 0.49 | 0.20 | -1.61 | 0.43 \*\* |
|  | (1.72) | (1.78) | (1.75) | (0.08) |
| **Party identification** | 1.27 \*\* | 1.22 \*\* | 1.46 \*\* | 0.11 \*\* |
|  | (0.42) | (0.43) | (0.43) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | 0.20 | 0.35 | 1.32 | 0.14 \*\* |
|  | (1.00) | (1.02) | (1.01) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.11 \* | 0.18 \*\* | 0.11 \* | -0.01 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 2.12 \* | 2.12 \* | 1.43 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.83) | (0.82) | (0.86) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | -0.23 | -0.06 | -0.10 | -0.02 \* |
|  | (0.26) | (0.27) | (0.27) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 4.36 | 2.19 | 6.09 | 1.32 \*\* |
|  | (5.83) | (6.04) | (6.02) | (0.27) |
| **N** | 1443 | 1443 | 1443 | 1381 |
| **R2** | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.16 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA7. Determinants of Black Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – In-group discrimination**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 5.00 \*\* | 3.83 \*\* | 4.77 \*\* | -0.05 |
|  | (0.61) | (0.58) | (0.61) | (0.03) |
| **Beliefs about Black**  **discrimination** | 4.69 \*\*  (0.89) | 3.90 \*\*  (0.85) | 4.26 \*\*  (0.90) | -0.04  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | -4.61  (2.51) | 0.29  (2.39) | -0.78  (2.53) | 0.12  (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -27.49 \*\* | -25.26 \*\* | -22.00 \*\* | 0.31 |
|  | (3.76) | (3.89) | (3.76) | (0.18) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 12.05 \*\* | 7.96 | 11.46 \*\* | 1.11 \*\* |
|  | (4.34) | (4.27) | (4.37) | (0.21) |
| **US-born** | -1.71 | -3.67 | -1.67 | 0.22 |
|  | (2.52) | (2.54) | (2.41) | (0.14) |
| **Home language** | -6.90 \*\* | -3.59 | -5.12 \* | 0.26 \* |
|  | (2.40) | (2.32) | (2.46) | (0.10) |
| **Party identification** | 0.97 \* | 0.23 | 0.60 | 0.11 \*\* |
|  | (0.43) | (0.41) | (0.44) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | -0.64 | -0.26 | -0.77 | 0.26 \*\* |
|  | (0.89) | (0.86) | (0.90) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.14 \*\* | 0.06 | 0.19 \*\* | -0.02 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 0.24 | 1.83 \* | 0.96 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.85) | (0.86) | (0.83) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | 0.62 \* | 0.24 | 0.40 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.24) | (0.25) | (0.24) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 14.89 \*\* | 22.07 \*\* | 13.24 \*\* | 1.69 \*\* |
|  | (5.19) | (4.98) | (5.07) | (0.27) |
| **N** | 1684 | 1684 | 1684 | 1644 |
| **R2** | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.16 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA8. Determinants of Latino Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – In-group discrimination**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 4.34 \*\* | 3.16 \*\* | 4.12 \*\* | 0.17 \*\* |
|  | (0.76) | (0.76) | (0.75) | (0.04) |
| **Beliefs about Latino**  **discrimination** | 4.83 \*\*  (0.91) | 6.34 \*\*  (0.94) | 4.47 \*\*  (0.99) | 0.04  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | 4.39  (2.99) | -2.92  (3.03) | -0.92  (3.27) | 0.26  (0.13) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Hostile sexism** | -25.46 \*\* | -16.95 \*\* | -21.61 \*\* | 0.35 |
|  | (4.07) | (4.15) | (4.04) | (0.19) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 9.93 \* | 8.72 | 7.68 | 0.43 |
|  | (4.74) | (4.68) | (4.91) | (0.22) |
| **US-born** | 2.56 | 2.33 | 1.76 | 0.15 |
|  | (1.78) | (1.81) | (1.86) | (0.08) |
| **Home language** | -1.19 | -1.22 | -2.01 | 0.44 \*\* |
|  | (1.72) | (1.76) | (1.75) | (0.08) |
| **Party identification** | 1.37 \*\* | 1.32 \*\* | 1.51 \*\* | 0.10 \*\* |
|  | (0.41) | (0.41) | (0.42) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | 0.39 | 0.25 | 1.04 | 0.15 \*\* |
|  | (0.99) | (0.99) | (1.01) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.09 | 0.18 \*\* | 0.11 \* | -0.01 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 1.70 \* | 1.81 \* | 1.23 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.81) | (0.82) | (0.84) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | -0.18 | 0.00 | -0.06 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.26) | (0.27) | (0.27) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 11.43 \* | 4.96 | 11.20 | 1.15 \*\* |
|  | (5.78) | (5.67) | (5.99) | (0.27) |
| **N** | 1520 | 1520 | 1520 | 1456 |
| **R2** | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.17 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*

**Table OA9. Determinants of Latino Men’s Evaluations of Women Candidates – Racial resentment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Black women FT** | **Latina women FT** | **WoC FT** | **WoC importance** |
| **MoC linked fate** | 2.96 \*\*  (0.76) | 2.25 \*\*  (0.77) | 3.01 \*\*  (0.75) | 0.15 \*\*  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Beliefs about Black**  **discrimination** | 4.32 \*\*  (0.89) | 5.41 \*\*  (0.90) | 4.07 \*\*  (0.95) | -0.10 \*  (0.04) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Group threat (zip**  **code)** | 4.94  (2.91) | -1.74  (3.04) | -0.26  (3.22) | 0.26 \*  (0.13) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Racial resentment** | -24.78 \*\* | -17.49 \*\* | -22.34 \*\* | -0.70 \*\* |
|  | (3.94) | (4.11) | (3.97) | (0.21) |
| **Hostile sexism** | -17.49 \*\* | -11.20 \*\* | -14.47 \*\* | 0.49 \* |
|  | (4.21) | (4.27) | (4.10) | (0.21) |
| **Benevolent sexism** | 10.90 \* | 9.07 | 8.72 | 0.50 \* |
|  | (4.57) | (4.63) | (4.78) | (0.22) |
| **US-born** | 2.96 | 2.49 | 1.51 | 0.12 |
|  | (1.73) | (1.78) | (1.80) | (0.08) |
| **Home language** | -0.75 | -0.64 | -2.15 | 0.39 \*\* |
|  | (1.64) | (1.71) | (1.67) | (0.07) |
| **Party identification** | 0.52 | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.09 \*\* |
|  | (0.42) | (0.43) | (0.43) | (0.02) |
| **Political interest** | 0.70 | 0.59 | 1.50 | 0.16 \*\* |
|  | (0.96) | (0.98) | (0.97) | (0.05) |
| **Age** | 0.15 \*\* | 0.22 \*\* | 0.16 \*\* | -0.01 \*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.00) |
| **Education** | 1.48 | 1.58 | 0.93 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.81) | (0.81) | (0.83) | (0.04) |
| **Income** | -0.06 | 0.09 | 0.04 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.26) | (0.27) | (0.26) | (0.01) |
| **Intercept** | 23.37 \*\* | 14.96 \* | 22.46 \*\* | 1.86 \*\* |
|  | (6.40) | (6.64) | (6.61) | (0.30) |
| **N** | 1522 | 1522 | 1522 | 1459 |
| **R2** | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.19 |

*\*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05.*

*Source: CMPS 2020*

*NOTE:*  “*Black women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Black women congressional candidates, “Latina women FT” is the feeling thermometer for Latina women congressional candidates, “WoC FT” is the feeling thermometer for “women of color congressional candidates” (all 0 to 100), and “WoC importance” is a five-category question about the importance of a candidate being WoC.*