RACIALIZING GENDERED INTERACTIONS

Koji Chavez
Washington University in St. Louis
kchavez@wustl.edu

Adia Harvey Wingfield
Washington University in St. Louis
ahwingfield@wustl.edu

Word Count: 7,692 with citations; 5,423 without citations

PRE-PRINT

Abstract

At this point, extensive research and data document the myriad ways that gender shapes social interactions. Yet while sociologists have devoted a great deal of attention to understanding how gender informs interactions, most of this work has yet to incorporate an intersectional approach that examines how these interactions are racialized in ways that produce specific outcomes. In this entry, we briefly review the literature that highlights the multiple ways social interactions are gendered. We then consider different approaches that seek to racialize these interactions, and end our paper with discussion of areas for future research.

RACIALIZING GENDERED INTERACTIONS

Sociologists and social psychologists have long theorized gender's influence on social interaction. Scholars only recently began to theorize race's influence on gendered interactions, despite feminist scholars' decades-long warning that focusing on gender (and race) in isolation excludes women of color (e.g., Hull, Scott, and Smith 1982). We begin this chapter with a brief overview of current theoretical approaches to gendered interactions. Taken together, and in line with a "gender frame" perspective (Ridgeway 2011; Ridgeway and Correll 2004), these theories emphasize how hegemonic beliefs about men and women guide social interaction. However, since hegemonic beliefs about men and women implicitly refer to *white* men and *white* women, the current theoretical approaches to gendered interactions, while putatively race neutral, are not clearly applicable beyond the white non-Hispanic population. With this critique in mind, we then discuss nascent theoretical approaches to *racialized* gendered interactions, focusing on intersectional theories of stereotype prototypicality (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008; Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). These theories suggest the implicit "racing" of gender as white, and the implicit "gendering" of racial groups as masculine or feminine relative to a white "just right" racial standard, have implications for who we perceive as prototypical men, women, black people, Asian people, etcetera. In turn, gender and racial prototypicality or non-prototypicality guides racialized gendered interactions. While we believe intersectional theories of stereotype prototypicality show much promise, there is still more theoretical and empirical work to be done. In the final section, we provide our recommendations for research moving forward.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO GENDERED INTERACTIONS

Gender is a multi-level structure of stratification (Ridgeway 2009; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; Risman 1998, 2004), existing in hegemonic beliefs about men and women and in institutions into which those gender beliefs are inscribed, influencing how we organize our social interactions, and operating as part of our selves and identities. Of these three levels – macro/institutional, interactional, and individual (Risman 1998, 2004) – social interaction may be most consequential for maintaining or reducing gender inequality (Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 2006; Risman 2004). In this chapter, we focus on the interactional dimension of the gender structure (Risman 1998, 2004), and begin with a review of theoretical approaches to gendered interaction.

The "gender frame" perspective provides an overarching theme for current theoretical approaches to gendered interaction (Ridgeway 2011; Ridgeway and Correll 2004). According to the framing perspective, gender acts as one (out of at least three, including race and age) primary *frames* we use to coordinate our social interactions (Ridgeway 2011). During interaction, we automatically categorize individuals by sex (Ito and Urland 2003) to which widely held cultural beliefs about how men and women act (and should act) are attached (Ridgeway 2011). Relative social status is fundamental to these gender beliefs, with higher social status attached to men than to women (Ridgeway 2001). These gender stereotypes – centered around relative competency, agency, communality, and warmth – are *hegemonic*: they are held by individuals *and* are embedded in societies' institutions, such as its laws, workplaces, organizational structures, and family organization. Hegemonic gender beliefs are rules by which individuals behave in public with others, and by which they anticipate, evaluate, and penalize others' behavior. Thus, hegemonic beliefs about men and women guide social interaction. Individuals need not personally believe hegemonic stereotypes; they simply must believe those hegemonic stereotypes are the bases on which others judge their behavior (Ridgeway and Correll 2004).

One of the most influential theoretical approaches to gendered interactions is the ethnomethodological perspective that gender is something one *does* during interaction, rather than something one simply *is* (West and Zimmerman 1987). The "doing gender" approach suggests men and women continuously reaffirm their maleness or femaleness during interaction by acting according to widely held gender beliefs about how men and women should act (e.g., Messner 2000). While less successful as a predictive theory (see Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 2006), conceptualizing gender as something one does has greatly influenced scholars' subsequent thinking about how gender influences social interaction.

Social role theory argues hegemonic beliefs about men and women are sustained through our casual observations of the sexual division of labor, and in turn, these beliefs influence how we interpret social interaction (Eagly and Wood 2012). Since men systematically occupy more agentic social roles and women more communal ones, we attribute their role-appropriate behavior to gender, and *expect* men and women to behave in stereotypical ways (Eagly and Wood 2012). Scholars have critiqued this approach, arguing gender stereotypes are relatively stable despite men and women's changing roles (Rudman et al. 2012:177). Koenig and Eagly (2014), however, provide experimental evidence that perceptions of group-level occupational changes (e.g., more men becoming nurses) influence group stereotypes. Role incongruity theory, an extension of social role theory, suggests gendered interactions differ whether widely held gender stereotypes conflict or overlap with traits expected for given roles (Eagly and Karau 2002). For example, agentic women leaders are penalized for violating gender norms of communality, and women considered for leadership positions are evaluated as having fewer leadership qualities than men, even when objectively equal (Eagly and Karau 2002).

Status characteristics theory, an offshoot of expectations states theory, addresses a specific facet of social interaction: task performance and evaluation. According to status characteristic theory, gender acts as a "status characteristic" that, when salient, designates relatively higher social status to men, and lower social status to women (Correll and Ridgeway 2003). Gender is "salient" in mixed-sex settings or when it is culturally linked to the task or context. When individuals interact with a shared goal – as they do at work – status characteristics guide expectations for how well others (and they themselves) will perform. As social status is associated with competency, men are expected to be generally more competent than women, and much more competent than women when the task at hand is male-typed (e.g., math-related tasks). Such gender expectations become self-fulfilling prophecies: because men are expected to be more competent than women, they are given more opportunities to talk and participate during interaction, their input is considered more influential, they act more confidently, and they are judged on a lower standard then women (Foschi 2000). As a result, men are *judged* to be more competent than women, all else equal. In female-typed tasks, in which women are expected to be more competent than men, yet only marginally so (Wagner and Berger 1997), the same self-fulfilling interactional process likely occurs but to the relative benefit of women.

The backlash and stereotype maintenance model (BSMM) focuses on reactions to gender norm violations, and actions in anticipation of such reactions. When individuals act in stereotype-disconfirming ways, and thus fail to conform to hegemonic beliefs about how men and women should act, they receive a social "backlash" (e.g., ostracism) or economic backlash (e.g., hiring rejection) from others (Rudman et al. 2012). Men *and* women receive backlash for failing to conform to normative gender standards (Moss-Racusin 2014). The individual who acts

in stereotype-disconfirming ways may anticipate backlash, hide their disconfirming behavior, or more proactively conform to gender stereotypes (Moss-Racusin and Rudman 2010). Thus, those who act atypically yet hide or diminish their atypical behavior, *and* those who penalize them for gender norm non-conformity, maintain hegemonic stereotypes during interaction.

Taken together, these theories of gendered interactions highlight how hegemonic beliefs about men and women – particularly those centered around relative competency, agency, warmth, and communality – provide a "frame" through which men and women interpret and anticipate others' behaviors during interaction and guide their own. These theoretical approaches also share a major theoretical blind spot: by treating gender in isolation from race, such theories implicitly refer to white men and white women while excluding people of color. We take up this critique and current theoretical approaches to *racialized* gendered interactions in the following section.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO RACIALIZING GENDERED INTERACTIONS

In the United States, race is, along with gender, a multi-level structure of stratification, and serves as an additional primary frame by which we coordinate interactional behavior. We automatically categorize individuals by race (Ito and Urland 2003), which conjures up widely held hegemonic beliefs linked to different racial groups. Chief among these beliefs are those regarding racial groups' competence relative to dominant whites (Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch 1972).

Despite race being a primary frame for coordinating interaction, and despite wide agreement among scholars that hegemonic beliefs about gender *and* race influence interactional behavior, race has typically been ignored in the theoretical approaches to gendered interactions

outlined above. However, race implicitly underlies all these theoretical approaches despite its conspicuous absence from them. Hegemonic gender beliefs which influence gendered interactions, and on which theories of gendered interactions are based, implicitly refer to *white* men and *white* women (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). This is because white (middle-class) men, as the group dominating western society's institutions, are the default comparison group to which hegemonic gender beliefs are oriented. Thus, hegemonic gender beliefs guide gendered interactions in predictable ways for white men and white women, yet their influence on non-white men and women's gendered interactions is less clear. By not explicitly confronting how gender and race guide interaction, scholars have whitewashed theories of gendered interaction, calling into question the extent to which these theories apply to non-white populations. We first review theoretical approaches to racialized gendered interactions that emphasize gender and racial stereotypes as distinct non-overlapping constructs, followed by the nascent intersectional approach emphasizing that while race and gender are understood as separate constructs, their implicit overlap results in predictable racialized gendered interactions.

Gender and race as separate, non-overlapping constructs

A common theoretical approach to racialized gendered interactions is to treat *either* gender *or* racial stereotypes as influencing interaction, depending on the salience of gender or race in the given context (see Bodenhausen 2010). When gender is highly salient, widely held gender beliefs will dominate how individuals organize interactions. When race is most salient, widely held racial beliefs will instead dominate. Depending on which is more salient, individuals switch between gender and racial frames to guide their actions (in general, see Shih, Sanchez, and Ho 2010). Pittinsky, Shih, and Trahan (2006), for instance, find racial cues influence people to see

others in racial terms, while gender cues influence them to see the same people in gendered terms. In a famous example, Asian women perform worse on math problems when investigators prime gender (evoking gender stereotypes of math competence) rather than race (evoking Asian stereotypes of math competence) (Shih, Pittinsky, and Ambady 1999).

We find a similar treatment of race and gender as separate, non-overlapping constructs in theoretical approaches to gender and racial discrimination. Subordinate male target theory argues racial discrimination is based on competition for resources and threat "perpetrated by males directed against males" (Sidanius and Veniegas 2000:55). Thus, racial discrimination targets minority men. According to this argument, minority women are subject to gender discrimination, and while they receive some discrimination by their association with minority men, they are not racial discrimination's main target (Veenstra 2013). While subordinate male target theory does not explicitly focus on social interactions (instead focusing on discrimination), it suggests racialized interactions are separate from gendered interactions, with men of color experiencing the former, and all women experiencing the latter. There is little attention to how racial and gender stereotypes function together.

Double jeopardy theory addresses the discriminatory experience of individuals of two or more "disadvantaged" social groups, and deviates from the either/or conception of racialized and gendered experiences assumed under subordinate male target theory. When individuals belong to multiple disadvantaged groups, they experience discrimination directed at each group in a cumulative manner (e.g., Beal 1970). While early theoretical conceptions focused on additive disadvantage, scholars soon adopted an interactional model in which doubly (or triply) disadvantaged individuals experienced more, but not strictly additive, disadvantage (Almquist 1975). Double jeopardy theory, historically used in reference to black women, suggests women

of color experience gendered interactions as described in the above theories, including social penalties for deviance from gender norms, and *also* experience racial interactional disadvantage through expectations of lower competence relative to whites (Bell and Nkomo 2001). Still, the underlying assumption is that racial and gender hegemonic stereotypes separately influence interactional behavior.

Intersectional prototypicality theory

Unlike the above theoretical approaches which treat gender and race as separate, non-overlapping constructs, intersectional theories begin with the understanding that race, gender, and other categories of difference are intertwined and mutually constitutive (see Choo and Ferree 2010). Within this tradition, Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz (2013) develop a theoretical approach to how hegemonic gender and racial frames work together for organizing social interaction. The main thrust of their argument is gender and race are socially constructed as separate concepts, yet *implicitly overlap* (see Galinsky, Hall, and Cuddy 2013; Johnson, Freeman, and Pauker 2012). This implicit overlap has implications for who we consider prototypical of gender and racial stereotypes. Stereotypical prototypicality or non-prototypicality, and the salience of gender and racial stereotypes in the given interactional context, predict the nature of racialized gendered interactions.

As previously noted, hegemonic gender stereotypes implicitly refer to white men and women. Thus, gender is implicitly "raced" as white. As we associate masculinity and femininity to gender categories, and because these categories are implicitly white, prototypical (and thus "just right") femininity and masculinity are represented by a white woman and white man respectively (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). Embedded in these hegemonic beliefs of

prototypical femininity and masculinity is the relative dominance of the latter over the former (for "hegemonic masculinity," see Connell 1987, 2005; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Indeed, hegemonic beliefs about femininity legitimize and "guarantee the dominate position of men and the subordination of women" (Schippers 2007:94).

Just as gender is implicitly "raced," race is implicitly "gendered." Since white men are the hegemonic default reference group, racial groups are perceived as possessing "subordinate" masculinities compared to white men's "just right" masculinity (Connell 1987, 2005; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). For example, black people are seen as overly or dangerously masculine compared to whites, while Asians are seen as relatively feminine (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study 1 and 2; Goff, Thomas, and Jackson 2008; Johnson et al. 2012). Thus, while race is socially constructed as genderless, different racial groups are associated with varying degrees of masculinity and femininity.

The implicit overlap of hegemonic gender and racial beliefs has implications for whom we consider a prototypical man, woman, black person, Asian person, and so on (Ghavami and Peplau 2012). The prototypical man is a *white* man. The prototypical woman is a *white* woman. Asian women are also prototypical women, given hegemonic beliefs about Asian femininity. The prototypical black person is a black *man*. However, black women and Asian men do not fit neatly into hegemonic gender and racial prototypes. A black woman is neither a prototypical black person nor a prototypical woman, and an Asian man is not a prototypical man.

People more easily link hegemonic gender and racial stereotypes to those who are prototypical of those stereotypes (Macrae and Quadflieg 2010). Non-prototypical people are less likely to be remembered (Silvera, Krull, and Sassler 2002), and non-prototypical stimuli are less easily processed (Fiske et al. 1987). This suggests individuals quickly draw on gender and racial

stereotypes for white men and women, black men, and Asian women, but are slower to connect hegemonic racial and gender stereotypes to black women and Asian men. As people have more difficulty applying hegemonic gender and racial beliefs to guide their interactions, non-prototypical people may be left socially "invisible" and ignored (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008). The extent to which non-prototypically matters in interaction depends on whether individuals deem racial or gender stereotypes useful in processing interactional information (Kunda and Spencer 2003). Such is the case when social interaction occurs in mixed-race or mixed-gender groups or dyads, or when race or gender are culturally linked to the task or context.

SUGGESTIVE EVIDENCE OF INTERSECTIONAL PROTOTYPICALITY THEORY

In this section, we review suggestive evidence of intersectional prototypicality theory. These findings are "suggestive" because, while supporting intersectional prototypicality theory, little research to date focuses on actual interactions.

Non-prototypical people can be "invisible" – less seen, less remembered, or taken less seriously – during social interaction (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008; Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). Sesko and Biernat (2010) provide evidence of social invisibility: evaluators are less likely to recognize black women's faces compared to white men and women and black men's faces, and are less likely to correctly attribute statements back to black women. Black women are also more likely to be misclassified as men relative to white women (Goff, Thomas, et al. 2008; Thomas, Dovidio, and West 2014), and are more slowly classified as black people relative to black men (Thomas et al. 2014). Evaluators are less likely to correctly attribute statements to Asian men than to Asian women and whites (Schug, Alt, and Klauer 2015). Evaluators also are

less able to understand non-prototypical people's perspective (i.e., Asian men, black women) compared to prototypical people's (i.e., Black men, Asian women) (Todd and Simpson 2016).

When the context or task involved are culturally linked to masculinity, intersectional prototypicality theory predicts white men and women's gendered interactions proceed according to the theories of gendered interactions described above. Non-prototypical people, however, in particular black women and Asian men, have unique "binds" and "freedoms" during interaction (Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013).

In masculine contexts, black women's invisibility allows them to escape lower competence expectations associated with white women and black men. Biernat and Sesko (2013) find evaluators rate black women, but not white women, as equal to white and black men in masculine-typed task competency. When the position itself is masculine-typed, evaluators judge black women to be more position-appropriate than white or Asian women due to black women's perceived masculinity (Hall, Galinsky, and Phillips 2015). Outside of the workplace context, Harkness (2016) finds experimental participants are more willing to lend money to black women than to black men and white women. She argues black women are "invisible" to damaging stereotypes of black people and women, and instead are judged to be self-reliant and agentic.

There is some evidence black women escape the social backlash white women experience for violating gender norms. Hall (2012) finds black women escape penalties for dominant behavior, while white and Asian women do not. Indeed, black women may strategically behave agentically to avoid social invisibility. Ong (2005) finds black female physics students adopt a "loud black woman" persona to combat their classroom invisibility. Similarly, Wingfield (2010) finds black women professionals, unlike black male professionals, strategically express anger

and irritation to be taken seriously by white coworkers. In another study, Swim et al. (2003) find although black female college students report the same types and number of racially-charged incidents as their male counterparts, black female college students are more likely to confront the perpetrator. The authors hypothesize that black men "may suffer greater consequences in society than [black] women may suffer if they assertively confront" (58–59).

In leadership positions, black women may again have some freedom from hegemonic racial and gender beliefs. Experimental evaluators are more likely to select black women than white or Asian women for a masculine leadership position (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study 5). Livingston, Rosette, and Washington (2012) find black women leaders do not experience the same backlash as white women leaders for displaying dominance rather than communality. However, black women's freedom in masculine leadership positions may depend on their perceived success or failure. When evaluators perceive the organization is failing, they are more likely to perceive black women as ineffectual leaders than black men or white women (Rosette and Livingston 2012).

Black women's interactions in masculine-typed settings are not entirely beneficial. Black women still face interactional penalties suggested by double jeopardy theory. Minority women experience more harassment at work than both white women and minority men (Berdahl and Moore 2006). Harassment accumulation may result in black women's inurement to harassment's damaging effects (Raver and Nishii 2010).

Intersectional prototypicality theory predicts Asian men are penalized during interaction in masculine-typed settings. Hall et al. (2015) find evaluators are least likely to select Asian men to masculine-typed jobs relative to white or black men, because of their perceived lack of masculinity. This pattern extends to masculine leadership positions (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study

5). Chen (1999) finds Chinese American men adopt strategic interactional behaviors to compensate, deflect, deny or repudiate the perception of Asian men as less masculine. Interestingly, Asian men, as unprototypical men, may escape social penalties for breaking masculine gender norms (Hall 2012).

Black men fit the prototypical image of a black person. During social interaction, individuals quickly associate black men with hegemonic stereotypes of relatively lower competency, and hyper masculinity (Goff, Steele, and Davies 2008). Rather than thoroughly review this literature, which has been extensively reviewed elsewhere (see Pager 2007), we highlight those aspects relevant to the intersectional prototypicality approach.

Like white women who display agency, black male dominance disrupts the racial interactional hierarchy, resulting in a backlash. For example, black men are more penalized for NFL celebrations than white men (Hall and Livingston 2012). In anticipation of backlash, black men actively alter their interactional behavior. Wingfield (2010) finds black professional men, conscious of racial stereotypes, avoid behavior deemed too aggressive. Non-behavioral characteristics also counter negative black stereotypes. While black men may be penalized for masculine leadership positions compared to white men (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study 5), less masculine facial features may counter stereotypes of black men's hyper masculinity (Livingston and Pearce 2009). In another set of studies, scholars find feminine stereotypes of gay men counter hyper masculine stereotypes of black men during hiring decisions (Pedulla 2014).

Prototypical stereotypes of hyper masculinity may *advantage* black men in some masculine-typed settings (Hall et al. 2015). In the leverage buyout industry, in which masculinity is highly prized, black men experience more social acceptance from their white male coworkers due to their knowledge of sports, aided by congruity between hyper-masculine black

men stereotypes and the ideal masculine worker. White women, on the other hand, experience more social isolation (Turco 2010).

Intersectional prototypicality theory suggests in contexts culturally linked to femininity, black women are disadvantaged during interaction compared to white women. There is some supporting evidence. Hall et al. (2015) find black women are least likely to be considered appropriate for feminine jobs compared to white and Asian women.

In female-typed jobs, gendered interaction may benefit white *men* despite white women's expected competence in such settings. During interaction, white men are expected to be generally more competent than women, and are better able to connect with female colleagues. Importantly, white men are also better able to connect with superiors (typically men), and are expected to be more competent in leadership positions. As a result, white men ride a "glass escalator" to more authoritative leadership roles (Williams 1992). This gendered interactional process differs for black men. Like white men, black men in female-typed jobs are more visible, yet unlike white men, and as prototypical black people, black men do not observe that people expect them to be accomplished or competent during interaction (Wingfield and Wingfield 2014). Black men in these jobs are more likely to report awkward and unfriendly interactions with coworkers, inability to socially connect with supervisors, and client perceptions that they are unsuited for higher-status positions (Wingfield 2009). As a result, they are less likely to ride the glass escalator.

In contexts of heterosexual attraction – dating being a primary example – prototypicality theory posits that since the hegemonic image of the prototypical man and woman is a *white* man and *white* woman, white men and white women are standards of masculinity and femininity. Indeed, there is growing evidence black women, relative to white and Asian women, are

penalized during romantic interaction due to perceived masculinity (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study 3; Goff, Thomas, et al. 2008; Lin and Lundquist 2013). As black women are penalized during heterosexual romantic interaction for being perceived as too masculine, so too are Asian men for being perceived as too feminine (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study 3). Asian men with more stereotypically Asian features are perceived as less attractive, whereas the opposite is true for Asian women (Wilkins, Chan, and Kaiser 2011).

The non-prototypicality of black women (too masculine) and Asian men (too feminine) has consequences for assumptions about sexual orientation. Johnson and Ghavami (2011) find black women and Asian men, as unprototypical women and men, are more likely than their male and female counterparts to be perceived as homosexual.

Evidence from dating markets reflects racialized gendered interactions. White men are less likely to date black women relative to other women; female date-seekers are much more likely to exclude Asian men relative to other men; and white women are less willing to date black and Asian men relative to white men (Feliciano, Robnett, and Komaie 2009). Census data on interactional marriage matches these preferences (Galinsky et al. 2013, Study 4).

However, all is not lost for Black women and Asian men. Non-black men are more open to dating black women, and non-Asian women are more open to dating Asian men, when black women and Asian men initiate contact (Lewis 2013). This suggests individuals use race and gender stereotypes for "preemptive discrimination," but such stereotypes dissipate with more information.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Despite "intersectionality" being a buzzword for decades (Davis 2008), theorizing how gender and racial stereotypes shape social interaction is a recent endeavor (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008; Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). There is much theoretical work to be done. *Evidence* of racialized gendered interactions is lacking even more. Thus, the main push forward is for more research on actual interactions (see Babbitt 2013). Beyond the call for basic evidence from racialized gendered interactions, we offer four general critiques of current approaches: the limitation to black and Asian racial groups; the limitation to hegemonic masculinity/femininity stereotypes; the limited investigation of racialized gendered interaction moderators; and the limitation to experimental and qualitative research designs.

By and large, research on racialized gendered interactions focuses on the experience of black women vis-à-vis white women and black men. Recently, scholars expanded their scope to Asian men and women, given Asian men and women's relevance to intersectional prototypicality theory. We believe scholars should further expand their scope to Hispanic men and women. Whether Hispanic men and women are seen as prototypical men, women, or Hispanics has implications for how Hispanics "fit" into the U.S. racial hierarchy, which is particularly relevant given the rapidly growing Hispanic population.

Scholars may also enrich our understanding of racialized gendered interactions by expanding to a third dimension. Given the overlap of race and masculinity, sexual orientation is a promising route. Pedulla (2014) offers interesting experimental evidence that being gay (or simply signaling gay sexual orientation) mitigates harmful black male stereotypes of hyper-aggression. Social class is another dimension likely to influence racialized gendered interactions. Penner and Saperstein (2013), for example, have begun to explore the interplay of gender and class on perceptions of an individual's race.

We argue that a promising avenue of research is to study the conditions under which hegemonic beliefs besides masculine/feminine stereotypes and non-hegemonic beliefs are salient and influence interactions. For example, hegemonic beliefs about black women may conform to the asexual and nurturing "Mammy" image in some caretaker roles, or the hypersexual "Jezebel" image in romantic settings (West 1995). Asian men may be seen as hyper-intelligent in a school context, while hyper-aggressive in a martial arts context (Chan 2000). Non-hegemonic beliefs – beliefs held by certain groups, but not embedded in society's institutions – may also influence racialized gendered interactions when interacting individuals believe they share those beliefs (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). Within the African American community, for example, the belief that girls and boys are equally competent may uniquely influence gendered interactions (Dugger 1988).

In addition to prototypicality and masculine- or feminine-linked settings, other individual-, group-, institutional- or organizational-level factors likely influence racialized gendered interactions. Individuals' attitudes, goals, and motivations likely influence how and to what extent interactions are racialized and gendered (see Plant, Devine, and Peruche 2010). For example, those who think in essentialist ways (Chao 2013), or believe blacks and whites have little genetic overlap (Plaks et al. 2012), more readily draw on racial and gender stereotypes, and may more likely engage in racialized gendered interactions.

The influence of group racial and gender composition on gendered interactions is likely more complicated than researchers have allowed. Interracial interactional anxiety, for example, may influence how interactions are gendered. During interracial interaction, whites fear they will be seen as racist (Trawalter, Richeson, and Shelton 2009). However, white men and women react differently to anxiety-producing interracial interactions, with men more likely to hold

essentialist and racist views than women, and to be less friendly toward racial others (Littleford, Wright, and Sayoc-Parial 2005). Toosi, Sommers, and Ambady (2012) find in mixed-race and mixed-sex interactional contexts, white women grow more confident over time, while white men move in the opposite direction. This pattern reduces (white) gender interactional inequality. The authors suggest social complexity of coordinating with non-whites provides opportunity for white women, who are expected to be competent in social tasks, to emerge as leaders.

While whites fear they will be seen as racist during interracial interaction, non-whites fear being discriminated against (Trawalter et al. 2009). However, women of color may interpret and respond to white people's interactional behavior differently from men of color (Remedios and Snyder 2015). Yet it is unclear how these gender differences among men and women of color influence gendered interactions.

Scholars have generally focused on racialized gendered interactions at work or in romantic settings. Scholars should explore racialized gendered interactions in non-heteronormative dating and relationships, and in low-stakes settings, such as in friend groups, informal social clubs, or among roommates. Furthermore, organizational characteristics may also influence the role of race in gendered interactions. Fault line literature suggests when race and gender overlap with organizational hierarchical positions (e.g., all black women within an organization are secretaries), interactional tensions within organizations increase (Thatcher and Patel 2011). Under such conditions, individuals may be more aware of racial and gender differences, leading to increased racialized and gendered interactions, or leading to avoidance of interaction all together. The extent to which race or gender are built into organizational rules, and to which organizational rules restrict individuals' interactional behavior, may also moderate the extent to which gendered interactions are racialized within organizations (Ridgeway 2009).

Current research on racialized gendered interactions typically uses cross-sectional research designs to collect data at one point in time. A cross-sectional research design is not well equipped to explore changes in racialized gendered interactions over one's lifetime, or from on historical period to the next. For example, research on black women's inurement to discrimination (see Raver and Nishii 2010) would benefit from a longitudinal design. So too would the study of changes in workplace racialized gendered interaction as employers fluctuated between color- and gender-blind, affirmative action, and diversity management policies (see Skrentny 2014).

Research on racialized gendered interactions, and intersectionality in general, lends itself theoretically and historically to qualitative research methods (Shields 2008). Scholars have also used laboratory experiments to tease out mechanisms. We argue that quantitative survey data, while underutilized in the field (however, see Penner and Saperstein 2013), has value for studying racialized gendered interactions (also see Shields 2008). Such data allow scholars to test, and thus add more empirical meat to, theories generated from qualitative and experimental data, and allows scholars to generalize qualitative or laboratory findings to a wider context. Moving forward, scholars should exploit the strengths of such methods toward greater understanding of racialized gendered interactions.

In this chapter, we have provided a brief overview of the current state of the literature on racialized gendered interactions. Scholars have only begun to address how race influences gendered interactions, yet we believe theories acknowledging the role of stereotype prototypicality show much promise moving forward (Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach 2008; Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz 2013). However, as this final section makes clear, there is more work to be done in theoretical development and in basic observation of racialized gendered

interactions. We call on scholars to push our understanding of racialized gendered interactions forward in the directions suggested here.

REFERENCES

Almquist, Elizabeth M. 1975. "Untangling the Effects of Race and Sex: The Disadvantaged Status of Black Women." *Social Science Quarterly* 56(1):129–42.

Babbitt, Laura G. 2013. "An Intersectional Approach to Black / White Interracial Interactions: The Roles of Gender and Sexual Orientation." *Sex Roles* 68:791–802.

Beal, Frances M. 1970. "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female." Pp. 90–100 in *The Black Woman: An Anthology*, edited by T. Cade. New York: Signet.

Bell, Ella L. J. Edmonson and Stella M. Nkomo. 2001. *Our Separate Ways: Black and White Women and the Struggle for Professional Identity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press Books.

Berdahl, Jennifer L. and Celia Moore. 2006. "Workplace Harassment: Double Jeopardy for Minority Women." *The Journal of Applied Psychology* 91(2):426–36.

Berger, Joseph, Bernard P. Cohen, and Morris Zelditch. 1972. "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction." *American Sociological Review* 37(3):241–55.

Biernat, Monica and Amanda K. Sesko. 2013. "Evaluating the Contributions of Members of Mixed-Sex Work Teams: Race and Gender Matter." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 49(3):471–76.

Bodenhausen, Galen V. 2010. "Diversity in the Person, Diversity in the Group: Challenges of Identity Complexity for Social Perception and Social Interaction." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40:1–16.

Chan, Jachinson W. 2000. "Bruce Lee's Fictional Model of Masculinity." *Men and Masculinities* 2(4):371–87.

Chao, Melody Manchi. 2013. "Essentializing Race: Its Implications on Racial Categorization." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 104(4):619–34.

Chen, Anthony S. 1999. "Lives at the Center of the Periphery, Lives at the Periphery of the Center: Chinese American Masculinities and Bargaining with Hegemony." *Gender and Society* 33(5):584–607.

Choo, Hae Yeon and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. "Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities." *Sociological Theory* 28(2):129–49.

Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender & Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W. 2005. *Masculinities*. 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19(6):829–59.

Correll, Shelley J. and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2003. "Expectation States Theory." Pp. 29–51 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by J. Delamater. New York: Kluwer Academic Press.

Davis, Kathy. 2008. "Intersectionality as Buzzword." *Feminist Theory* 9(1):67–85.

Dugger, Karen. 1988. "Social Location and Gender-Role Attitudes: A Comparison of Black and White Women." *Gender and Society* 2(4):425–48.

Eagly, Alice H. and Steven J. Karau. 2002. "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders." *Psychological Review* 109(3):573–98.

Eagly, Alice H. and Wendy Wood. 2012. "Social Role Theory." Pp. 458–76 in *Handbook of Theories in Social Psychology*, edited by P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanksi, and E. T. Higgins. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Feliciano, Cynthia, Belinda Robnett, and Golnaz Komaie. 2009. "Gendered Racial Exclusion Among White Internet Daters." *Social Science Research* 38(1):39–54.
Fiske, Susan T., Steven L. Neuberg, Ann E. Beattie, and Sandra J. Milberg. 1987. "Category-Based and Attribute-Based Reactions to Others: Some Informational Conditions of Stereotyping and Lndividuating Processes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 23:399–427.
Foschi, Martha. 2000. "Double Standards for Competence Theory and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:21–42.
Galinsky, Adam D., Erika V. Hall, and Amy J. C. Cuddy. 2013. "Gendered Races: Implications for Interracial Marriage, Leadership Selection, and Athletic Participation." *Psychological Science* 24(4):498–506.
Ghavami, Negin and Letitia Anne Peplau. 2012. "An Intersectional Analysis of Gender and Ethnic Stereotypes: Testing Three Hypotheses." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 37(1):113–27.
Goff, Phillip Atiba, Claude M. Steele, and Paul G. Davies. 2008. "The Space Between Us: Stereotype Threat and Distance in Interracial Contexts." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94(1):91–107.
Goff, Phillip Atiba, Margaret A. Thomas, and Matthew Christian Jackson. 2008. "'Ain't I a Woman?': Towards an Intersectional Approach to Person Perception and Group-Based Harms." *Sex Roles* 59:392–403.
Hall, Erika V. 2012. "Optimal Masculinity: Feminine Races or Genders Attenuate Sanctions for Domineering Behavior." in *Academy of Management Proceedings*.
Hall, Erika V., Adam D. Galinsky, and Katherine W. Phillips. 2015. "Gender Profiling: A Gendered Race Perspective on Person – Position Fit." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 41(6):853–68.
Hall, Erika V. and Robert W. Livingston. 2012. "The Hubris Penalty: Biased Responses to 'Celebration' Displays of Black Football Players." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48(4):899–904.
Harkness, Sarah K. 2016. "Discrimination in Lending Markets: Status and the Intersections of Gender and Race." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 79(1):81–93.
Hull, Gloria T., Patricia B. Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds. 1982. *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, but Some of Us Are Brave*. New York: Feminist Press.
Ito, Tiffany A. and Geoffrey R. Urland. 2003. "Race and Gender on the Brain: Electrocortical Measures of Attention to the Race and Gender of Multiply Categorizable Individuals." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85(4):616–26.
Johnson, Kerri L., Jonathan B. Freeman, and Kristin Pauker. 2012. "Race Is Gendered: How Covarying Phenotypes and Stereotypes Bias Sex Categorization." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 102(1):116–31.
Johnson, Kerri L. and Negin Ghavami. 2011. "At the Crossroads of Conspicuous and Concealable: What Race Categories Communicate about Sexual Orientation." *PLoS ONE* 6(3):1–8.
Koenig, Anne M. and Alice H. Eagly. 2014. "Evidence for the Social Role Theory of Stereotype Content: Observations of Groups' Roles Shape Stereotypes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 107(3):371–92.
Kunda, Ziva and Steven J. Spencer. 2003. "When Do Stereotypes Come to Mind and When Do They Color Judgment? A Goal-Based Theoretical Framework for Stereotype Activation and

Application." *Psychological Bulletin* 129(4):522–44.
Lewis, Kevin. 2013. "The Limits of Racial Prejudice." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110(47):18814–19.
Lin, Ken-Hou and Jennifer Lundquist. 2013. "Mate Selection in Cyberspace: The Intersection of Race, Gender, and Education." *American Journal of Sociology* 119(1):183–215.
Littleford, Linh Nguyen, Margaret O'Dougherty Wright, and Maria Sayoc-Parial. 2005. "White Students' Intergroup Anxiety During Same-Race and Interracial Interactions: A Multimethod Approach." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 27(1):85–94.
Livingston, Robert W. and Nicholas A. Pearce. 2009. "The Teddy-Bear Effect: Does Having a Baby Face Benefit Black Chief Executive Officers?" *Psychological Science* 20(10):1229–36.
Livingston, Robert W., Ashleigh S. Rosette, and Ella F. Washington. 2012. "Can an Agentic Black Woman Get Ahead? The Impact of Race and Interpersonal Dominance on Perceptions of Female Leaders." *Psychological Science* 23(4):354–58.
Macrae, C. Neil and Susanne Quadflieg. 2010. "Perceiving People." Pp. 428–463 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by S. T. Fiske and D. T. Gilbert. New York: John Wiley.
Messner, Michael A. 2000. "Barbie Girls versus Sea Monsters: Children Constructing Gender." *Gender and Society* 14(6):765–84.
Moss-Racusin, Corinne A. 2014. "Male Backlash: Penalties for Men Who Violate Gender Stereotypes." Pp. 247–69 in *Gender in Organizations: Are Men Allies or Adversaries to Women's Career Advancement?*, edited by D. A. Major and R. J. Burke. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
Moss-Racusin, Corinne A. and Laurie A. Rudman. 2010. "Disruptions in Women's Self-Promotion: The Backlash Avoidance Model." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 34:186–202.
Ong, Maria. 2005. "Body Projects of Young Women of Color in Physics: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Science." *Social Problems* 52(4):593–617.
Pager, Devah. 2007. *Marked: Race, Crime, and Finding Work in an Era of Mass Incarceration*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Pedulla, David S. 2014. "The Positive Consequences of Negative Stereotypes: Race, Sexual Orientation, and the Job Application Process." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77(1):75–94.
Penner, Andrew M. and Aliya Saperstein. 2013. "Engendering Racial Perceptions: An Intersectional Analysis of How Social Status Shapes Race." *Gender and Society* 27(3):319–44.
Pittinsky, Todd L., Margaret J. Shih, and Amy Trahan. 2006. "Identity Cues: Evidence From and for Intra-Individual Perspectives on Positive and Negative Stereotyping." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 36(9):2215–39.
Plaks, Jason E., Lori Wu Malahy, Mara Sedlins, and Yuichi Shoda. 2012. "Folk Beliefs About Human Genetic Variation Predict Discrete Versus Continuous Racial Categorization and Evaluative Bias." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 3(1):31–39.
Plant, E. Ashby, Patricia G. Devine, and Michelle B. Peruche. 2010. "Routes to Positive Interracial Interactions: Approaching Egalitarianism or Avoiding Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36(9):1135–47.
Purdie-Vaughns, Valerie and Richard P. Eibach. 2008. "Intersectional Invisibility: The Distinctive Advantages and Disadvantages of Multiple Subordinate-Group Identities." *Sex Roles* 59(5–6):377–91.
Raver, Jana L. and Lisa H. Nishii. 2010. "Once, Twice, or Three Times as Harmful? Ethnic

Harassment, Gender Harassment, and Generalized Workplace Harassment." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(2):236–54.
Remedios, Jessica D. and Samantha H. Snyder. 2015. "How Women of Color Detect and Respond to Multiple Forms of Prejudice." *Sex Roles* 73:371–83.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2001. "Gender, Status, and Leadership." *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4):637–55.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2009. "Framed Before We Know It." *Gender and Society* 23(2):145–60.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2011. *Framed by Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender and Society* 18(4):510–31.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Tamar Kricheli-Katz. 2013. "Intersecting Cultural Beliefs in Social Relations: Gender, Race, and Class Binds and Freedoms." *Gender and Society* 27(3):294–318.
Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2006. "Gender and Interaction." Pp. 247–74 in *Handbook of Sociology of Gender*, edited by J. S. Chafetz. New York: Springer Sciences + Business Media.
Risman, Barbara J. 1998. *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Risman, Barbara J. 2004. "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender & Society* 18(4):429–50.
Rosette, Ashleigh Shelby and Robert W. Livingston. 2012. "Failure Is Not an Option for Black Women: Effects of Organizational Performance on Leaders with Single Versus Dual-Subordinate Identities." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48(5):1162–67.
Rudman, Laurie A., Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, Peter Glick, and Julie E. Phelan. 2012. "Reactions to Vanguards: Advances in Backlash Theory." Pp. 167–227 in *Advances in Experimental Sociology*, edited by P. Devine and A. Plant. Burlington: Academic Press.
Schippers, Mimi. 2007. "Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony." *Theory and Society* 36(1):85–102.
Schug, Joanna, Nicholas P. Alt, and Karl Christoph Klauer. 2015. "Gendered Race Prototypes: Evidence for the Non-Prototypicality of Asian Men and Black Women." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 56:121–25.
Sesko, Amanda K. and Monica Biernat. 2010. "Prototypes of Race and Gender: The Invisibility of Black Women." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46(2):356–60.
Shields, Stephanie A. 2008. "Gender: An Intersectionality Perspective." *Sex Roles* 59(5–6):301–11.
Shih, Margaret, Todd L. Pittinsky, and Nalini Ambady. 1999. "Stereotype Susceptibility: Identity Salience and Shifts in Quantitative Performance." *Psychological Science* 10(1):80–83.
Shih, Margaret, Diana R. Sanchez, and Geoffrey C. Ho. 2010. "Costs and Benefits of Switching Among Multiple Social Identities." Pp. 62–83 in *The Psychology of Social and Cultural Diversity*, edited by R. J. Crisp. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
Sidanius, Jim and Rosemary C. Veniegas. 2000. "Gender and Race Discrimination: The Interactive Nature of Disadvantage." Pp. 47–69 in *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*, edited by S. Oskamp. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Silvera, David H., Douglas S. Krull, and Margaret A. Sassler. 2002. "Typhoid Pollyanna: The

Effect of Category Valence on Retrieval Order of Positive and Negative Category Members." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 12(2):227–36.
Skrentny, John D. 2014. *After Civil Rights: Racial Realism in the New American Workplace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Swim, Janet K., Lauri L. Hyers, Laurie L. Cohen, Davita C. Fitzgerald, and Wayne H. Bylsma. 2003. "African American College Students' Experiences with Everyday Racism: Characteristics of and Responses to These Incidents." *Journal of Black Psychology* 29(1):38–67.
Thatcher, Sherry M. B. and Pankaj C. Patel. 2011. "Demographic Faultlines: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 96(6):1119–39.
Thomas, Erin L., John F. Dovidio, and Tessa V. West. 2014. "Lost in the Categorical Shuffle: Evidence for the Social Non-Prototypicality of Black Women." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 20(3):370–76.
Todd, Andrew R. and Austin J. Simpson. 2016. "Perspective Taking and Member-to-Group Generalization of Implicit Racial Attitudes: The Role of Target Prototypicality." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 0(0):00–00.
Toosi, Negin R., Samuel R. Sommers, and Nalini Ambady. 2012. "Getting a Word in Group-Wise: Effects of Racial Diversity on Gender Dynamics." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48(5):1150–55.
Trawalter, Sophie, Jennifer A. Richeson, and J. Nicole Shelton. 2009. "Predicting Behavior During Interracial Interactions: A Stress and Coping Approach." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 13(4):243–68.
Turco, Catherine J. 2010. "Cultural Foundations of Tokenism: Evidence from the Leveraged Buyout Industry." *American Sociological Review* 76(6):894–913.
Veenstra, Gerry. 2013. "The Gendered Nature of Discriminatory Experiences by Race, Class, and Sexuality: A Comparison of Intersectionality Theory and the Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis." *Sex Roles* 68(11–12):646–59.
Wagner, David G. and Joseph Berger. 1997. "Gender and Interpersonal Task Behavior: Status Expectations Accounts." *Social Perspectives* 40(1):1–32.
West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125–51.
West, Carolyn M. 1995. "Mammy, Sapphire, and Jezebel: Historical Images of Black Women and Their Implications for Psychotherapy." *Psychotherapy* 32(3):458–66.
Wilkins, Clara L., Joy F. Chan, and Cheryl R. Kaiser. 2011. "Racial Stereotypes and Interracial Attraction: Phenotypic Prototypicality and Perceived Attractiveness of Asians." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 17(4):427–31.
Williams, Christine L. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions." *Social Problems* 39(3):253–67.
Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. "Racializing the Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender and Society* 23(1):5–26.
Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2010. "Are Some Emotions Marked 'Whites Only'? Racialized Feeling Rules in Professional Workplaces." *Social Problems* 57(2):251–68.
Wingfield, Adia Harvey and John Harvey Wingfield. 2014. "When Visibility Hurts and Helps: How Intersections of Race and Gender Shape Black Professional Men's Experiences with Tokenization." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 20(4):483–90.