Double Disadvantage: Race, Gender, and Intersectional Inequalities in Political Knowledge

Jasmine English*

November 12, 2025

Abstract

The gender gap in political knowledge is among the most robust findings in political science. Yet research rarely considers how gender intersects with race and ethnicity to shape inequalities in political knowledge. Using original survey data from the United Kingdom, this study re-examines the gender gap through an intersectional lens. Confirming established results, political knowledge is strongly associated with multiple forms of political engagement, and women score consistently lower than men. However, political knowledge is not evenly distributed among women: the gap between white women and ethnic minority women in fact exceeds the overall gender gap. These results reveal a double disadvantage for ethnic minority women and underscore the need to conceptualize political knowledge as socially situated.

*Assistant Professor of Political Science, Reed College (jasenglish@reed.edu)

1 Introduction

The gender gap in political knowledge is a canonical finding in political science, with women consistently scoring lower than men on factual knowledge batteries (Mondak and Anderson, 2004; Lizotte and Sidman, 2009; Wolak and McDevitt, 2011; Burns et al., 2001; Verba et al., 1997; Stolle and Gidengil, 2010; Fraile, 2014; Dassonneville and McAllister, 2018). This unequal distribution of knowledge raises fundamental questions about democratic equality: citizens who possess greater political knowledge are better equipped to hold elected officials accountable, align their policy preferences with their votes, and participate meaningfully in democratic life (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Galston, 2001; Verba et al., 1995; Nie et al., 1996; Zaller, 1992; Meirick and Wackman, 2004; Gilens, 2001; Siegel-Stechler, 2019).

Despite extensive attention to the gender gap, research has largely overlooked how gender intersects with race and ethnicity to shape patterns of political knowledge. This omission is consequential: research indicates that there are racial disparities in political knowledge (Verba et al., 1993; Prior and Lupia, 2008; Mondak, 1999; Abrajano, 2010; Abrajano and Alvarez, 2010), which suggests that gendered inequalities may themselves vary by racial and ethnic group. Analyses that treat gender as a uniform category therefore risk obscuring important and compounding disadvantages in access to political knowledge.[1]

This paper addresses this gap by examining political knowledge through an explicitly intersectional lens. Drawing on original, nationally diverse survey data from the United Kingdom, I first validate the canonical findings that political knowledge correlates with political engagement and that women report less political knowledge than men. Second, I show that political knowledge is not evenly distributed among women and that the gap between white and ethnic minority women in fact exceeds the overall gap between women and men.

These findings have important implications for understanding democratic inequality in contemporary Britain. Specifically, the findings identify a "double disadvantage" faced by ethnic minority women, which may compound existing inequalities in political voice and representation. The paper thus underscores the importance of conceptualizing political knowl-

[1]: Recent work does demonstrate intersectional variation in other political behaviors; for instance, Martin and Shorrocks (2025) find gender gaps in vote choice among some but not all ethnic minority groups in Britain.

edge as socially situated, and suggests that "one-size-fits-all" civic education and engagement initiatives may fail to address the distinctive disadvantages of ethnic minority women.

2 Political Knowledge From An Intersectional Perspective

2.1 Gender, Race, and Political Knowledge

Political knowledge—defined as factual information about politics, political institutions, and current affairs—has long been understood as a cornerstone of democratic citizenship (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996). Citizens who possess greater political knowledge are better equipped to connect their preferences to votes, evaluate government performance, and participate effectively in democratic processes (Galston, 2001; Gilens, 2001; Verba et al., 1995).

That women possess less political knowledge than men is among the most robust findings in political science (Mondak and Anderson, 2004; Burns et al., 2001; Lizotte and Sidman, 2009; Wolak and McDevitt, 2011; Fraile, 2014; Dassonneville and McAllister, 2018). Across contexts and time periods, women correctly answer fewer factual political questions even controlling for education, political interest, and media consumption (Verba et al., 1997; Wolak and McDevitt, 2011; Lizotte and Sidman, 2009; Fraile, 2014; Dassonneville and McAllister, 2018). Explanations for this gap range from gendered socialization and role expectations to motivational and epistemic norms that penalize women's displays of confidence and risk-taking (Wolak and McDevitt, 2011; Ferrín et al., 2019; Mondak and Anderson, 2004; Ferrín et al., 2018). However, much of this research treats "women" as an undifferentiated category. This approach obscures potentially meaningful variation in political knowledge among women and risks conflating the experiences of differently situated groups.

A parallel body of work documents persistent racial and ethnic differences in political knowledge (Verba et al., 1993; Prior and Lupia, 2008; Mondak, 1999; Abrajano, 2010; Abrajano and Alvarez, 2010). Racial and ethnic minorities often score lower on standard political knowledge batteries, which reflects broader structural inequalities: ethnic minorities face systematic barriers to political information due to educational segregation, economic marginalization, and historical exclusion from political institutions (Verba et al., 1993). Moreover, ethnic minorities

tend to demonstrate *greater* knowledge of domains salient to marginalized communities. For instance, studies that incorporate minority politicians and knowledge of policing and incarceration into political knowledge measures find that racial and ethnic minorities demonstrate greater knowledge than their white counterparts (Hutchings, 2001; Iyengar, 1990; Pérez, 2015; Abrajano, 2015; Cohen and Luttig, 2020; Jackson, 2025).[2]

Together, these findings suggest that political knowledge reflects the social and political contexts in which it is acquired. However, research has largely examined gender and race as independent sources of inequality in political knowledge. A more complete understanding of political knowledge therefore requires an intersectional framework that recognizes how gender and race jointly shape what citizens know about politics.

2.2 Toward an Intersectional Understanding of Political Knowledge

Despite extensive research on how gender and race shape political knowledge, few studies have examined knowledge at the intersection of these dimensions. This gap represents a significant omission: social identities do not operate independently but combine to produce unique forms of advantage and disadvantage (Crenshaw, 1989; Collins, 1990). Ethnic minority women experience both racialized and gendered forms of exclusion that cannot be understood by simply adding together the effects of race and gender (Crenshaw, 1991; Hancock, 2007). Rather, these identities interact to create qualitatively distinct experiences of marginalization that reflect compounded rather than merely accumulated disadvantages.

Intersectional approaches thus direct attention to the experiences produced at the nexus of identities like race, gender, and class (Collins, 1990; McCall, 2005; Smooth, 2006; Brown, 2014; Cohen, 1999; García Bedolla, 2007). This framework recognizes that systems of oppression—patriarchy, racism, capitalism—are mutually constitutive rather than separable (Collins, 1990). Within political science, intersectional analyses show how ethnic minority women face unique barriers to political participation (Smooth, 2006; Brown, 2014), experience distinct patterns

[2] Perhaps most relevant to this study, recent work in the U.S. extends this logic to intersectional identities and demonstrates that Black women-specific knowledge measures reverse gender gaps in political knowledge among African Americans (Jackson, 2025).

of policy responsiveness (Hancock, 2007; Jordan-Zachery, 2007), and are underrepresented in ways that differ from white women and ethnic minority men (Brown, 2014). Applied to political knowledge, an intersectional framework thus generates two main expectations. First, ethnic minority women may exhibit lower political knowledge than white women due to compounded marginalization. Second, this within-gender gap may equal or exceed the overall gender gap, revealing distinct disadvantages that single-axis analyses obscure.

While much research on political knowledge focuses on the United States, the United Kingdom offers a theoretically valuable context for examining intersectional inequalities. Britain's distinct colonial history and postwar immigration patterns produced a racialized social structure that differs from the American context, yet generates similar dynamics of marginalization (Modood et al., 1997; Sobolewska and Ford, 2020). Ethnic minority women in Britain—particularly Black British, South Asian, and Mixed-heritage women—face documented barriers in education, employment, and political representation that are deeply intertwined with both race and gender (Mirza, 1997; Brah, 1996). These structural inequalities suggest that access to political knowledge may be similarly patterned by intersecting identities. Indeed, recent research on vote choice demonstrates the value of intersectional analysis in the British context, finding significant gender gaps in Labour support among Pakistani and Bangladeshi voters but not other ethnic minority groups (Martin and Shorrocks, 2025). This variation across ethnic communities suggests that intersectional political patterns—including in political knowledge—cannot be assumed to be uniform and require empirical investigation.

3 Data and Measurement

To examine intersectional patterns in political knowledge, I fielded an original survey to a nationally diverse sample of 1,613 British adults via Prolific in Fall 2025. This sample excludes 43 respondents who failed an attention check. Appendix S1 presents descriptive statistics for the sample and Appendix S2 presents the survey questionnaire. Appendix S7 describes how the study adheres to APSA's Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research.

The survey measures political knowledge, political engagement, and demographic back-

ground (in that order). To measure political knowledge, I use a five-item scale with multiple choice questions designed to capture knowledge of how government works. In line with the existing literature (Lee et al., 2022; Weitz-Shapiro and Winters, 2023; Kraft and Dolan, 2023; Pérez, 2015; Jansa et al., 2024), I use Delli Carpini and Keeter (1993) as a starting point for selecting and wording questions. Each respondent is scored as correct (1) or incorrect (0) and their score is summed and scaled from 0 to 1. Respondents received the political knowledge questions in random order. Table 1 presents the question wordings and correct answers.

Table 1: Political Knowledge Items (United Kingdom)

United Kingdom
Which party currently has a majority of seats in the House of Commons? *Labour Party*
What is the maximum length of time Parliament can last before a general election must be held? *Five years*
Which party is generally considered more to the right at the national level? *Conservative Party*
Who is responsible for making the final decision on whether a law passes in the U.K.? *House of Commons*
What office is currently held by Rachel Reeves? *Chancellor of the Exchequer*

Note: Correct answers indicated in italics.

After the political knowledge questions, respondents answer questions about political engagement: voting in the most recent election (0 or 1), participating in a protest or demonstration in the past 12 months (0 or 1), contacting a government official in the past 12 months (0 or 1), and talking about politics with family, friends, or coworkers ("Never" to "Daily" on a five-item scale, rescaled 0-1). The survey ends with a set of demographic questions.

4 Validating Canonical Findings

Before turning to the intersectional analysis, this section examines the canonical findings that political knowledge correlates with political engagement (Galston, 2001; Verba et al., 1995; Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996) and that there is a significant gender gap in political knowledge

(Burns et al., 2001; Mondak and Anderson, 2004; Wolak and McDevitt, 2011; Fraile, 2014; Dassonneville and McAllister, 2018; Verba et al., 1997; Stolle and Gidengil, 2010).

First, Table 2 demonstrates that political knowledge is strongly and positively associated with multiple forms of participation. Respondents with more factual political knowledge are significantly more likely to report voting, protesting, contacting officials, and discussing politics. The relationship is particularly strong for voting and political discussion, underscoring the role of political knowledge in facilitating both formal and informal engagement.[3]

Table 2: Political Knowledge and Participation

	Vote	Protest	Contact	Discussion
Knowledge	0.308***	0.097**	0.089*	0.191***
	(0.047)	(0.031)	(0.038)	(0.022)
N	1,593	1,593	1,593	1,593
R^2	0.158	0.030	0.035	0.130
Adjusted R^2	0.149	0.021	0.025	0.121

Note: Estimates for party ID, gender, race/ethnicity, age, income, education, and region are included in all models but suppressed for brevity. Robust standard errors (HC1) in parentheses. * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001.

I next examine the gender gap in political knowledge. Table 3 presents weighted political knowledge means and shows that women score 0.65 versus 0.72 for men, a difference of seven points (p<.001). This analysis uses survey weights developed using 2024 data from the U.K. Office of National Statistics (applied in addition to front-end quota sampling) to ensure population representativeness. I constructed these weights using gender, age, ethnicity, and education. Because of some missing cases on weight dimensions, my final sample size is 1,595.

Together, these results confirm that the U.K. sample reproduces two empirical regularities in the literature: first, political knowledge is a strong predictor of participation, and second, there exists a significant gender gap in political knowledge. However, these aggregate patterns may mask important heterogeneity. The following section explores this possibility by examining variation in political knowledge among women by race and ethnicity.

[3] All models in Table 2 include controls for party affiliation, gender, race/ethnicity, age, income, education, and region. Appendix S3 presents the the full regression results with estimates for all covariates.

Table 3: Gender Gap in Political Knowledge

Men	Women	Difference	P-value
0.72	0.65	0.07	< 0.001

Note: Weighted means (N=1,595). Difference is men minus women. P-value from weighted two-sample t-tests. Political knowledge scaled 0–1. N=818 women, N=777 men.

5 Intersectional Inequalities in Political Knowledge

The gender gap documented above treats women as a uniform category. But do all women have similar access to political knowledge? If race and gender interact to shape access to political information—as intersectional theory predicts—we should observe meaningful variation in political knowledge between white women and ethnic minority women, a category that includes women who identified as Black, Asian, Mixed, and/or Other on the survey.

Table 4 reveals a clear and substantively meaningful pattern: the gap between white and ethnic minority women (ten points) actually exceeds the overall gap between men and women (seven points) and is highly statistically significant ($p<0.001$). In other words, the racial knowledge gap among women is larger than the overall gender knowledge gap. Appendix S4 disaggregates ethnic minority women by ethnic group and shows that each group scores lower on average than white women. Appendix S5 shows that the within-gender gap remains significant in a regression with controls for age, education, income, region, and party affiliation.

Table 4: Political Knowledge by Race and Gender

White Women	Ethnic Minority Women	Difference	P-value
0.67	0.57	0.10	< 0.001

Note: Weighted means. Difference is white women minus ethnic minority women. All p-values from weighted two-sample t-tests. Political knowledge scaled 0–1. N=467 white women, N=351 ethnic minority women.

To put this finding in perspective, the ten-point gap between white women and ethnic minority women is twice as large as the knowledge gap between the highest and lowest income quartiles (5 points) and twice as large as the knowledge gap between university graduates and

those without A-levels (5 points). This finding is noteworthy given that income and education are fundamental determinants of political knowledge (Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996; Verba et al., 1995). That intersectional race-gender disparities exceed socioeconomic disparities underscores the centrality of race and gender in structuring access to political information.

A closer examination of the full intersectional pattern supports this point. As detailed in Appendix S6, both white and ethnic minority respondents exhibit gender gaps of roughly equal magnitude (7 points each). However, the gap between white women and ethnic minority women (10 points) exceeds these within-race gender gaps. This finding indicates that the disadvantage faced by ethnic minority women cannot be attributed solely to gender; rather, it reflects a distinctively racialized form of exclusion that compounds gendered barriers to political knowledge. These patterns thus reveal a double disadvantage for ethnic minority women, who possess less political knowledge than white women (reflecting racialized exclusion) and ethnic minority men (reflecting gendered barriers within minority communities).

Together, these results demonstrate that the canonical gender gap in political knowledge is not uniform. Ethnic minority women possess significantly less political knowledge than white women, and this within-gender gap exceeds the overall gap between women and men. These findings confirm that political knowledge is structured by intersecting systems of inequality, rather than gender or race alone. Traditional approaches that analyze gender and race as separate sources of inequality risk masking the multiple disadvantages of ethnic minority women. The next section considers what these findings mean for how we measure political knowledge and for understanding whose voices are heard in democratic politics.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the canonical gender gap in political knowledge masks critical intersectional inequalities. Using survey data from the United Kingdom, I show that ethnic minority women possess significantly less political knowledge than white women and that this within-gender gap (10 points) exceeds the overall gender gap (7 points). This pattern cannot be explained by socioeconomic factors alone: the race-gender gap is twice as large as the

disparities produced by income or education. These findings reveal that political knowledge is structured by intersecting hierarchies of race and gender, not by either dimension in isolation.

These results have three main implications. First, they underscore the need to reconsider not only the content of political knowledge measures (Hutchings, 2001; Pérez, 2015; Abrajano, 2015), but the distribution of political knowledge across social identities. Analyzing gender in isolation risks masking the distinct experiences of ethnic minority women. Second, these disparities matter for democratic equality. Because political knowledge shapes who is perceived as competent and whose voices carry weight, intersectional knowledge inequalities may reinforce existing hierarchies of participation and representation. Third, the findings suggest that "one-size-fits-all" civic education initiatives may prove insufficient for addressing the distinctive disadvantages of ethnic minority women. More promising interventions might include: (1) civic education that connects political knowledge to the lived experiences of marginalized communities and makes institutional knowledge more relevant and accessible, and (2) mentorship and leadership programs specifically designed for ethnic minority women, which research suggests can increase both political efficacy and knowledge (Brown, 2014).

A methodological note: the measures employed in this paper are conventional and focus on institutional structures, party positions, and elite officeholders. This choice establishes a conservative baseline for understanding intersectional differences. Prior research shows that racial minorities demonstrate greater knowledge than whites when measures incorporate domains like policing, incarceration, or minority political leadership (Cohen and Luttig, 2020; Pérez, 2015; Abrajano, 2015). Future research should examine whether intersectional patterns persist or intensify with knowledge measures that recognize multiple forms of expertise.

In sum, this paper demonstrates that political knowledge in Britain is structured by the intersection of race and gender and reveals a double disadvantage for ethnic minority women. Moving beyond single-axis analyses thus sharpens our understanding of who is viewed as informed, who participates, and whose voices are heard in democratic life. Only by recognizing how race and gender intersect can we develop theories—and interventions—that reflect the lived realities of all citizens.

References

Abrajano, M. (2015). Reexamining the "racial gap" in political knowledge. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(1):44–54.

Abrajano, M. A. (2010). *Campaigning to the new American electorate: Advertising to Latino voters*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Abrajano, M. A. and Alvarez, R. M. (2010). *New Faces, New Voices: The Hispanic Electorate in America*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. Routledge, London.

Brown, N. E. (2014). Political participation of women of color: An intersectional analysis. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 35(4):315–348.

Burns, N., Schlozman, K. L., and Verba, S. (2001). *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cohen, C. and Luttig, M. (2020). Reconceptualizing political knowledge: Race, ethnicity, and carceral violence. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(3):805–818.

Cohen, C. J. (1999). *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Unwin Hyman, Boston.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1):139–167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6):1241–1299.

Dassonneville, R. and McAllister, I. (2018). Gendered biases in political knowledge tests? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(3):552–575.

Delli Carpini, M. X. and Keeter, S. (1993). Measuring political knowledge: Putting first things first. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(4):1179–1206.

Delli Carpini, M. X. and Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press.

Ferrín, M., Fraile, M., and García-Albacete, G. (2019). Adult roles and the gender gap in political knowledge: A comparative study. *West European Politics*, 42(7):1368–1389.

Ferrín, M., Fraile, M., García-Albacete, G. M., and Gomez, R. (2018). The gender gap in political knowledge: Is it all about guessing? An experimental approach. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 30(1):111–132.

Fraile, M. (2014). Do women know less about politics than men? the gender gap in political knowledge: A cross-national analysis. *Political Research Quarterly*, 67(2):355–367.

Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4:217–234.

García Bedolla, L. (2007). Intersections of inequality: Understanding marginalization and privilege in the post-civil rights era. *Politics & Gender*, 3(2):232–248.

Gilens, M. (2001). Political ignorance and collective policy preferences. *American Political Science Review*, 95(2):379–396.

Hancock, A.-M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1):63–79.

Hutchings, V. L. (2001). Political context, issue salience, and selective attentiveness: Constituent knowledge of the clarence thomas confirmation vote. *The Journal of Politics*, 63(3):846–868.

Iyengar, S. (1990). *Shortcuts to Political Knowledge: The Role of Selective Attention and Accessibility*, pages 160–185. *Information and Democratic Processes.* Eds. John A. Ferejohn and James H. Kuklinski. University of Illinois Press.

Jackson, J. C. (2025). Dismantling the master's house: An assessment of the gender gap in the political knowledge of african americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 106:e70015.

Jansa, J. M., Ringsmuth, E. M., and Smith, A. P. (2024). Calibrating confidence: Civic education and the relationship between objective political knowledge and political knowledge confidence. *Perspectives on Politics*, 23(3):997–1012.

Jordan-Zachery, J. S. (2007). Am i a black woman or a woman who is black? a few thoughts on the meaning of intersectionality. *Politics & Gender*, 3(2):254–263.

Kraft, P. W. and Dolan, K. (2023). Glass half full or half empty: Does optimism about women's representation in elected office matter? *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 44(2):139–151.

Lee, H., Diehl, T., and Valenzuela, S. (2022). The confidence gap: How knowledge confidence shapes political participation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(6):798–818.

Lizotte, M.-K. and Sidman, A. (2009). Explaining the gender gap in political knowledge: A theory of guessing. *Journal of Politics*, 71(4):1218–1231.

Martin, N. S. and Shorrocks, R. (2025). Gender vote gaps among ethnic minority voters in britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 55:e73, 1–9.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3):1771–1800.

Meirick, P. C. and Wackman, D. B. (2004). Kids voting and political knowledge: Narrowing gaps, informing votes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(5):1161–1177.

Mirza, H. S., editor (1997). *Black British Feminism: A Reader.* Routledge, London.

Modood, T., Berthoud, R., Lakey, J., Nazroo, J., Smith, P., Virdee, S., and Beishon, S. (1997). *Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage.* Policy Studies Institute, London.

Mondak, J. J. (1999). Reconsidering the measurement of political knowledge. *Political Analysis*, 8(1):57–82.

Mondak, J. J. and Anderson, M. R. (2004). The knowledge gap: A reexamination of gender-based differences in political knowledge. *Journal of Politics*, 66(2):492–512.

Nie, N. H., Junn, J., and Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996). *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. University of Chicago Press.

Prior, M. and Lupia, A. (2008). Money, time, and political knowledge: Distinguishing quick recall and political learning skills. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(1):169–183.

Pérez, E. (2015). Mind the gap: Why large group deficits in political knowledge emerge—And what to do about them. *Political Behavior*, 37(4):933–954.

Siegel-Stechler, K. (2019). Is civics enough? high school civics education and young adult voter turnout. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 43(3):241–253.

Smooth, W. (2006). Intersectionality in electoral politics: A mess worth making. *Politics & Gender*, 2(3):400–414.

Sobolewska, M. and Ford, R. (2020). *Brexitland: Identity, Diversity and the Reshaping of British Politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stolle, D. and Gidengil, E. (2010). What do women really know? a gendered analysis of varieties of political knowledge. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(1):70–86.

Verba, S., Brady, H., and Schlozman, K. L. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.

Verba, S., Burns, N., and Schlozman, K. L. (1997). Knowing and caring about politics: Gender and political engagement. *Journal of Politics*, 59(4):1051–1072.

Verba, S., Nie, N. H., and Kim, J.-o. (1993). Race, ethnicity and political resources: Participation in the united states. *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(4):453–497.

Weitz-Shapiro, R. and Winters, M. S. (2023). Knowledge of social rights as political knowledge. *Political Behavior*, 45(4):1911–1931.

Wolak, J. and McDevitt, M. (2011). The roots of the gender gap in political knowledge in adolescence. *Political Behavior*, 33(3):505–533.

Zaller, J. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Supplementary Material for "Double Disadvantage"

Contents

S1 Descriptive Statistics: Prolific Sample

Table A1. Demographic breakdown: U.K. Prolific sample.
Means for continuous variables; percentages for binary indicators.

Variable	All	Women	Men
N	1595.0	818.0	777.0
Age (mean)	43.3	43.7	43.0
Education (mean, 1-4 scale)	2.8	2.8	2.8
Income (mean, 1-9 scale)	4.8	4.7	4.8
Labour (percent)	43.8	44.9	42.7
Conservative (percent)	20.9	19.2	22.7
Independent/Other (percent)	35.3	35.9	34.6
White (percent)	56.0	57.1	54.8
Black (percent)	16.6	16.0	17.2
Asian (percent)	19.7	19.1	20.5
Mixed (percent)	6.0	6.2	5.8

S2 Survey Questionnaire

Political Knowledge (Correct answer in italics)

1. Which party currently has a majority of seats in the House of Commons?
   Conservative Party; *Labour Party*; Liberal Democrats; I don't know

2. What is the maximum length of time Parliament can last before a general election must be held?
   3 years; 4 years; *5 years*; 7 years

3. Which party is generally considered more to the right at the national level?
   Labour Party; *Conservative Party*; They are considered equally right-wing; I don't know

4. Who is responsible for making the final decision on whether a law passes in the U.K.?
   Monarch; Prime Minister; *House of Commons*; I don't know

5. What office is currently held by Rachel Reeves?
   Chancellor of the Exchequer; Home Secretary; Speaker of the House of Commons; I don't know

Political Engagement

1. Vote: In talking to people about elections, we often find that some were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't have time. How about you—did you vote in the last general election?
   Yes; No

2. Protest: Please indicate whether you have taken part in a protest, demonstration or march in the past 12 months.
   Yes; No

3. Contact: During the past 12 months, have you contacted your local councillor, MP, or a government office/agency about an issue that mattered to you?
   Yes; No

4. Discussion: How often do you talk about politics with family, friends, or coworkers?
   Daily; A few times a week; A few times a month; Less than once a month; Never

Covariates

1. What is your gender?
   Male; Female; Some other gender; Prefer not to say

2. What is your age?
   Open-ended

3. What is your race/ethnicity? Please select all that apply.
   White; Black; Asian; Mixed; Other

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   Postgraduate degree (e.g., Master's, PhD, professional qualification); Undergraduate degree (e.g., Bachelor's); Higher National Diploma (HND), Higher National Certificate (HNC), or Foundation degree; A-levels, Scottish Highers, or equivalent (completed school-leaving qualification); GCSEs or equivalent (completed secondary school qualifications); Less than GCSEs; left school before taking exams

5. What is your total annual household income before taxes?
   Less than £10,000; £10,000–£19,999; £20,000–£29,999; £30,000–£39,999; £40,000–£49,999; £50,000–£74,999; £75,000–£99,999; £100,000–£149,999; More than £150,000

6. In which region of the United Kingdom do you currently live?
   England – North; England – Midlands; England – South; Scotland; Wales; Northern Ireland

7. Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as...
   Labour; Conservative; Independent/Other

S3 Participation Regressions with Covariates

Table A2. Political Knowledge and Participation

	Vote	Protest	Contact	Discussion
Knowledge	0.308*** (0.047)	0.097** (0.031)	0.089* (0.038)	0.191*** (0.022)
Independent/Other	−0.042 (0.027)	0.033* (0.016)	0.049 (0.027)	0.015 (0.014)
Labour	0.065** (0.023)	0.028 (0.016)	0.009 (0.025)	0.010 (0.013)
Female	−0.008 (0.019)	−0.009 (0.014)	0.038* (0.019)	−0.031** (0.010)
Black	−0.045 (0.037)	−0.006 (0.025)	−0.067* (0.028)	0.033* (0.016)
Mixed	−0.020 (0.051)	−0.022 (0.033)	0.048 (0.048)	0.027 (0.025)
Other	−0.226* (0.096)	−0.016 (0.055)	0.004 (0.076)	0.103* (0.049)
White	0.107*** (0.029)	−0.031 (0.020)	−0.011 (0.026)	0.062*** (0.014)
Age	0.004*** (0.001)	−0.002** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.0004)
Income	0.012* (0.005)	−0.004 (0.003)	−0.008 (0.005)	−0.0002 (0.003)
Education	0.0004 (0.010)	0.014* (0.007)	0.021 (0.011)	0.017** (0.006)
England-North	−0.008 (0.028)	−0.005 (0.017)	0.023 (0.027)	0.031* (0.014)
England-South	−0.006 (0.026)	0.031 (0.017)	0.057* (0.025)	0.021 (0.013)
Northern Ireland	−0.061 (0.095)	0.088 (0.072)	−0.017 (0.079)	−0.002 (0.035)
Scotland	−0.055 (0.044)	0.010 (0.028)	0.004 (0.041)	0.004 (0.021)
Wales	0.035 (0.051)	0.042 (0.044)	0.041 (0.067)	0.052 (0.029)
Constant	0.290*** (0.066)	0.036 (0.042)	−0.096 (0.059)	0.331*** (0.031)
N	1,593	1,593	1,593	1,593
R^2	0.158	0.030	0.035	0.130
Adjusted R^2	0.149	0.021	0.025	0.121

Note: Robust standard errors (HC1) in parentheses. * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001.

S4 Within-Gender Gap by Racial/Ethnic Group

Table A3. Political Knowledge By Racial/Ethnic Group

White Women	Black Women	Asian Women	Mixed Women
0.67	0.59^a	0.53^a	0.64
$N = 467$	$N = 131$	$N = 156$	$N = 51$

Note: Weighted means. Political knowledge scaled 0–1. Significant differences between white and other racial/ethnic identity groups were determined through a two-tailed t-test and are indicated with an *a*.

S5 Within-Gender Gap: Regression with Covariates

Table A4. Survey-Weighted Regression of Political Knowledge (Women Only)

	Political Knowledge (0–1)
Ethnic Minority	−0.063***
	(0.022)
Age	0.004***
	(0.001)
Education	0.033***
	(0.010)
Income	0.014**
	(0.006)
England–North	0.044
	(0.039)
England–South	0.043
	(0.033)
Northern Ireland	−0.172**
	(0.079)
Scotland	0.037
	(0.057)
Wales	0.106**
	(0.043)
Independent/Other	−0.017
	(0.030)
Labour	−0.038
	(0.025)
Constant	0.320***
	(0.076)
N	816
Log Likelihood	−82.315
AIC	188.630

Note: Survey-weighted estimates with robust standard errors. * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001.

S6 Gender Gap by Race/Ethnicity

Table A5. Gender Gap in Political Knowledge by Race

Group	Men	Women	Difference	P_value
All Respondents	0.72	0.65	0.07	< 0.001
White	0.74	0.67	0.07	< 0.001
Ethnic Minority	0.64	0.56	0.07	< 0.001

Note: Weighted means. Political knowledge scaled 0–1. Difference is men minus women. P-value from weighted two-sample t-tests. N=467 white women, N=351 ethnic minority women, N=426 white men, N=351 ethnic minorty men.

S7 Ethical Considerations

This project received ethics review and was determined to be exempt from further oversight by the [REDACTED] Institutional Review Board under U.S. federal exemption criteria for minimal-risk survey research. All data were collected in Fall 2025 via Prolific, and respondents were compensated at Prolific's prevailing fair-wage rates. Respondents were adults drawn from a general population sampling frame, and no vulnerable populations were targeted or disproportionately represented. No deception was used, and all respondents provided informed consent prior to participation.