

Black to Reality: Entertainment Television as a Priming Agent for Race-Based Evaluations of Candidates

Stephen Maynard Caliendo
Department of Political Science
North Central College
smcaliendo@noctrl.edu

Charlton D. McIlwain
Department of Culture and Communication
New York University
Cdm1@nyu.edu

Given the widespread tendency to avoid direct discourse about race in America (specifically among whites), we seek to better understand whether racial messages that heighten our awareness about race have an effect on voter decision-making. Rather than focusing on messages from news media or political advertising as priming agents, we explore the potential effect of popular culture. Specifically, we provide results of an experimental design where respondents were exposed to candidate advertisements in the context of one of two prime time reality television programs: *Black.White*. (which focuses on race relations in America) and *Fear Factor* (specifically, an episode that has no explicit racial content). Embedded candidate ads are drawn from a fictitious bi-racial election (a white candidate versus an African American candidate) and contain one of two types of racial messages from the white candidate: an implicitly racial message or no racial message at all. Due to limited data at the time of presentation, results are overwhelmingly inconclusive. We offer insight into the types of analysis that will be possible when more data is collected, as well as discussion of the gaps in the literature that necessitate such a study.

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30 - September 2, 2007, Chicago, Illinois.

We would like to thank Jaclyn Sprawka at North Central College for her assistance. Partial funding for this paper was provided by a New York University Steinhardt Research Challenge Fund Grant.

Please do not cite without authors' permission. Interested scholars may contact either author or visit RaceProject.org to check for updated versions.

Black to Reality: Entertainment Television as a Priming Agent for Race-Based Evaluations of Candidates

While we are starting to learn more about the ways racial messages can prime racist predispositions in whites to advantage one candidate over another, there are many questions that remain. Previous work has examined the types of racial messages that are used in election campaigns to prime white racial attitudes and tested the degree to which racial attitudes are relied upon when making voting decisions (Johnston 1999; Mendelberg 2001; Valentino, Hutchings and White 2002; Valentino, Traugott and Hutchings 2002). A related line of research has explored the perceptions that white voters have about minorities (and minority candidates in particular), as well as the ways in which those attitudes influence vote choice (Sigelman, et al. 1995; Terkildsen 1993; Williams 1990). Although conclusions regarding the direct link between whites' existing prejudicial attitudes and vote choice are mixed, research thus far supports the notion that racial cues are effective in priming such attitudes, and in doing so affecting whites' voting decisions.

This scholarship is rooted in the broader psychological principle of cognitive priming (Bornstein 2005; DeCoster and Claypool 2004; Malhotra and Krosnick 2007; Roediger 1990), in which a stimulus (e.g., a campaign advertisement or a news story about a campaign) triggers and makes available to the conscious mind a more deeply-rooted belief held by an actor (e.g., a voter). The activation of these beliefs subsequently affects individuals' psychological processing such that the attitude(s) elicited by the communication is relied upon to make a decision (e.g., a public policy preference or a vote choice). Specifically with respect to priming racial messages in political campaigns, we know that implicit racial cues are effective in making latent negative racial attitudes accessible to white voters (Mendelberg 2001). Once primed, white voters are then less

likely to vote for and more likely to express negative evaluations of political candidates who are either members of a racial minority group or white candidates who the voter perceives to be championing minority interests. To date, all of the work with which we are familiar has focused on either political advertisements or mass media reports as priming stimuli. Further, these studies have focused on either one or the other (but not both) of these communicative forms.

We argue for three shifts from the extant literature: 1) We must consider entertainment sources as potential priming agents; 2) We must begin to examine the effect of racial priming on persons of color, as well as on whites; and 3) We must examine the ways in which racial priming can affect perceptions of candidates when both are members are racial minority groups. Here, we address the first item by exposing participants to prime-time television programs (one with explicit racial content and one with no racial content) and campaign advertisements for a fictitious bi-racial (white v. African American) election contest.¹ Given the widespread tendency to avoid direct discourse about race in America (specifically among whites), we seek to better understand whether messages that heighten our explicit awareness about race matters in general have some effect on voter decision-making.

Previous Literature

Priming and Racial Messages

Contemporary research on priming racial stereotypes transcends the context of campaigns (see, for example, Abraham and Appiah 2006; Chiao et al. 2006; Dixon 2006;

¹ Our design allows for examination of all three elements, though space and limited data permit us only to address one.

Graham and Lowery 2004; Rada and Wulfemeyer 2005).² Other research, which does focus on campaigns, considers mass media reports as potential priming stimuli (Caliendo and McIlwain 2006; Terkildsen and Damore 1999). Recent studies that have tested the priming effects of racial messages and their effect on candidate evaluation and vote choice ultimately support Mendelberg's (2001) theory that implicit racial appeals are effective persuasive tools (Valentino, Hutchings and White 2002; Valentino, Traugott and Hutchings 2002). Mendelberg argues that while explicit appeals to race violate the "norm of racial equality," and thus tend to have a backlash effect on those who use them, implicit appeals can effectively prime white voters' negative racial predispositions in ways that do not raise those beliefs to consciousness. Implicit messages are visual, not textual/verbal, and, used alongside nonracial text, produce differing effects such that once racial prejudices are primed, they can affect decision making. These conclusions are consistent with a number of related studies (Entman and Rojecki 2000; Reeves 1997).³

In the two most thorough tests of Mendelberg's theory, Valentino and his colleagues set out to isolate and measure actual priming effects resulting from voters' exposure to subtle racial messages. In doing so, they were able to test what types of cues (priming stimuli) are most powerful in activating racial beliefs and identify the psychological mechanisms that underlie racial priming. In one study (Valentino, Hutchings and White 2002) the researchers experimentally manipulated the types of racial cues viewed by respondents in a laboratory setting, using political ads as the vehicle for the racial cues. This choice of stimulus (political advertisements) differs from those used in

² See Weaver (2007) for a discussion of the psychological processes involved in the common communication constructs of agenda setting, framing and priming.

³ For more specific psychological tests of implicit and explicit attitudes, see McConnell and Liebold (2001) and Rydell et al. (2006).

Mendelberg's studies (news stories), but the results suggest, along with previous research (Brians and Wattenberg 1996; Jacobs and Shapiro 1994), that ads may be a more appropriate cue since they express unmediated intentional messages of candidates, alleviating much of the third-party framing effects that news broadcasts or stories present. Valentino, Hutchings and White (2002) found that messages regarding government spending and taxation prime racial attitudes even without racial imagery. However, they found that when imagery was used, there was a more powerful priming effect. Further, they found that racial priming is mediated by the accessibility of race in memory, rather than self-reported levels of the importance of group representation. In a related study, Valentino, Traugott and Hutchings (2002) found that ads containing racial cues significantly strengthened the impact of (self identified) ideology in evaluating candidates, especially in cases where ads portrayed some advantage of whites over blacks. Conclusions from this study suggest that factors that highlight the salience of race in voters' memory – such as media reporting – may have the same effect.

Effects of Popular Culture/Entertainment Media

Many scholars have been interested in studying the political content of popular culture (Gianos 1998; Giglio 2000; Holbert and Hansen 2006; Holbrook and Hill 2005; Sachleben and Yenerall 2003; Shea 1999; Watkins 2005). Others have studied the effects of popular culture on non-political attitudes (Mazzeo et al. 2007). A limited, but notable literature exists with respect to the effects of popular culture on political attitudes (Adams et al. 1985; Beavers 2002; Feldman and Sigelman 1985; French and van Hoorn 1986; Lenart and McGraw 1989). Furthermore, some of this work has focused specifically on racial attitudes.

The heralded miniseries *Roots* (and its sequel, *Roots: The Next Generation*), for instance, sparked several studies (e.g., Hur 1978; Balon 1978), centering primarily on the concepts of selective exposure and racial consciousness. Surlin (1981) found that viewers of different races and degrees of authoritarianism (see Adorno et al. 1950) exerted effort to “keep their viewing experience consonant with their cognitive-belief structure” (Surlin 1981, 81). He found evidence of selective exposure, selective perception and retention of cognitive balance and reinforcement. Fairchild, Stockard and Bowman (1986) found that Southern and rural respondents to a national survey were less likely to watch *Roots* – a finding they suggests also supports the selective exposure hypothesis. Moreover, they surmise that propensity to view the program was related to “black consciousness.” Finally, Ball-Rokeach, Grube and Rokeach (1981) examined attitudes following the sequel to *Roots* with a separate sample pre-test post-test design. They found that respondents who scored higher on a measure of egalitarianism were most likely to watch the program (selective exposure), though they found no results to support any change in equalitarian attitudes as a result of exposure.⁴ Alternately, Matabane and Gandy (1988) found the PBS series *The Africans* was not perceived as a “black” program, but had a wide appeal (contrary to the selective exposure hypothesis). And Davis and Davenport’s (1997), work on the film *Malcolm X* (as well as the media attention it received) in Houston, Texas, report that “Racial Consciousness” was affected by *Malcolm X* – especially among young African Americans.

Given the agreement that explicit discussions of race in popular culture will elevate one’s racial consciousness, we do not know how such priming might influence one’s

⁴ As revealed below, our study improves on this design by not permitting participants to self-select the television program.

political decision-making. This question is important, especially if we are looking to validly test such effects. That is, we know that voters do not make political decisions in a media vacuum; they watch entertainment television, view political ads, watch television or other forms of news, and engage in a host of other forms of communication prior to making voting choices. Ascertaining the effects that explicit discourse about race in television programming may have on voters who are also exposed to implicit racial messages in political ads moves us closer to understanding the multidimensional ways in which voters expose themselves and react to racial messages.

This study departs from most existing studies of race and political communication by exploring the potential effect of popular culture on attitudes toward candidates in a fictitious bi-racial (white versus African American) election. Specifically, we provide results of an experimental design where respondents were exposed to candidate advertisements in the context of one of two reality television programs: *Black.White* (which focuses on race relations in America) and *Fear Factor* (an episode that has no explicit racial content). The candidate ads were carefully constructed and produced to isolate their racial messages and imagery. All ads from David Jackson (the black candidate) are the same: there is no racial message involved. There are two ads from Bob Herbert (the white candidate),⁵ however, and they differ as follows: one contains no racial message whatsoever; the other contains the same verbal script as the first ad, but substitutes race-priming images for race-neutral images to create an implicit racial message.⁶ Our central questions are: 1) Do explicit references to race and race relations in television entertainment programming influence voters to reaffirm and intensify or to

⁵ We chose to use two male candidates to eliminate gender as a variable.

⁶ See Appendix A for more detailed discussion of the advertisements.

rethink previously held attitudes about race and racial minorities?; and 2) Does this effect influence the way individuals react to racial messages in political ads in terms of their perceptions of and likelihood to vote for a particular candidate?

Data and Methods

We constructed a simple stimulus-posttest experimental design to explore the relationship between exposure to entertainment programming that primes racial attitudes and participants' feelings toward and willingness to vote for a candidate. Specifically, we embedded campaign advertisements, some of which contain an implicit racial message, for a bi-racial congressional election in a thirty-minute segment of the FX network's reality series *Black. White.*⁷ A control group saw the same advertisements in a segment of another so-called "reality TV" program that does not have racial content (NBC's *Fear Factor*).⁸

With the incentive of potentially winning one of four \$250 Amazon.com gift certificates, participants were solicited via email and through links to the survey posted on various Internet websites, as well as through invitations communicated via specific Internet listserves/ mailing lists. Participants were presented with a consent form and alerted that the study would take them approximately 45 minutes to complete. Once they agreed to participate, subjects were given a limited pre-test consisting only of questions related to the subjects' current emotional state. Beyond this, no pretest measures were taken in order to minimize the possibility of priming effects.

⁷ *Black. White.* sought to explore race relations in America by transforming a black family into a white family and a white family into a black family via prosthetics and make-up. The families were sent out to experience the world while living together in the same household.

⁸ We produced advertisements with explicit racial content, as well, but did not test them in this context because we want to isolate racial priming to the television program. Further, we produced the same series of advertisements in a fictitious contest where both candidates were black males. These stimuli will be used in later work.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental groups (*Black.White./no racial message*; *Black.White./implicit racial message*; *Fear Factor/no racial message*; and *Fear Factor/implicit racial message*) and asked to view a portion of a popular entertainment program that included commercial advertisements, as well as the two political advertisements (one from Jackson and one from Herbert). The stimulus spots were repeated during the second commercial break, so that each participant saw each ad twice during the thirty-minute segment of the program. After the program, participants completed a post-test survey⁹ designed to measure a number of dependent variables: potential vote choice between the two candidates; “feelings” about each candidate (measured by a “feeling thermometer”); perceptions of whether either candidate “played the race card”; and perceptions of each candidates’ ability to handle the public policy issue (education) that is the focus of the advertisements. Predictor and control variables include demographic information (sex, religion, age, race, etc.), level of media attentiveness, party identification and ideology, measures of symbolic racism (SR2K) for white participants (Henry and Sears 2002) and measures of black identity (MIBI) for black participants (Sellers et al. 1998).¹⁰

Findings

Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown of the participants under consideration for this paper. Because of the nature of the questions we examine here, as well as the low number of racial minority participants to date, we only include white respondents in our analysis. It is clear that the narrow pool of participants available for analysis severely compromises any findings we put forth below. Participants are disproportionately female,

⁹ See Appendix B for question wording.

¹⁰ Non-black, racial minority participants completed the SR2K scale, given the racial specificity of the MIBI scale.

young, educated graduate students. Perhaps most troublesome is that they are overwhelmingly liberal (77%). Further, 45% of the group is from New York state.

[Table 1 about here]

While external validity is always compromised in an experimental design, the lack of variation in demographic and attitudinal variables in this group of participants is of great concern. We are taking steps to widen our pool in the coming weeks, which will allow a richer analysis. Below, we provide an idea of the types of analysis that will lead us to a better understanding of our research questions.

Our first research question relates to whether exposure to explicit racial content in the *Black.White.* program results in increased racial awareness. We tested participants' level of racial consciousness through their responses to several race-specific questions designed to test affect. Specifically, we asked participants if the program they watched made them feel a certain way about their own racial group or a different racial group. We constructed a five-item racial awareness scale ($\alpha = .74$) that ranges from 1 (low awareness) to 7 (high awareness). While the mean score for participants who watched *Black.White.* was slightly higher than those who watched *Fear Factor*, the difference is not statistically significant ($F = .741, p = .391$). Indeed, the variance on this measure is miniscule, as respondents overwhelmingly reported not experiencing the feelings noted in the survey.

Our second set of questions relate to whether exposure to explicit racial content affects participants' political decisions. In short, the data here show no discernible, statistically significant difference between experimental groups on our three primary dependent variables. As seen in Tables 2-4, while none of the included predictors have a statistically significant effect on participants' perception of a difference in the ability of the

candidates to handle education as a public policy issue, there are statistically significant predictors of the candidates' net feeling thermometer ratings and vote choice. Both ideology and belief about Herbert "playing the race card" predict a net feeling thermometer scores; those factors, as well as heightened symbolic racism predict the hypothetical vote.

[Tables 2 through 4 about here]

All of these findings are intuitive. Participants with higher levels of symbolic racism, as well as conservatives, were more likely to vote for Herbert than those with lower levels of symbolic racism. Herbert has a higher net rating on the feeling thermometer scales when viewers believe he did not play the race card, and participants who did not agree that he played the race card are more likely to indicate that they would vote for him. This is of interest given Mendelberg's (2001) findings that recognition of a racial message will not only render it ineffective but result in a backlash effect. Accordingly, we wonder whether participants' exposure to racial content influences their perception of who played the race card. According to the data we present here, the answer is no. Participants viewing either program with ads that contained Herbert's implicit racial message believed that he played the race card. This finding very much cuts against the pilot testing and other experimental work with these ads (see Appendix A; see also Caliendo, McIlwain and Caliendo 2006) that showed no recognition of the race card being played when an implicit message was used. Participants in this study who watched *Black.White*. did not erroneously assign the race card label to Herbert in the conditions when he put forth a race-neutral message in his ads. Clearly, more data must be collected before we can make any confident claims about effects of the programs or the ads.

Discussion

The reality is that while we have a design in place to explore the research questions we put forth, we simply do not have enough (and enough variation) of participants to appropriately test our hypotheses. In the coming months, we will be able to examine the extent to which racial priming by an entertainment program 1) occurs; and 2) has an effect on evaluation of candidates in a bi-racial election scenario. That information will help to fill a gap in the literature that has focused almost exclusively on racial messages' effect on white candidates who use them, and on priming by advertisements or the news media. Further, our experiment includes non-white participants, who have virtually been ignored by scholars studying the effect of racial messages on voters. In the next iteration of the experiment, we will similarly test the potential of entertainment programming to prime and/or effect racial attitudes in a race that features two black candidates, one of whom employs a racial message. While we are excited about the future, we are unable to shed much light on these questions at the present time.

References

- Abraham, Linus and Osei Appiah. 2006. "Framing News Stories: The Role of Visual Imagery in Priming Racial Stereotypes." *The Howard Journal of Communications* 17: 183-203.
- Adams, William. C., Allison Salzman, William Vantine, Leslie Suelter, Anne Baker, Lucille Bonvouloir, Barbara Brenner, Margaret Ely, Jean Feldman and Ron Ziegel. 1985. "The Power of The Right Stuff: A Quasi-Experimental Field Test of the Docudrama Hypothesis." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 49: 330-339.
- Adorno, T. W., Betty Aron, Maria Hertz Levinson and William Morrow, W. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ball-Rokeach, Sandra. J., Joel W. Grube, and Milton Rokeach. 1981. "'Roots: The Next Generation' – Who Watched and with What Effect?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 45: 58-68.
- Balon, Robert E. 1978. "The Impact of 'Roots' on a Racially Heterogeneous Southern Community: An Exploratory stud." *Journal of Broadcasting* 22: 299-307.
- Beavers, Staci L. 2002. "'The West Wing' as a Pedagogical Tool. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35: 213-216.
- Bornstein, Robert F. 2005. "Reconnecting Psychoanalysis to Mainstream Psychology: Challenges and Opportunities." *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 22(3): 323–340.
- Brians, Craig Leonard and Martin P. Wattenberg. 1996. "Campaign Issue Knowledge and Salience: Comparing Reception from TV Commercials, TV News and Newspapers." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 172-193.
- Caliendo, Stephen M. and Charlton D. McIlwain. Forthcoming. "Black Messages, White Messages: The Differential Use of Racial Appeals by Black and White Candidates" *Journal of Black Studies*.
- Caliendo, Stephen M. and Charlton D. McIlwain. 2006. "Minority Candidates, Media Framing, and Racial Cues in the 2004 Elections." *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 11(4): 1-25.
- Caliendo, Stephen M., Charlton D. McIlwain and Jillian M. Caliendo. 2006. "The Effects of Racial Messages in Televised Campaign Advertising: A Multi-Contextual Experimental Study." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.

- Chiao, Joan Y., Hanna E. Heck, Ken Nakayama and Nalini Ambady. 2006. "Priming Race in Biracial Observers Affects Visual Search for Black and White Faces." *Psychological Science* 17(5): 387-392.
- Davis, Darren W. and Christian Davenport. 1997. "The Political and Social Relevancy of 'Malcolm X': The Stability of African American Political Attitudes." *Journal of Politics* 59: 550-564.
- DeCoster, Jamie and Heather M. Claypool. 2004. "A Meta-Analysis of Priming Effects on Impression Formation Supporting a General Model of Informational Biases." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 8(1): 2-27.
- Dixon, Travis L. 2006. "Psychological Reactions to Crime News Portrayals of Black Criminals: Understanding the Moderating Roles of Prior News Viewing and Stereotype Endorsement." *Communication Monographs* 73(2): 162-187.
- Entman, Robert M. and Andrew Rojecki. 2000. *The Black Image in the White Mind: Media and Race in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fairchild, Halford H., Russell Stockard and Philip Bowman. 1986. "Impact of Roots: Evidence from the National Survey of Black Americans." *Journal of Black Studies* 16: 307-318.
- Feldman, Stanley and Lee Sigelman. 1985. "The Political Impact of Prime-Time Television: 'The Day After.'" *Journal of Politics* 47: 556-578.
- French, Perrin L. and Judith van Hoorn. 1986. "Half a Nation Saw Nuclear War and Nobody Blink? A Reassessment of the Impact of 'The Day After' in Terms of a Theoretical Chain of Causality." *International Journal of Mental Health* 15: 276-297.
- Gianos, Phillip L. 1998. *Politics and Politicians in American Film*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Giglio, Ernest 2000. *Here's Looking at You: Hollywood, Film, and Politics*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Graham, Sandra and Brian S. Lowery. 2004. "Priming Unconscious Racial Stereotypes About Adolescent Offenders." *Law and Human Behavior* 2: 483-504.
- Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson. 2004. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Henry, P. J. and David O. Sears. 2002. "The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale." *Political Psychology* 23: 253-283.

- Holbert, Lance R. and Glenn J. Hansen. 2006. "Fahrenheit 9-11, Need for Closure and the Priming of Affective Ambivalence: An Assessment of Intra-affective Structures by Party Identification." *Human Communication Research* 32: 109-129.
- Holbrook, R. Andrew and Timothy G. Hill. 2005. "Agenda-Setting and Priming in Prime Time Television: Crime Dramas as Political Cues." *Political Communication* 22: 277-295.
- Hur, K. Kyoan. 1978. "Impact of 'Roots' on Black and White Teenagers." *Journal of Broadcasting* 22: 289-298.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, Paul Waldman and Susan Sherr. 2000. "Eliminate the Negative? Categories of Analysis for Political Advertisements." In James A. Thurber, Candice J. Nelson and David A. Dulio (eds.), *Crowded Airwaves: Campaign Advertising in Elections*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1994. "Issues, Candidate Image, and Priming: The Use of Private Polls in Kennedy's 1960 Presidential Campaign." *American Political Science Review* 88: 527-540.
- Johnston, Anne. 1999. "Political Advertising During the 1996 North Carolina Senate Race: The Helms and Gantt Rematch. In *The electronic election: perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication*, ed., Lynda Lee Kaid and Dianne G. Bystrom. pp. 303-15). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 303-315.
- Lenart, Silvo and Kathleen M. McGraw. 1989. America Watches 'Amerika': Television Docudrama and Political Attitudes." *Journal of Politics* 51: 697-712.
- Malhotra, Neil and Jon A. Krosnick. 2007. "Retrospective and Prospective Performance Assessments during the 2004 Election Campaign: Tests of Mediation and News Media Priming." *Political Behavior* 29: 249-278.
- Matabane, Paula W. and Oscar H. Gandy, Jr. 1988. "Through the Prism of Race and Controversy: Did Viewers Learn Anything from 'The Africans'?" *Journal of Black Studies*, 19, 3-16.
- Mazzeo, Suzanne E., Sara E. Trace, Karen S. Mitchell and Rachel Walker Gow. 2007. "Effects of a Reality TV Cosmetic Surgery Makeover Program on Eating Disordered Attitudes and Behaviors." *Eating Behaviors* 8: 390-397.
- McConnell, Allen R. and Jill M. Leibold. 2001. "Relations Among the Implicit Association Test, Discriminatory Behavior, and Explicit Measures of Racial Attitudes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 37: 435-442.
- McIlwain, Charlton D. and Stephen M. Caliendo. 2005. "Shades of Brown and Black: Minority Congressional Candidates and Their Opponents in Multiple Contexts."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

- Mendelberg, Tali. 2001. *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rada, James A. and K. Tim Wulfemeyer. 2005. "Color Coded: Racial Descriptors in Television Coverage of Intercollegiate Sports." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 49(1): 65-85.
- Reeves, Keith. 1997. *Voting Hopes or Fears? White Voters, Black Candidates and Racial Politics in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roediger, Henry L. 1990. "Implicit Memory: Retention Without Remembering." *American Psychologist* 45: 1043-1056.
- Rydell, Robert J., Allen R. McConnell, Diane M. Mackie and Laura M. Strain. 2006. "Of Two Minds: Forming and Changing Valence-Inconsistent Implicit and Explicit Attitudes." *Psychological Science* 17(11): 954-958.
- Sachleben, Mark and Kevan M. Yenerall. 2003. *Seeing the Bigger Picture: Understanding Politics Through Film and Television*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Sellers, Robert M., Mia A. Smith, J. Nicole Shelton, Sephanie Rowley, A. J. and Tabbye M. Cahvovs. 1998. "Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity: A Reconceptualization of African American Racial Identity." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 2: 18-39.
- Shea, Daniel M. (Ed.). 1999. *Mass Politics: The Politics of Popular Culture*. New York: St. Martin's/Worth.
- Sigelman, Carol K., Lee Sigelman, Walkosz, Barbara J. and Michael Nitz. 1995. "Black Candidates, White Voters: Understanding Racial Bias in Political Perceptions." *American Journal of Political Science* 39: 243-265.
- Surlin, Stuart H. 1981. "Race and Authoritarianism: Effect on the Perception of Roots." *Journal of Black Studies* 12: 71-82.
- Terkildsen, Nayda. 1993. "When White Voters Evaluate Black Candidates: The Processing Implications of Candidate Skin Color, Prejudice, and Self-monitoring." *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 1032-1053.
- Terkildsen, Nayda and David F. Damore. 1999. "The Dynamics of Racialized Media Coverage in Congressional Elections." *Journal of Politics* 61: 680-699.

- Valentino, Nicholas A., Vincent L. Hutchings and Ismail K. White. 2002. "Cues That Matter: How Political Ads Prime Racial Attitudes During Campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 96: 75-90.
- Valentino, Nicholas A., Michael W. Traugott and Vincent L. Hutchings. 2002. "Group Cues and Ideological Constraint: A Replication of Political Advertising Effects Studies in the Lab and in the Field." *Political Communication* 19: 29-48.
- Watkins, S. Craig. 2005. *Hip Hop Matters: Politics, Popular Culture, and the Struggle for the Soul of a Movement*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Weaver, David H. 2007. "Thoughts on Agenda Setting, Framing and Priming." *Journal of Communication* 57: 142-147.
- Williams, Linda F. 1990. White/Black Perceptions of the Electability of Black Political Candidates. *National Political Science Review* 2: 45-64.

Appendix A. Descriptions of Political Advertisements

Three fictitious advertisements were used for this paper. Participants viewed two advertisements from one of four treatment conditions: an episode of *Black.White.* that contains campaign advertisements for a biracial contest with no racial messages used; an episode of *Black.White.* that contains campaign advertisements for a biracial contest with an implicit racial message from the white candidate; an episode of *Fear Factor* that contains campaign advertisements for a biracial contest with no racial messages used; and an episode of *Fear Factor* that contains campaign advertisements for a biracial contest with an implicit racial message from the white candidate. We were careful to produce each spot so that the only difference between spots by the same sponsoring candidate is the nature of the racial message. All three spots are “contrast” advertisements (Jamieson, Waldman and Sherr 2000), each of which deals with a single issue (education) and each of which display visual representations of both the sponsoring candidate and his opponent. While the issue positions made by each candidate generally fall along typical liberal/conservative ideological lines, no statement of either candidate’s party affiliation appears in any of the spots. The following is a brief description of the experimental conditions and the advertisements that will be used as stimuli in each.

Conditions 1 and 3: Black.White. Bob Herbert (white) v. David Jackson (black), no racial message

David Jackson’s contrast ad on education contains no racial message. Bob Herbert’s contrast ad on education similarly contains no racial message.

Conditions 2 and 4: Fear Factor. Bob Herbert (white) v. David Jackson (black), implicit racial message

David Jackson’s ad is identical to that used in Conditions 1 and 3. Bob Herbert’s ad uses the same verbal script as his ad in Conditions 1 and 3, but photographs suggestive of racial division are included to create an implicitly racial message.

In producing the advertisements, we decided to use one substantive policy issue (education) to minimize the possibility that a second (or more) policy position might act as an intervening variable. In developing implicit appeals to race, we followed Mendelberg (2001) by combining racially-suggestive visuals with language that, divorced from the images, does not invoke racial attitudes. Further, we content analyzed nearly four hundred Congressional campaign advertisements run between 1992 and 2002 in races where at least one of the candidates was African American (Caliendo and McIlwain forthcoming). This revealed a set of patterns that suggest the general dimensions of the kinds of content that tend to be used and manipulated to evoke a particular kind of racial message: the presence or absence of the black opponents’ photograph in the ad, the racial makeup of ancillary (non-candidate) individuals featured in the ad, the presence of racially suggestive language (e.g., common code-words such as “welfare,” “inner-city,” etc.) and/or images, and the tone of the ad, which generally took the form of an attack or contrast ad when some racial message was conveyed. Additionally, case studies of contests in the 2004 election cycle that featured a racial minority candidate (McIlwain and Caliendo 2005) revealed that racial messages were used and constructed by candidates through images and language (code-

words). These elements are implemented in the fictitious ads described above (an in many instances they are exact replications of parts of actual ads).

We then conducted an experimental pilot study that included a third condition (explicit racial message by Herbert) to test the effect of the racial messages (Caliendo, McIlwain and Caliendo 2006). We showed two advertisements each to 136 participants placed into one of six experimental condition groups. The ads were repeated so that each participant viewed each spot twice. On a posttest survey, we asked participants to indicate their perception of which candidate “played the race card.” We found that the ads generated responses from participants consistent with Mendelberg’s (2001) conclusions about the efficacy of implicit racial ads above explicit messages or none at all. A cross-tabulation of the data show that of the respondents who saw an explicit ad in the white/black contest, an overwhelming majority (82 per cent) correctly indicated that the race card was played in the way that we intended. Recognition of no racial message from either candidate was accurate among a majority of respondents (56 per cent) in the white/black “no racial messages” group. While all of the numbers are not as high as we would have preferred, it should be noted that the small sample that was used for the pilot study consisted of college students, most of whom were enrolled in liberal arts courses (and would therefore have higher levels of racial sensitivity than the general population). The participants in the current study will ultimately be representative of the adult voting population with respect to level of education and degree of racial sensitivity. These results, in combination with focus-group discussions of the ads, suggest that the intended effect of carefully manipulating messages to include the desired racial content was successful.

Appendix B. Question Wording from Survey Instrument

Vote Choice

“If you were able to vote in the election between David Jackson and Jim Herbert, for whom would you be most likely to vote based on what you know of the candidates?” [responses: David Jackson; Jim Herbert; neither candidate]

Feeling Thermometers

“We would like to get your feelings about these two candidates. Please rate each of them using what is called a “feeling thermometer.” You may use any number from 0 to 100 for a rating. 100 = you feel extremely favorable and warm toward him; 0 = you don’t feel favorable toward him at all and you don’t care for him at all. If you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward a candidate, you may rate him a 50.”

Ability to Handle the Education Issue

“If David Jackson were to win the election, how likely is he to help to solve the education problems in America?” [responses: he definitely would; he probably would; neutral/hard to say; he probably would not; he definitely would not]

“If Jim Herbert were to win the election, how likely is he to help to solve the education problems in America?” [responses: he definitely would; he probably would; neutral/hard to say; he probably would not; he definitely would not]

Playing the Race Card

“It has been argued that some politicians or candidates for political office play the Race Card, meaning that they attempt to use racially charged messages to influence voters. How much do you agree with the following statements? David Jackson played the race card. [responses: strongly agree; agree; neutral; disagree; strongly disagree] Jim Herbert played the race card.” [responses: strongly agree; agree; neutral; disagree; strongly disagree]

Multi-Dimensional Inventory of Black Identity and Symbolic Racism 2000 Scales

For wording of MIBI scale questions, see Sellers et al. (1998).

For wording of Symbolic Racism 2000 scale questions, see Henry and Sears (2002).

Ideology

“We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Below is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative.” [responses: extremely liberal; liberal; slightly liberal; moderate; slightly conservative; conservative; extremely conservative; don’t know]

Racial Awareness Scale

An additive scale was created with the following five variables ($\alpha = .74$, $N = 158$).

“Thinking of the PROGRAM you just watched, please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. [responses: none of this feeling (1) to a great deal of this feeling (7)]

- Watching this program made me feel angry at the issues facing my race.
- Watching this program made me feel angry at blacks.
- Watching this program made me feel angry at whites.
- Watching this program made me realize I would feel guilty if I didn't vote for black candidates.
- Watching this program made me feel frightened at what could happen if black candidates are not elected.”

Table 1. Descriptive Information about ParticipantsSex

| | |
|--------|-----------|
| Female | 64% (103) |
| Male | 34% (55) |

Age

| | |
|-------|----------|
| 18-25 | 53% (86) |
| 26-34 | 27% (43) |
| 35-44 | 12% (20) |
| 45-54 | 3% (5) |
| 55-64 | 1% (2) |
| 65+ | 1% (2) |

Education

| | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| High school grad / GED | 4% (7) |
| Some college / 2-year degree | 25% (40) |
| 4-year college degree | 22% (35) |
| > 4-year college degree | 47% (75) |

Employment

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| For wages | 35% (57) |
| Self Employed | 4% (6) |
| Out of work > 1 year | 1% (2) |
| Out of work < 1 year | 2% (3) |
| Homemaker | 3% (4) |
| Student | 51% (82) |
| Retired | 1% (1) |

Year of college student

| | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| First-year | 2% (3) |
| Sophomore | 9% (14) |
| Junior | 8% (12) |
| Senior | 8% (13) |
| 5 th -year senior | 2% (3) |
| Graduate student | 25% (40) |

Ideology

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Extremely liberal | 22% (35) |
| Liberal | 39% (62) |
| Slightly liberal | 16% (25) |
| Moderate | 12% (19) |
| Slightly conservative | 4% (6) |
| Conservative | 6% (9) |
| Extremely conservative | 1% (2) |

Experimental Group

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>Black.White. /No racial message:</i> | 18% (29) |
| <i>Black.White. /Implicit racial message:</i> | 25% (41) |
| <i>Fear Factor /No racial message:</i> | 29% (46) |
| <i>Fear Factor /Implicit racial message :</i> | 28% (45) |

Note: Maximum N = 161. Only white participants were analyzed for this paper. Participants were not included in the analysis if all of the following variables were missing: vote choice, feeling thermometer (for each candidate), ability to handle education (for each candidate).

Table 2. Difference in Feeling Thermometer Scores

| | Program | Herbert Race Card | Ideology | SR2K |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| (Constant) | -9.701 (7.061) | -18.996 (5.992)** | 6.051 (4.393) | -1.028 (2.157) |
| Coefficient | 5.495 (4.290) | 5.697 (1.788)** | -2.812 (1.506)+ | -4.986 (3.333) |
| Adjusted R-Square | .004 | .055 | .016 | .008 |

Note: Each column contains results of separate bivariate OLS regression models; coefficients appear in cells with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is a subtractive index of feeling thermometer scores for each candidate (Herbert-Jackson), so that net positive values indicate support for Herbert). *Program* is a dummy variable where 1 = *Black.White.* and 0 = *Fear Factor.* *Herbert Race Card* is a four-point (strongly agree to strongly disagree) scale where higher values indicate disagreement that Herbert “played the race card.” *Ideology* is a seven-point Likert scale where 1 = extremely liberal and 7 = extremely conservative. *SR2K* is a measure of the participant’s level of symbolic racism. See Appendix B for question wordings. N = 154. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10

Table 3. Vote Choice

| | Program | Herbert Race Card | Ideology | SR2K |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| (Constant) | -.535 (.540) | -2.392 (.567)*** | .331 (.356) | -.496 (.167)** |
| Coefficient/S.E. | .009 (.329) | .576 (.162)*** | -.343 (.133)* | -.548 (.265)* |
| Nagelkerke R-Square | .000 | .116 | .064 | .039 |

Note: Each column contains results of separate binary logistic regression models; coefficients appear in cells with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is a dummy variable of respondent’s indication of a likely vote for Herbert (1) or Jackson/ neither candidate (0). *Program* is a dummy variable where 1 = *Black.White.* and 0 = *Fear Factor.* *Herbert Race Card* is a four-point (strongly agree to strongly disagree) scale where higher values indicate disagreement that Herbert “played the race card.” *Ideology* is a seven-point Likert scale where 1 = extremely liberal and 7 = extremely conservative. *SR2K* is a measure of the participant’s level of symbolic racism. See Appendix B for question wordings. N = 154. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10

Table 4. Difference in Perceived Ability to Handle Education

| | Program | Herbert Race Card | Ideology | SR2K |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| (Constant) | .030 (.358) | -.134 (.307) | -.406 (.212) | -.194 (.106) |
| Coefficient/S.E. | -.137 (.212) | -.018 (.090) | .086 (.074) | .150 (.167) |
| Adjusted R-Square | -.008 | -.014 | .005 | -.003 |

Note: Each column contains results of separate bivariate OLS regression models; coefficients appear in cells with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is a subtractive index of respondents' perception of each candidate's ability to handle education as a public policy issue (Herbert-Jackson), so that net positive values indicate support for Herbert). *Program* is a dummy variable where 1 = *Black.White.* and 0 = *Fear Factor.* *Herbert Race Card* is a four-point (strongly agree to strongly disagree) scale where higher values indicate disagreement that Herbert "played the race card." *Ideology* is a seven-point Likert scale where 1 = extremely liberal and 7 = extremely conservative. *SR2K* is a measure of the participant's level of symbolic racism. See Appendix B for question wordings. N = 154. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10