

# **The Effects of Racial Messages in Televised Campaign Advertising: A Multi-Contextual Experimental Study<sup>1</sup>**

Stephen Maynard Caliendo  
Department of Political Science  
North Central College  
30 N. Brainard Street  
Naperville, IL 60540  
[smcaliendo@noctrl.edu](mailto:smcaliendo@noctrl.edu)

Charlton D. McIlwain  
Department of Culture and Communication  
New York University

Jillian Maynard Caliendo  
Department of Psychology  
Avila University

## **Abstract**

The extant literature in the areas of race, campaign communication and voting behavior has left unaddressed a number of issues that we explore in this paper. Previous studies have focused almost solely on the perceptions of black candidates by white voters; we are interested in understanding how racial cues in political advertising affect voter voters' (both black and white) evaluations of candidates of either race. This paper presents the results of a 2 (race of candidates: black vs. white, black vs. black) X 3 (racial messages: implicit racial message vs. no racial message vs. explicit racial message) independent groups stimulus-posttest experimental design pilot study wherein participants are exposed to campaign advertisements that were carefully crafted and produced specifically for this project. We test the effects of racial messages on vote choice and candidate evaluation in both biracial (African American v. white) and all-black contests, controlling for a number of theoretically-grounded independent variables. Results highlight the way information processing of ads with racial content affects the evaluation of candidates in multiple election contexts, as well as the degree to which such messages are effective in priming preexisting racial attitudes. In short, what we know about how racial messages affect white voters differs from the reality of the way racial messages work in the context of black voters where both candidates in the election are also black.

---

<sup>1</sup> This study was made possible with funding from New York University's Steinhardt School, Dean's Discretionary Research Fund.

## **The Effects of Racial Messages in Televised Campaign Advertising: A Multi-Contextual Experimental Study**

Previous research on the intersections of race, political campaign communication and voting behavior has focused largely on two distinct, yet related, sets of questions. First, what perceptions do white voters have about minorities in general and minority candidates specifically, and how might those attitudes influence vote choices in election contests where either a minority candidate or a white candidate championing minority interests is involved (Sigelman et al., 1995; Terkildsen, 1993; Williams, 1990)? Second, what forms of racial messages are used in political campaigns to prime white racial attitudes (primarily related to specific public policy issues), and are these racial attitudes relied upon when making voting decisions (Johnston, 1999; Mendelberg, 2001; Valentino, Hutchings & White, 2002; Valentino, Traugott & Hutchings 2002)? 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.

While we rely on conclusions from these two areas in our present study, they leave unaddressed the following question, which we seek to answer: How do racial cues in political advertising impact voters' (both black and white) evaluation of both black and white candidates? This question is increasingly pertinent given the dramatic increase of the minority population in the U.S. (especially Latino – see Hero and Tolbert, 1995); the increase in minorities elected to local and state offices (Bositis, 2002a), which suggests that federal election contests in certain areas will increasingly involve minority candidates competing with whites; and continued reliance on redistricting that has increased the number of majority-minority congressional districts throughout the U.S.

A second relatively recent shift involves the growing ideological diversity within African American communities. Such diversity is expressed in a number of factors, including: the nonracial types of policy issues that blacks say concern them; the increasing numbers of blacks self-identifying as either independents or Republicans (whose numbers increased 150% between 2000 and 2002); and the changing view of what black leadership means (Bositis, 2002b). Though as a whole the vast majority of black voters are still registered Democrats and/or vote for Democratic Party candidates, this growing diversity is likely to change the degree of competitiveness among candidates vying for seats in majority-black districts, which, up to this point, has generally not been the case (Gerber, 1996). In this scenario, then, blacks will be targeted with a wider range of candidate messages aimed at a greater diversity of attitudes and policy issues. Black voters would increasingly have to make difficult choices about the candidate for whom they vote and, we believe, such messages will often take the form of appeals to racial (African American) authenticity.

This reality is the foundation for a second question addressed in our study: How do appeals to racial authenticity in political advertising by black candidates affect black and white constituents of majority-black districts in terms of their evaluation of and likelihood to vote for a particular black candidate? The creation and/or maintenance of majority-minority districts during the redistricting process have historically been the primary avenues for minority representation in the United States House of Representatives. While some disagree as to the normative benefit of this reality to the broader issues of representation (see Lublin, 1995, 1999), our aim in this project is simply to understand the effects of differing elements of communication under several conditions involving minority and white candidates and respondents. Assumptions about why black candidates fare better in majority-minority districts (particularly majority-black districts) are rooted in models of group consciousness and group identity (see Bobo and Gilliam, 1990). These sociological models, along with models of media effects and those drawn from political psychology, inform our purposes and objectives for this project.

### **Previous Literature**

#### Perceptions and Evaluations of Minority Candidates

While much scholarship regarding the election of blacks and other minorities to political office has focused on debates surrounding the efficacy of redistricting policies on descriptive and substantive representation, comparatively few studies have focused directly on individual-level attitudes towards black candidates and office-holders and the way in which they are evaluated by voters in terms of their fitness for office. Conclusions from this body of literature assert that, by and large, white voters tend to hold negative

perceptions of black candidates and evaluate them more negatively than their white counterparts.

Williams (1990), for example, found in a national survey that when whites were asked to evaluate black and white candidates they more often than not attributed positive characteristics such as “intelligent,” “hard-working,” and “trustworthy,” to white candidates more than black candidates. Others, such as Terkildsen (1993) have found similar conclusions, adding to the mix the fact that black candidates’ skin color and tone significantly effected whites’ negative evaluations of them. She concluded that while black candidates as a whole were evaluated more negatively than white candidates, dark-skinned blacks were evaluated most harshly.

These studies cite race and skin color as primary determinants of whites’ negative evaluations of black candidates. However, other researchers, such as Sigelman et al. (1995) suggest that despite the correlation between espoused stereotypes and perception or evaluation of candidates, a minority candidate’s race is not necessarily the most salient predictor of his or her negative evaluations. They conclude that individual’s previously-held ideologies and political expectations of minority candidates are more significant factors. Others, such as Howell & McLean (2001), determined that, for minority political office-holders, their performance, rather than their race, was a more significant predictor of whites’ evaluations.

The majority of research shows, however, that race is at least one factor among others. Thus, it is important to further explore what degree of effect it has on voting decisions. Further, as some scholars point out, it is rather difficult to dissociate race and ideology because they have been integrally connected for so long (Kinder & Winter, 2001). These points notwithstanding, the above studies fail to address whether mediated messages may, in part, be responsible for the negative attitudes expressed about black candidates. Parallel studies about racial attitudes and evaluations, however, add to this area of research by focusing more on priming processes that make such attitudes accessible and, more specifically, the use of mediated racial messages in the context of political campaigns to do so.

#### Racial Priming and Implicit Racial Appeals

Mendelberg’s (2001) work that convincingly argues that implicit racial appeals by white candidates significantly prime negative racial attitudes among white voters has been supported in subsequent studies. Valentino, Hutchings & White (2002) not only demonstrated support for Mendelberg’s conclusions, but isolated more precisely the kinds of messages that have greater priming effects. They found that messages using imagery in political ads linking blacks to comments about undeserving groups had the most significant priming effect. Additionally, their results show that racial priming is mediated by the accessibility of race in memory, rather than self-reported levels of the importance of group representation. And they found that expectancy-violating, negative racial cues regarding blacks suppressed racial priming, while the violation of positive stereotypes of whites had a positive racial priming effect.

In a related study, Valentino, Traugott & Hutchings (2002) found that ads containing racial cues significantly strengthened the impact of ideology self-placement in evaluating candidates. This was especially so in cases where ads portrayed some advantage of whites over blacks. Conclusions from this study suggest that group cues (and group racial cues even more) are powerful in priming political ideology.

The authors in both of these related studies identify at least one significant limitation: the non-inclusion of African American voters as an audience for consideration. They state:

In keeping with this practice, we too focus on nonblacks, though we do so reluctantly. We believe that the theory of implicit communication applies to blacks as well as whites, though individual differences will certainly moderate the size of the effect . . . Ultimately, however, the theory of racial priming must be extended to include and understand the reactions of *all* audience members. (Valentino, Hutchings & White, 2002, p. 78, emphasis in the original)

Neglecting to measure the effect on black respondents is one of two significant gaps in the scholarship. The second has to do with the race of the candidates in election contests where racial messages are invoked. Work on the (in)famous Willie Horton ad from the 1988 presidential election has helped us to understand the impact of racial messages in general, but cannot account for the effect of racial messages on voters’ perceptions of a racial minority candidate (see Jamieson 1992, pp. 16-42; Kinder & Sanders 1996, chapter 9; Mendelberg, 1999; Reeves, 1997). Further all of this work focuses on racist messages (those that rely upon existing and historic negative predispositions of non-whites), and ignore the possibility of racial messages (those invoking race in ways that do not link to white superiority) (see Caliendo & McIlwain 2005).

We seek to address both limitations, not by replicating the aspects of the above-cited work that tests cognitive processing, but rather by focusing on the attitudinal and (simulated) behavioral effects of viewing ads with racial messages. We do so first by posing the following question: Do racial cues by a white candidate differentially and generally affect black and white voters' candidate evaluation and vote choice? This question leads us to several hypotheses. For our biracial election contest conditions, we have three sub-hypotheses drawn from a broad hypothesis:

H1: There will be a three-way interaction between race of candidate, race of participant and type of message, such that:

H1a: White respondents who view ads containing implicit racial messages from a white candidate running against a black opponent will evaluate the white candidate more favorably than the black candidate and will be more likely to vote for the white candidate, as compared to whites who do not view racial messages.

H1b: Black respondents who view ads containing implicit racial messages from a white candidate running against a black opponent will evaluate the white candidate less favorably than the black candidate and will be less likely to vote for the white candidate, as compared to blacks who do not view racial messages.

H1c: Respondents of either race who view ads containing explicit racial messages from a white candidate running against a black opponent will evaluate the white candidate less favorably than the black candidate and will be less likely to vote for the white candidate, as compared to respondents who do not view racial messages.

The first two sub-hypotheses are derived from group identity literature that suggests that in the American context, racial identity is often a powerful predictor of social and political attitudes and behavior (Herring, Jankowski & Brown, 1999; Schermund, Sellers, Mueller, & Crosby, 2001). Several experimental studies have found consistency with these theories. Manipulating news stories about crime as stimuli, Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) found modest effects of the inclusion of a suspect's race (black) as a visual cue such that negative attitudes about blacks were heightened among white respondents, but not among black respondents. We expect these results to be somewhat dependent on the respondent's degree of symbolic racism (for white respondents). Peffley, Hurwitz and Sniderman (1997), for example, found that whites who held negative racial predispositions were likely to evaluate blacks more harshly on the racially-charged issues of crime and welfare policy than were whites with less negative predispositions. The third sub-hypothesis follows Mendelberg (2001), who found that explicit appeals to race violate the norm of racial equality, and are, therefore, not generally effective.

Addressing these issues in depth fills a gap in the literature by concentrating on racial messages that are used to directly affect support for a minority candidate. While this aspect of the study is a unique contribution to the existing state of knowledge, the second part of the study moves forward into territory that has heretofore been virtually absent in the literature, but that is increasingly relevant.

### African American Voter Psychology and Behavior

Though there are a few exceptions, nearly all black members of Congress have come from districts that are composed of a majority of black constituents (so-called "majority-minority districts") (Lublin, 1995, p. 125, note 5). While the value of these districts to secure adequate representation for the black community is debatable (see Benoit & Shepsle, 1995; Guinier, 1995; Handley, Groffman & Arden, 1994; King, Bruce & Gelman, 1995; Lublin, 1995), their existence typifies the reality of black representation in Congress to date. Understanding the dynamics of voting behavior within such districts, then, is an important, but neglected, aspect of political psychology and political communication. As mentioned by authors cited above and others, very little is known about how and why African Americans make voting decisions generally, or how they respond to political advertising more specifically. Blacks have generally been seen as a monolithic voting bloc, but this is an increasingly incorrect assumption (Morris, Roberts & Baker, 2001). Accordingly, two significant psychological factors may have a bearing on blacks' voting decisions: racial group identification and political ideology (which also relates to views about appropriate methods of political strategy). Black candidates running in majority-

black districts, we suspect, will increasingly express these factors in appeals to racial authenticity.

Smith (1989) argued that black politics are degenerating because of the decreasing fidelity to which black politicians (and blacks in general) have, in the absence of a highly racially charged atmosphere (as compared to the 1960s and 1970s), devoted themselves to race-based politics. Characterizing the results of such a trend, Smith states that “[l]ike the transformations of black music, it will be a hollow victory if in order to achieve equitable descriptive-symbolic representation blacks are required to sacrifice their substantive policy agendas” (p. 161).

Such attitudes about black identity, ideology and social action have arisen from the history of American culture that has necessitated: (a) the development of psychological beliefs about the self to combat double-consciousness; (b) black political solidarity to gain power and legitimacy in fighting anti-black sentiment and power; and consequently (c) the entanglement of race with specific political issues (or ideologies). The literature firmly supports the breadth and depth with which ideas about individual identity generally, and black identity in particular, contribute to African Americans’ cognitive processing of political information and decision-making (Allen, Dawson & Brown, 1989; Gandy, 2001).

Black psychology emerged in the 1960s as a response to what was seen as a bias towards white models of psychology. The standard form of psychology, already preoccupied with notions of individual personality, was amended by black psychologists who posited the need for the development of “authentic” black identities to counteract blacks’ internalized hatred of themselves given white perceptions of them (Akbar, 1984; Hall, Cross & Freedle, 1972; White, 1972). This concept of what would constitute a “healthy” sense of self for the black individual has persisted as a necessary condition for proper psychological functioning (Cross, 1991; Grossman, Wirt & Davids, 1985; Phinney, 1990; Shelby, 2002; Thompson, 1999, 2001).

Where black identity development was the individual psychological response to the problem of racism, the notion of black solidarity (group identity) became, around the same time, the group political response. It was suggested that in order to gain the political agency necessary to redress problems associated with America’s racist past, blacks would need to band together under a common banner of identity and political strategy to attain gains in the political and socioeconomic contexts of the day (Clay, 1993; Smith, 1989).

The necessary final step in this process of African American socialization was the entanglement and association by blacks with a particular political ideology, which includes both their stances on particular “racial” and “non-racial” policy issues, as well as with political party alliances (Glaser, 1995). Although African American political alliances still strongly favor the Democratic Party, blacks’ and whites’ issue concerns have largely converged. A recent poll reveals that the economy, world affairs and terrorism were the top three concerns for both blacks and whites, and that the number of blacks self-identifying with the Democratic Party decreased almost 24 per cent between 2000 and 2002 (Bositis, 2002b). Further, there is growing support for what have been seen as “conservative” or Republican issue positions: favoring school vouchers, Social Security Investment Accounts, and President Bush’s faith-based initiatives (Bositis, 2002b).

In summary, it is reasonable to expect that African Americans’ voting decisions will be heavily influenced by the following: the degree to which African Americans strongly identify themselves individually to a racial group and the degree to which they identify with members of the larger racial group; their political ideology; and strategies to realize political goals, all of which also vary with other demographic factors such as age, income and residential setting (see Cohen & Dawson, 1993; Bledsoe et al., 1995). As Morris, Roberts & Baker (2001) point out, however, these factors are largely out of one’s control at the moment when one is making a voting decision. What can be controlled and varied significantly are the kinds of messages candidates use to persuade voters. Given the cultural foundations that produce African Americans’ individual attitudes and beliefs about normative political practice, the form of racial appeal used by candidates will seek to prime black voters’ sense of authenticity in relation to the attitudes outlined above (see Bledsoe, Sigelman & Combs, 1995; Cross, 1991; Davis & Davenport, 1997; Kinder and Winter, 2001; “Social Science and the Citizen,” 2001).

Racial appeals in all-black election contests have become more common as of late (see McIlwain & Caliendo 2004). Perhaps the most fitting and recent example of the kinds of messages that pervade this kind of scenario is the 2002 Democratic primary contest for Alabama’s 7th Congressional District, which pitted Earl Hilliard against Artur Davis. Press accounts of the contest pivoted on the race issue, particularly with respect to the interpretation that the incumbent, Hilliard, was claiming that “his lighter-skinned opponent [was] not really black at all” (Harnden, 2002). For their part, the candidates also participated in discussions about black authenticity, which foreshadows what we expect to be an increasingly common theme in more competitive majority-minority districts.

Though we are primarily interested in understanding black voters' responses to such messages, we are also concerned with the responses to the same messages by white voters who are constituents of majority-black districts. Given that research shows that increased levels of competitiveness in majority-black districts (sparked by a growing gap in political ideology, strategy and racial identification among blacks) increases voter turnout among both blacks and whites (Gay, 2001), understanding how African American candidates' appeals to racial authenticity affect white voters will likely have far-reaching implications.

Accordingly, the remaining questions explored in our present study are as follows: first, what effect do racial appeals to black authenticity by black candidates have on black voters' candidate evaluation and vote choice?; and second, are blacks and whites differentially affected by such appeals? These questions lead to the following hypotheses.

H2: There will be a two-way interaction between race of participant and type of message, such that:

H2a: Black participants who view ads between two black candidates are more likely to have favorable evaluations for the candidate whose ad appeals to racial authenticity (implicit or explicit), and are more likely to vote for him than the candidate who does not, as compared to white participants.

While racial messages may have a disconcerting effect on some whites when used by a white candidate in a bi-racial election, the extant literature suggests that the lack of identity investment by whites will have little effect comparatively on white voters as opposed to blacks. For instance, McIntosh (1992) suggests that few whites acknowledge their position of privilege above blacks and other minorities. Jackson & Heckman (2002) similarly suggest this by identifying white college students' lack of concern over a circulated racial "hate message," as compared to the reaction of black students. These and other studies suggest that because blacks have more of a stake in the outcome, they, more than whites, will be affected by an appeal to racial authenticity (whether the appeal is made explicitly or implicitly) that is bounded within the confines of a primarily African American community (i.e., majority-minority districts, where such appeals will generally be used).

H2b: Black participants who view ads between two black candidates are more likely to have favorable evaluations of, and are more likely to vote for, the candidate whose ad appeals to racial authenticity than the candidate who does not, as compared to black participants who view ads in which no appeal to racial authenticity is made.

Since there is a dearth of literature on this direct issue (as noted above), there is little direct theoretical rooting for this sub-hypothesis. However, related literature suggests that an appeal to authenticity will have a positive effect on the candidate who uses it and a negative effect on the candidate who is said to be "less" authentic. Justification for this stems from understanding what an appeal to racial authenticity really is. Questions about racial authenticity have emerged within popular and academic discussion of rap music, perhaps more so than any other form of expression. Those researching such areas, such as Kapano (2002) and McLeod (1999) view authenticity of expression as a way of opposing the threat of assimilation by maintaining a minority group's collective identity. According to each of them, appeals to authenticity emerge when such an assimilative threat is present within a given context, and it appeals to those who maintain a sense of racial group identification, inducing a greater sense of the need to maintain racial group solidarity. We suggest that, as a whole, such identification exists within a majority-black district where two black candidates would likely compete with one another. Additionally, we suggest that an appeal to authenticity will be successful because it suggests that not voting for the "authentic" black candidate may translate into a loss of social and political capital and diminish the collective identity of voters' racial group members. Perhaps most of all, we expect that such appeals would be successful because they implicate the voter in these possible detrimental effects (if he or she decides to not vote for the "authentic" black candidate).

H2c: White participants who view ads between two black candidates will evaluate the candidate who makes an implicit or explicit appeal to authenticity more negatively and will be less likely to vote for him, as compared to white participants who view ads in which no appeal to racial authenticity is made.

If H2a is justified because whites lack the identity and interest investment (compared to blacks) resulting in differential effects of an appeal to racial authenticity, the converse provides some justification for H2c. This is to say that an appeal to racial authenticity may suggest to a white voter that the black candidate who holds himself or herself out to be more authentic will favor black interests over their own. Further, an explicit appeal similarly violates the norm of racial equality, which should serve to undermine the message of the communicator. Measurement and analysis of this aspect of the project is somewhat complicated by Berinsky's work (2004, especially chapter 3; see also Berinsky 1999, 2002), which finds that whites tend to shield attitudes that cut against the norm of racial equality with regard to racially relevant policy preferences or vote choice in a biracial election by claiming that they "don't know" their position or for whom they will vote.

### Methods and Data

Although there are certainly important and identifiable limitations of experimental work, it provides the most useful methodology to study the processes of decision-making and attitude formation. While external validity is compromised, internal validity is greatly heightened. As Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) note, "[e]xperiments have the well-known advantage of greater precision in estimating causal effects" (563). This pilot study has the additional disadvantages of using undergraduate students as research participants. While there is no ability (or intent) to generalize from the results, there is much that can be understood about the perception of minority candidates and the processing of racial messages within these constraints.

In an attempt to provide control (see Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002) we hold gender constant. We chose to use male candidates primarily because there are (and have been) far more male members of Congress than female members of Congress. Although we find that unacceptable at a normative level, we are concerned that using female candidates (or one female and one male candidate) would introduce confounding factors to the design. For this study, we have two election scenarios for the United States House of Representatives: one in which a black male is running against a white male and one in which two black males are running against one another. We do not mention either candidate's party identification at any time.

### Samples

Our total sample size is 177 participants (see Table 1 for descriptives of the sample), but we conceptualize the study in terms of two separate samples: those who were exposed to the biracial contest (David Jackson, a black man, versus Bob Herbert, a white man) and those who were exposed to the all-black contest (David Jackson versus Vincent Fox). Participants were undergraduate students at six different colleges and universities in the United States. While students of all races were included in all experimental conditions, there were too few white students involved in the Jackson/Fox contest conditions and too few black students involved in the Jackson/Herbert contest conditions to allow appropriate statistical tests for this small pilot study. Accordingly, we isolate participants by race to test our hypotheses, with the consequence of not being able to test sub-hypotheses H1b and H2c. As this study is a pilot for a much larger study (with an adult sample), we are reluctant but willing to accept this limitation.

[Table 1 about here]

### Stimuli and Experimental Procedures

For the larger study, we will employ a 2 X 3 X 2, posttest-only independent groups experimental design.<sup>2</sup> Given the racial composition of the conditions (as noted above), this pilot utilizes a 2 (race of

---

<sup>2</sup> Part of the purpose of the pilot was to test the potential effect of having a pretest/posttest design. We were concerned that attitudinal items such as the Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale, the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity, or even political ideology and party identification may be primed by exposure to the campaign advertisements and questions about the candidates with a posttest-only design. Alternately, we were concerned that a pretest/posttest design would prime participants to watch the advertisements differently, thereby affecting the processing of the messages. We used a pretest/posttest design on approximately one-third of the participants in the Jackson/Fox conditions and found no statistically significant difference in the means of vote choice, the difference in feeling thermometer measures of the candidates, symbolic racism or black identity.

candidates) X 3 (type of racial message) design. The stimuli are 30-second television advertisements for two candidates in a fictitious election scenario (though participants were not informed that the contest is fictitious until the debriefing). All of the ads are contrast ads (see Jamieson, Waldmann & Sherr, 2000). Ads for each candidate were produced so that the difference in ad content resides primarily in the form of racial appeal made (explicit vs. implicit vs. none) and the race of the candidates (black/black vs. white/black). The spots were repeated so that each spot was viewed twice. After the videos are complete, participants were handed a paper-and-pencil posttest and were debriefed after all surveys were collected.

### *Ad Messages*

To determine how to construct the types of messages for each of the categories of racial messages, 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. This study 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. These include 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 (McIlwain & Caliendo, 2002).

We then conducted an experimental study to test the effect of racial messages using actual candidate ads that conform in part to those described above (in the white vs. black contest). 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 (Caliendo, McIlwain & Karjala, 2003). Additionally, a case study of the 2002 election contests that featured an African American candidate revealed that racial messages (in white vs. black and black vs. black contests) were used and constructed by candidates through images and language (code-words) used in each of the ads described above (and in many instances they are exact replications of parts of actual ads) (Caliendo & McIlwain, 2004).

Rather than rely on existing advertisements, we commissioned eight spots to be produced so that we had complete control over the manipulation of messages in each condition.<sup>3</sup> We began with storyboards of potential implicit and explicit messages and discussed them with a focus group of graduate students in the Department of Culture and Communication at New York University. We settled on using only one substantive policy issue (education) to minimize the possibility that a second (or third) 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. For the ads with explicitly racial appeals, we combined the same images used in the implicitly racial spots with explicitly racial language. The type of racial appeal varies for only one of the candidates in each scenario. Accordingly, we kept relatively constant the advertisements by the other candidate (David Jackson), altering only the name and image of the opponent. All of the candidates are male (as noted above) and approximately the same age. The two African American candidates have relatively similar skin tones (see Terkildsen, 1993). A description of the ads used in each condition is provided in Appendix A.

Post-hoc analysis of the data provides some measure of validity for the message manipulations we constructed in the ads. In the bi-racial contests, a cross-tabulation of condition with participants' perception of who "played the race card" (black candidate only, white candidate only, both, or neither) shows that 85% of respondents believed that the white candidate played the race card (and not the black candidate) in the explicit condition, as compared to 37% in the implicit condition and 15% in the no racial content condition. Taken together, these findings suggest that the messages in these conditions were properly constructed.

Similarly, in the all-black contest there is a clear distinction about use of "the race card." While respondents were in agreement that neither candidate played the race card when there was no intended racial message (63%), they recognized when a racial message was used. In the explicit condition, 68% of participants noted that Fox played the race card, as compared with 34% who believed that he did so in the implicit condition and 22% who believed that he did so in the condition where there was no racial message.

<sup>3</sup> We have applied for more extensive funding that would enable us to use an adult population, randomize the conditions for participants, and add a third contest (white v. white) for an additional control.



## Variables

Two primary dependent variables – *candidate evaluation* and *vote choice* – measure participants' responses to the stimuli. The first variable is measured by a question asking participants to indicate for which candidate they would be most likely to vote if given the opportunity. The second variable measures the respondents' ratings of both candidates on a feeling thermometer ranging from 0 to 100. To deal with the fact that these dimensions might vary greatly from one respondent to another, a new variable was computed by subtracting one candidate's score from the other and using the differential score as the indicator of candidate evaluation for each respondent (see Kahn and Kenney, 1999; Smith et al., 1999). Finally, we asked participants to indicate their perception of which candidate played the race card.<sup>4</sup>

There are a number of independent variables that we use as predictors or controls. Besides demographic information (sex, age, race), participants were asked to indicate their political ideology on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "extremely liberal" to "extremely conservative." Also included was an indicator of respondents' partisanship (recoded to a 7-point Likert scale). Scores from the Henry and Sears (2002) Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale were included as a potential covariate for white participants. The scale is the most recent of several versions of the scale (see Kinder & Sears, 1981; Sears, van Laar, Carillo & Kosterman, 1997).

Finally, scores from part of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI), which measures the three stable dimensions black identity (Sellers et al., 1998), was used as a possible covariate for black participants. It is comprised of three scales (Centrality, Regard and Ideology). Participants are asked to respond regarding the extent to which they agree with the items using a seven-point Likert scale. The 36-item Ideology scale consists of four subscales (nine items each) that measure attitudes about the way blacks should act. The four subscales include Assimilation, Nationalist, Humanist, and Minority. We used the Humanist subscale.

## **Results**

As noted above, while we initially intended to address our hypotheses related to the effects racial messages in bi-racial and black-only election contests might have on both black and white respondents, we were unable to do so. Our participant pool was largely skewed such that there were too few black participants in the bi-racial contest scenario and too few whites in the only-black scenario to perform any statistical analysis. Thus, while our hypotheses related to the differential effects racial messages might have on whites and blacks in both election scenarios, we are able to analyze such messages in bi-racial contests on white voters and appeals to authenticity only on black voters.

In our amended 2 X 3 design, we proceeded to test our primary hypotheses regarding the effects of racial messages on white voters in a bi-racial election contest, and the effects of appeals to racial authenticity on black voters in the contest where both candidates were black. Summary results for key variables are found in Table 2.

[Table 2 about here]

### White Voters, Bi-racial Contest

For the biracial conditions (all white respondents), our primary hypothesis mirrors Mendelberg's (2001) findings that: (H1) White respondents will view the candidate who uses an implicit racial appeal more favorably than the candidate who uses no racial appeal or an explicit racial appeal. White respondents will also be more likely to vote for the candidate who uses an implicit appeal.

When we examine descriptive statistics for significant differences on respondents' vote choice and difference in means tests for candidate evaluation, the racial message manipulation appears to work as expected, confirming our hypotheses. A cross-tabulation of experimental condition by vote choice yields a statistically significant  $X^2$  (12.60). When Herbert uses an implicitly racial message, he is rewarded with nearly 55% of the vote (compared with only 31% of the vote in the condition when there was no racial message used). When he uses an explicitly racial message, however, he earns only 12% of the vote. Similarly, a difference in means test for the difference in feeling thermometer scores between the two candidates shows that Jackson has a net advantage of 6.7 points in the condition with no racial message, but that advantage drops to 2.7 in the condition

<sup>4</sup> Relevant question wordings can be found in Appendix B.

where Herbert uses an implicit message. When Herbert uses an explicitly racial message, Jackson's net advantage shoots up to 27.2 points. An ANOVA test confirms statistical significance for the difference in these means ( $F=8.27$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Additionally, Pearson's bivariate correlations show moderate relationships in the expected direction between the explicit experimental condition and Herbert's trustworthiness (.33), his ability to handle the education issue (.37) and perception of Herbert's campaign (.45). Taken together, these results lend confirmation to the notion that the messages were designed properly, which was an important part of this pilot study.

Of course, we are interested in more than just the main effects of the experimental treatment on respondents' measures of candidate evaluation. We also tested whether or not respondents' exposure to different racial messages were actually significant predictors of respondents' choices given some theoretically-driven controls. The results here tell a slightly different story. Tables 3 and 4 present results of regression models that test the effect of the experimental conditions on the two dependent variables (vote choice and feeling thermometer scores) controlling for political ideology and either symbolic racism (in the white sample) or black identity (in the black sample). While all of the signs are in the expected directions, many of the indicators do not meet standard levels of statistical significance.

Table 3 presents the results of regression models for the dependent variable calculated by subtracting the feeling thermometer score for Herbert (in the white sample) or Fox (in the black sample) from the feeling thermometer score for Jackson. Accordingly, positive values indicate support for Jackson, while negative values indicate support for Herbert or Fox (the candidates whose type of racial message varied), respectively. The constant reflects value for the simulation condition where neither candidate used a racial message (a variable for that condition was excluded from the models to prevent full saturation). Among the white sample, participants in the implicit condition tended to support Herbert more than those in the condition where Herbert used no racial message, though the effect is not statistically significant. When Herbert used an explicitly racial message, he suffered a backlash effect, as predicted. Participants' level of symbolic racism affected their support for Herbert, irrespective of what message they saw: the higher the level of symbolic racism, the less support for Jackson (the black candidate).

[Table 3 about here]

Table 4 features models that allow us to examine effects of the experimental conditions on vote choice, operationalized as a dummy variable where 1=a vote for Herbert or Fox (the candidates whose message type varied). The results mirror those from Table 3. In the white sample, participants who viewed implicit messages by Herbert rewarded him, while those who saw his explicit message punished him (neither indicator is statistically significant). Symbolic racism works in the expected direction, with higher levels benefiting the white candidate (Herbert).

[Table 4 about here]

Having found mixed support for our primary hypotheses for white respondents involved in a bi-racial election contest when controlling for symbolic racism and ideology, we now move to black participants' responses to appeals to racial authenticity in the contest that included two black candidates.

### Black Voters, Black Candidates & Authentic Appeals

In our campaign scenario involving two black candidates, our first hypothesis (H2a) was that participants will feel more strongly about the candidate who makes an explicit appeal to racial authenticity than the candidate who makes either an implicit appeal or no appeal at all. The suspicions of researchers who speculated about the narrowness of our collective understanding of how racial messages work (since almost all studies involve white respondents) are somewhat borne out by our data. In short, racial messages do not work the same way in the context of an all-black election contest with black respondents. A crosstabulation of vote choice with experimental condition (which yields a statistically insignificant  $X^2$  of 1.23) shows that while Fox is the preferred candidate in this population, he actually does best when he communicates no appeal to racial authenticity (78% of the vote). His percentage declines slightly when he uses an implicitly racial message (69%) and a bit more when he uses and explicitly racial message (64%).

A difference in means test for the difference in feeling thermometer scores between the two candidates also confirms this trend: Fox has a 23 point advantage over Jackson in the condition with no racial messages, which slips to an 11 point advantage in the implicit message condition and down to only a 4 point advantage in the explicit messages condition. An ANOVA procedure yields a statistically insignificant difference in the means between each of these three conditions and the thermometer differential variable ( $F = 1.96, p = .149$ ). There is a clear distinction about use of “the race card,” though. While respondents were in agreement that neither candidate played the race card when there was no intended racial message (63%), they recognized when a racial message was used. In the explicit condition, 68% of participants noted that Fox played the race card, as compared with 34% who believed that he did so in the implicit condition and 22% who believed that he did so in the condition where there was no racial message.

Again, we test the predictive capacity of exposure to appeal to authenticity, along with models that include black respondents’ level of black identity and ideology, and interactions between implicit and explicit appeals each with black identity and ideology. In Table 3, we see that for the black sample, the results are similar to the white sample once we control for ideology and black identity, with one notable exception: implicit and explicit messages both tended to help Jackson (the target of the messages). That is, there is no difference in direction between the use of an implicit and an explicit racial message in this context. The MIBI scale is in the expected direction: higher levels of black identity translate into more support for Fox, the candidate who employed racial messages (though it must be noted that this coefficient is not statistically significant). With respect to vote choice (Table 4) for the black sample, while none of the predictors reach standard levels of statistical significance, all signs correspond to the findings in Table 3. The existence of any racial message translates into more support for the candidate who is the target (Jackson), and higher levels of black identity lead to support for Fox.

The OLS regression tests of both predictive models of black respondents’ evaluations of black candidates proved hollow, revealing no effects of the different kinds of appeals to racial authenticity to which respondents were exposed. Given these results, we initially considered that perhaps implicit and explicit appeals to racial authenticity have no meaningful distinction in terms of their effects on black respondents. To explore this further, we collapsed the experimental condition indicators into two categories: no racial message and racial message (combining the implicit and explicit condition indicators). A crosstabulation with vote choice and this new indicator does not yield a statistically significant  $X^2$  (1.04), nor does an ANOVA procedure with the difference in feeling thermometer scores reach the conventional level of statistical significance between the two groups ( $F = 3.23, p = .076$ ). As with the uncollapsed indicator of experimental condition, there is evidence that respondents recognized that someone “played the race card,” but some tended to attribute it to Jackson, as well: 47% of those in the conditions with an explicit or implicit message noted that Fox played the race card (as designed), but an additional 20% indicated that both candidates did.

To provide addition confirmation of this trend with the black respondents, we replicated the OLS and binary logistic regression tests from Tables 3 and 4 with this new collapsed indicator. The results for vote choice mirrored the model with the conditions entered separately (no statistically significant effects), though the new collapsed condition indicator is statistically significant ( $B = 25.96, p < .05$ ) in predicting higher feeling thermometer support for Jackson when Fox used an implicit or explicit racial message compared to when no racial message was present.

These somewhat curious results in the black sample of subjects is mitigated by the unequal distribution in support for Vincent Fox among respondents in all experimental conditions (measured by both vote choice and feeling thermometer differential).<sup>5</sup> Such support was widespread and included variables outside of those we directly tested. Fox was overwhelmingly seen as more trustworthy, more equipped to handle education, and ran a more favorable campaign in the estimation of most respondents.

---

<sup>5</sup> In a sense, David Jackson had no place to go but up in this sample. As noted above, Fox enjoyed a 23 point mean thermometer lead in the condition where there were no racial messages (65.5 to 42.8), and the lead narrowed a bit in the condition where Fox used an implicitly racial message (59.8 to 48.9) and a bit more still in the condition where Fox used an explicitly racial message (55.8 to 51.7).

## Discussion

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of racial messages in bi-racial election contests between white and black potential voters. We also wanted to compare these two groups in terms of the effect of appeals to racial authenticity. While we were not able to test what we thought would be one of the most significant aspects of this study – its comparative framework between white and black participants – we believe that, despite the limitations, there are some significant findings.

First, while the priming effects of implicit racial messages on white voters have been arguably established, scholars have not agreed as to what empirically constitutes an “implicit” racial message in televised political advertising or otherwise. One of the strengths of our study was our ability to construct and test specific manipulations of racial messages through combinations of language and visual images. The results show these manipulations to be largely successful. That is, not only did our sample of white participants respond to implicit and explicit appeals in the ways that we hypothesize based on the literature, but our additional measure of respondent recognition of racial messages (the “race card” question) supports the validity of our own manipulations and provides even greater strength to some implied assumptions behind previous literature in this area. That is, the theory of implicit racial appeals holds that white respondents do not recognize the racial nature of the appeal and are therefore free to be influenced by it in the way intended by the candidate who employs it. Further, white respondents recognize explicit appeals and reject it as violating the norm of racial equality by punishing the candidate who employs it. Our results clearly confirm these underlying assumptions.

Second, this is one of the times in which the absence of statistically significant results – for our all-black sample – is nonetheless substantively significant. We are charting new territory when it comes to better understanding African American voting behavior in general, and blacks’ responses to racial messages specifically. We know that black candidates utilize and find strategic import in using racial messages, and we know that such appeals, when aimed at primarily black voters, tend toward appeals to authenticity. Previous research, however, provides no direct guidance on how to approach the study of this group, which has been traditionally left out of studies of voting behavior. When it comes to understanding the ways in which racial messages are used and their potential effects on black voters, the results here show that we cannot at all rely upon the theoretical and empirical models based on white voters and the specific kinds of messages typically seen as having the most effect and being the most “dangerous” – those that target negative racial predispositions seen to disadvantage blacks over whites.

The results of this study suggest that distinctions between implicit and explicit racial messages do not apply either in their operationalization or their effect. That is, we contend, that blacks, because of their historical relationship with whites and systems of racism and discrimination, are more apt to pick up on racial messages, such that black respondents do not see an explicit message as “explicit,” in the sense that it is a non-normative form of communicating. There is likely no expectancy-violating psychological processing that, compared to whites, would lead blacks to view an explicit message in a negative light. And, it is likely that “implicit” messages, for blacks, are mostly seen as explicit – easily recognizable and acceptable.

The failure to produce any significant results from models driven primarily by research on white voters and racist (as distinguished from racial) messages suggests the need for researchers to think more precisely about how such appeals might be more reliably constructed given not only the message, but the characteristics of different subsets of the audience. For instance, we have argued elsewhere (Caliendo & McIlwain, 2005) that appeals to black authenticity can be conceptualized in five distinct ways. One of these ways, for example, is as an appeal to party authenticity in which candidates suggest that their opponents are less authentically black because they align themselves with a political party (Republican) with which blacks have seldom associated historically. Another is an ideological appeal to black authenticity, which is the kind communicated in the ads we produced for this experiment.

None of these forms of appeals is likely to find footing here, not because they are not rhetorically “appealing” to blacks, but because they are rhetorically unappealing to black 18-20 year-olds who comprised our sample. Ideological and party appeals to authenticity are likely not to make as much difference on those who are barely of voting age and have not developed a sophisticated sense of political party and/or ideological loyalty one way or another. A replication of the study on an adult sample, we believe, will likely bear this out.

Finally, in rethinking the message of the authentic appeal, it is possible that it may have worked differently if we had not necessarily followed the model of the appeals in the bi-racial contest (that is, connecting the appeal to a specific public policy issue). It may be that the appeal of appeals to authenticity work

better – or certainly differently – when not attached to a substantive political issue; in that case, the appeal may lie with race itself, not the racial implications of a broader political issue. This is to say that the almost omnipresent awareness of race amongst blacks, and the likelihood that they see discussions about race as significant in a culture that tends to avoid direct racial discourse, may be the nexus of the appeal that would come through more clearly. It may be, for instance, that a black candidate's claim that his or her opponent is simply not black enough (or that he or she is not qualified to advocate for black interests) is more rhetorically appealing than muddying the waters of such an appeal with various issue positions in order to demonstrate the opponent's "deficit of blackness."

### References

- Akbar, N. (1984). Afrocentric social sciences for human liberation. *Journal of Black Studies*, 14: 395-414.
- Allen, R. L., Dawson, M. C., & Brown, R. E. (1989). A schema-based approach to modeling an African American racial belief system. *American Political Science Review*, 83, 421-441.
- Benoit, K., & Shepsle, K. A. (1995). Electoral systems and minority representation. In P. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Classifying by race* (pp. 50-84). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Berinsky, A. J. (1999). The two faces of public opinion. *American Journal of Political Science*, 43, 1209-1230.
- Berinsky, A. J. (2002). Silent voices: Social welfare policy opinions and political equality in America. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46, 276-287.
- Berinsky, A. J. (2004). *Silent voices: Public opinion and political participation in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bledsoe, T., Welch, S., Sigelman, L., & Combs, M. (1995). Residential context and racial solidarity among African Americans. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39, 434-458.
- Bobo, L., & Gilliam, F. D., Jr. (1990). Race, sociopolitical participation, and black empowerment. *American Political Science Review*, 84, 377-393.
- Bositis, D. (2002a). Party, redistricting and minority representation: The southern states, 1992-2002. Paper presented at the Redistricting 1992-2002: Voting Rights and Minority Representation Conference. Retrieved June 20, 2003, from [http://www.jointcenter.org/whatsnew/conference\\_on\\_redistricting.htm](http://www.jointcenter.org/whatsnew/conference_on_redistricting.htm)
- Bositis, D. A. (2002b). *2002 national opinion poll: politics*. Washington, DC: The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.
- Caliendo, S. M. & McIlwain, C. D. (2004). Frames of authenticity: news coverage of black candidates and their campaigns. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Caliendo, S. M., & McIlwain, C. (2005). Racial messages in political campaigns. In S. J. Best & B. Radcliff (Eds.), *Polling America: An encyclopedia of public opinion*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Caliendo, S. M., McIlwain, C. D., & Karjala, A. (2003). Reading race: An experimental study of the effect of political advertisement's racial tone on candidate perception and vote choice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Clay, W. L. (1993). *Just permanent interests: Black Americans in Congress, 1870-1991*. New Jersey: Amistad Press.

- Cohen, C. J., & Dawson, M. C. (1993). Neighborhood politics and African American politics. *American Political Science Review*, 87, 286-302.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Davis, D. W., & Davenport, C. (1997). The political and social relevancy of Malcolm X: The stability of African American political attitudes. *Journal of Politics*, 59, 550-564.
- Gandy, O. H. (2001). Racial identity, media use, and the social construction of risk among African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, 31, 600-618.
- Gay, C. (2001). The effect of black congressional representation on political participation. *American Political Science Review*, 95, 589-602.
- Gerber, A. (1996). African Americans' congressional careers and the Democratic house delegation. *Journal of Politics*, 58, 831-845.
- Gilliam, F. D., & Iyengar, S. (2000). Prime suspects: The influence of local television news on the viewing public. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44, 560-573.
- Glaser, J. M. (1995). Black and white perceptions of party differences. *Political Behavior*, 17, 155-177.
- Grossman, B., Wirt, R., & Davids, A. (1985). Self-esteem, ethnic identity, and behavioral adjustment among Anglo and Chicano adolescents in West Texas. *Journal of Adolescence*, 8, 57-68.
- Guinier, L. (1995). The representation of minority interests. In P. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Classifying by race* (pp. 21-49). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hall, W. S., Cross, W. E. Jr., & Freedle, R. (1972). Stages in the development of black awareness. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Handley, L., Groffman, B., & Arden, W. (1994). Electing minority-preferred candidates to legislative office: The relationship between minority percentages in districts and the election of minority-preferred candidates. In B. Groffman (Ed.), *Race and Redistricting in the 1990s*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Harnden, T. (2002). Dream coming true for gifted black politician: Times are changing in the deep South. *The London Daily Telegraph*, 25 June.
- Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology*, 23, 253-283.
- Hero, R. R., & Tolbert, C. J. (1995). Latinos and substantive representation in the U.S. House of Representatives: Direct, indirect, or non-existent? *American Journal of Political Science*, 40, 851-871.
- Herring, M., Jankowski, T., & Brown, R.E. (1999). Pro-black doesn't mean anti-white: The structure of African-American group identity. *Journal of Politics*, 61(2), 336-386.
- Howell, S. E., & McLean, W. P. (2001). Performance and race in evaluating black mayors. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 65, 321-343.
- Jackson, R. L. & Heckman, S. (2002). Perceptions of white identity and white liability: An analysis of white student responses to a college campus racial hate crime. *Journal of Communication*, 52, 434-450.

- Jamieson, K. H. (1992). *Dirty politics: Deception, distraction, and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H., Waldman, P. & Sherr, S. (2000). Eliminate the negative? Categories of analysis for political advertisements." In J. A. Thurber, C. J. Nelson and D. A. Dulio (Eds.), *Crowded airwaves: Campaign advertising in elections*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Johnston, A. (1999). Political advertising during the 1996 North Carolina senate race: The Helms and Gantt rematch. In L. L. Kaid & D. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication* (pp. 303-315). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kahn, K. F., & Kenney, P. J. (1999). Do negative campaigns mobilize or suppress turnout?: Clarifying the relationship between negativity and participation. *American Political Science Review*, 93, 877-889.
- Kapano, B. N. (2002). Rap music as an extension of the black rhetorical tradition: "Keepin' it real." *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 26, 204-214.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sanders, L. M. (1996). *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, D.R., & Sears, D.O. (1981), Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 414-431.
- Kinder, D.R., & Winter, N. (2001). Exploring the racial divide: Blacks, whites, and opinion on national policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45, 439-453.
- King, G., Bruce, J., & Gelman A. (1995). Racial fairness in legislative redistricting. In P. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Classifying by race* (pp. 85-110). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lublin, D. (1995). Race, representation, and redistricting. In P. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Classifying by race* (pp. 111-125). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lublin, D. (1999). Racial redistricting and African-American representation: A critique of "Do majority-minority districts maximize substantive black representation in congress?" *The American Political Science Review*, 93, 183-186.
- McIntosh, P. (1992). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M. Anderson & P. Hill-Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (pp. 70-81). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McIlwain, C. D., & Caliendo, S. M. (2002). "How do I look?" An analysis of television advertisements for black candidates and their opponents, 1952-2000 (1992-2000 Senate races pilot study). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- McIlwain, C. D., & Caliendo, S. M. (2004). Frames of authenticity: News coverage of black candidates and their campaigns. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- McLeod, K. (1999). Authenticity within hip-hop and other cultures threatened with assimilation. *Journal of Communication*, 49, 134-150.
- Mendelberg, T. (1999). Executing Hortons. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 134-157.

- Mendelberg, T. (2001). *The race card: Campaign strategy, implicit messages, and the norm of equality*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Morris, J. D., Roberts, M. S., & Baker, G. F. (2001). Emotional responses of African American voters to ad messages. In L. L. Kaid & D. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication* (pp. 257-274). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Peffley, M., Hurwitz, J. & Sniderman, P.M. (1997). Racial stereotypes and whites' political views of blacks in the context of welfare and crime. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41, 30-60.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: A review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 499-514.
- Reeves, K. (1997). *Voting hopes or fears? White voters, black candidates and racial politics in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmermund, A., Sellers, R., Mueller, B., & Crosby, F. (2001). Attitudes toward affirmative action as a function of racial identity among African American college students. *Political Psychology*, 22, 759-773.
- Sears, D.O., van Laar, C., Carillo, M., & Kosterman, R. (1997). Is it really racism? The origins of white Americans' opposition to race-targeted policies. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 16-53.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Cahvous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 18-39.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Shelby, T. (2002). Foundations of black solidarity: Collective identity or common oppression? *Ethics*, 112, 231-266.
- Sigelman, C. K., Sigelman, L., Walkosz, B. J., & Nitz, M. (1995). Black candidates, white voters: Understanding racial bias in political perceptions. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39, 243-265.
- Smith, C. E., Jr., Brown, R. D., Bruce, J. M., & Overby, L. M. (1999). Party balancing and voting for Congress in the 1996 elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 93, 877-889.
- Smith, R. C. (1989). Recent elections and black politics: The maturation or death of black politics? *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 23, 160-162.
- Social science and the citizen. (2001). *Society*. September/October, 2-3.
- Terkildsen, N. (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.
- Thompson, V. L. S. (1999). Variables affecting racial identity salience among African Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139, 748-761.
- Thompson, V. L. S. (2001). The complexity of African American racial identification. *Journal of Black Studies*, 32, 155-165.
- Valentino, N. A., Hutchings, V. L., & White, I. (2002). Cues that matter: how political ads prime racial attitudes during campaigns. *American Political Science Review*, 96, 75-90.



- Valentino, N. A., Traugott, M. W., & Hutchings, V. (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.
- White, J. (1972). Toward a black psychology. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Williams, L. F. (1990). White/black perceptions of the electability of black political candidates. *National Political Science Review, 2*, 145-164.

## Appendix A. Descriptions of Ads in Each Experimental Condition

### **Condition 1: 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.

### **Condition 2: Bob Herbert (white) v. David Jackson (black), implicit racial message**

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

### **Condition 3: Bob Herbert (white) v. David Jackson (black), explicit racial message**

David Jackson's ad is identical to those used in Conditions 1 and 2. Bob Herbert's ad uses the same visuals as his ad in Condition 2, but the verbal script is explicitly racial.

### **Message Summaries**

We introduce a biracial contest wherein David Jackson, a black man, is running against Jim Herbert, a white man. In Condition 1, participants view contrast ads from both candidates on the issue of education, neither of which contains implicit or explicit reference to race. The ad by David Jackson is repeated for each of the remaining two conditions for this contest, so that his message is consistent. In Condition 2, participants are shown a Herbert ad with an implicitly racial message. The same verbal script is used as in the race-neutral ad from condition 1, but the visuals are designed to play on negative predispositions of African Americans by showing color photos of suburban schools contrasted with black and white images of inner-city schools. In Condition 3, Jim Herbert directly appeals to race by mentioning "the color of [the candidates'] skin" at the outset, and claiming that Jackson's plan is "to take money from folks like us to fund inner-city schools that look like him." Herbert mentions the words "quota" and "affirmative education," and rhetorically asks "does equality mean that it's right to take money from one group and give it to another simply because of the color of their skin?" He ends by stating that he believes in an education policy "that isn't just black and white." Visuals are the same as in Condition 2. Textual graphics include a red diagonal stamp across a photo of an inner-city school that reads "Jackson's Plan: Gives Our Money Away to Inner-City Schools."

### **Condition 4: Vincent Fox (black) v. David Jackson (black), no racial message**

David Jackson's ad is identical to those used in Conditions 1 through 3 (no racial message), with the exception that his opponent is now Vincent Fox, rather than Bob Herbert. Vincent Fox's ad similarly contains no racial message.

### **Condition 5: Vincent Fox (black) v. David Jackson (black), implicit racial message**

David Jackson's ad is identical to that used in Condition 4. Vincent Fox's ad uses the same verbal script as his ad in Condition 4, but photographs suggestive of racial divisions are included to create an implicitly racial message.

### **Condition 6: Vincent Fox (black) v. David Jackson (black), explicit racial message**

David Jackson's ad is identical to those used in Conditions 4 and 5. Vincent Fox's ad uses the same visuals as in his ad in Condition 5, but the verbal script is explicitly racial.

### **Message Summaries**

In the all-black election contest conditions, participants view the same ads from David Jackson (with the script and images changed only to reflect the new opponent), as well as one of three ads from Vincent Fox. Fox's ad in Condition 1 has no racial content in language or imagery. In Condition 2, Fox's ad has an identical verbal script as the ad with no racial content, but with the images are designed to question Jackson's African American authenticity by showing him in photographs with white students on a college campus. Condition 3 features an explicitly racial ad by Vincent Fox, who, standing in a busy intersection with many African American passers-by, claims that he and his opponent "may look the same on the outside, but the differences between [them]

couldn't be greater." As the camera pans out wider, Fox claims that "this community has always been a black community" and that he's "always been committed to black interests – our interests." A picture of Jackson appears above a caption that reads, "What does he know about the black community?" Fox's voiceover continues: "When I was growing up on the streets of our community, Jackson was playing in new playgrounds in his white suburban neighborhood. When I was going to college here, Jackson was rubbing elbows with the white elite at his Ivy League university." This is accompanied with same images of Jackson with white students on a college campus as shown in Condition 2. Fox argues that Jackson wants "our children" to "follow his footsteps" and attend white schools in other parts of the city, rather than charter schools that would "give them an Afro-centric education by black teachers who share their own black experience." Fox concludes by asking, "Who is really equipped to fight for black interests in Washington: someone whose blackness is only skin deep, or one who really knows what it means to be black?"

### Appendix B. Question Wording for Key Variables

If you were able to vote in the election between David Jackson and Vincent Fox [or Bob Herbert], whom would you be most likely to vote for based on what you know of the two candidates?

David Jackson

Vincent Fox [or Bob Herbert]

We would like to know 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. A rating between 50 and 100 degrees means that you feel warm or favorable toward the candidate. A rating between 0 and 50 degrees means that you don’t feel too favorable toward the candidate. If you do not feel particularly warm or cold toward a candidate, you may rate him a 50.

David Jackson \_\_\_\_\_

Vincent Fox  
[or Bob Herbert] \_\_\_\_\_

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. To what extent do you believe that David Jackson or Vincent Fox [or Bob Herbert] “played the race card?” (Please indicate the response that best matches your belief.)

- David Jackson played the race card, but Vincent Fox [or Bob Herbert] did not
- Vincent Fox [or Bob Herbert] played the race card, but David Jackson did not
- Both David Jackson and Vincent Fox [or Bob Herbert] played the race card
- Neither candidate played the race card

**Table 1. Profile of Participants for Each Election Contest****Jackson (African American) v. Herbert (white)**

## Race

White	83 (100%)
-------	-----------

## Gender

Female	66%
Male	34%

## Year

First-year	11%
Sophomore	24%
Junior	27%
Senior	39%

Mean age	21.60
----------	-------

Mean PID	4.51
----------	------

Mean ideology	3.92
---------------	------

**Jackson (African American) v. Fox (African American)**

## Race

African American	94 (100%)
------------------	-----------

## Gender

Female	46%
Male	54%

## Year

First-year	36%
Sophomore	54%
Junior	7%
Senior	2%

Mean age	20.09
----------	-------

Mean PID	2.50
----------	------

Mean ideology	3.48
---------------	------

**Note:** Participants were college students at six colleges and universities in the South, Midwest and Southeastern United States. Original N=252 (number of participants included for analysis is 177). Party identification is measured by way of a 7-point Likert scale: strong Democrat (1) to strong Republican (7). Ideology is measured by way of a 7-point Likert scale: extremely liberal (1) to extremely conservative (7).

**Table 2. Summary of Conditions and Key Variables**

<b>Experimental Conditions</b>	
Jackson (African American) v. Herbert (white)	<u>N</u>
No racial message by either candidate	13.5% (34)
Implicit racial message by Herbert	18.3% (46)
Explicit racial message by Herbert	13.1% (33)
Jackson (African American) v. Fox (African American)	
No racial message by either candidate	13.1% (33)
Implicit racial message by Fox	30.6% (77)
Explicit racial message by Fox	11.5% (29)

<b>Key Variables</b>			
<u>Vote</u>		<u>Mean Trustworthiness</u>	
Jackson v. Herbert		Jackson v. Herbert	
Jackson	61%	Jackson	2.30
Herbert	37%	Herbert	2.61
Jackson v. Fox		Jackson v. Fox	
Jackson	30%	Jackson	2.34
Fox	70%	Fox	2.04
<u>Mean Feeling Thermometer Scores</u>		<u>Mean Handling of the Substantive Issue (Education)</u>	
Jackson v. Herbert		Jackson v. Herbert	
Jackson	57.45	Jackson	2.61
Herbert	46.38	Herbert	2.78
Difference (Jackson – Herbert)	+11.07	Jackson v. Fox	
Jackson v. Fox		Jackson	2.43
Jackson	47.78	Fox	2.04
Fox	60.52	<u>Mean Perceptions of the Campaigns</u>	
Difference (Jackson – Fox)	-13.17	Jackson v. Herbert	
		Jackson's	2.52
		Herbert's	2.88
		Jackson v. Fox	
		Jackson's	2.45
		Fox's	2.07

Note: The Jackson v. Herbert conditions feature only white participants (N=83) (actual numbers vary due to missing data). The Jackson v. Fox conditions feature only African American participants (N=94). Feeling thermometers are 0 (cold) to 100 (warm). Participants' ratings of candidates' trustworthiness is measured by way of individual 4-point Likert scales: very trustworthy (1) to very untrustworthy (4). Participants' perspectives of whether a candidate "is likely to solve the education problems in America" are measured by way of individual 4-point Likert scales: definitely would (1) to definitely wouldn't (4). Participants' perspectives of the candidates' campaign tactics are measured by way of individual 4-point Likert scales: very favorable (1) to very unfavorable (4).

**Table 3. Difference in Feeling Thermometer Scores for Candidates**

	<u>Coefficient</u>
<b><i>Jackson v. Herbert</i></b>	
(constant)	51.51 (14.95)**
Implicit racial message by Herbert	-10.50 (8.66)
Explicit racial message by Herbert	20.57 (9.09)*
Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale	-2.82 (.80)**
Ideology	2.97 (2.00)

N = 67

F = 7.815\*\*\*

Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = .29***Jackson v. Fox***

(constant)	-21.03 (20.76)
Implicit racial message by Fox	22.32 (11.51)
Explicit racial message by Fox	31.996 (13.07)*
MIBI Humanist Subscale	-1.26 (4.68)
Ideology	-1.29 (3.29)

N = 53

F = 1.87

Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = .06

Note: Cells contain unstandardized OLS coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is a construction of separate feeling thermometer scores for each candidate (Jackson – Herbert), so that positive values indicate support for Jackson. Implicit Message and Explicit Message are dummy variables that represent experimental conditions (with the “no racial message” condition excluded from the model). The Jackson v. Herbert race contains only white respondents. The Jackson v. Fox race contains only African American respondents. Ideology is measured by way of a 7-point Likert Scale where higher values indicate a greater degree of conservatism.

\*\*\* p &lt; .001; \*\* p &lt; .01; \* p &lt; .05

**Table 4. Vote Choice*****Jackson v. Herbert***

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>
Implicit Message Condition	1.6687 (.9170)
Explicit Message Condition	-1.0242 (1.0750)
Symbolic Racism 2000	.2457 (.0967)*
Ideology	-.1588 (.2201)
Constant	-5.2607 (1.7728)**
N	69
Chi-Square	60.949
Log Likelihood	69.779
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.353

***Jackson v. Fox***

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Coefficient (standard error)</u>
Implicit Message Condition	- .5187 (.6580)
Explicit Message Condition	- .9237 (.7390)
MIBI – Humanist Scale	.2739 (.2795)
Ideology	.2612 (.1890)
Constant	- .4525 (1.1581)
N	66
Chi-Square	65.167
Log Likelihood	79.708
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.088

Note: Coefficients generated by binary logistic regression. The dependent variable is a dichotomous indicator of vote choice where 1=vote for Fox, 0=vote for Jackson. Implicit Message and Explicit Message are dummy variables that represent experimental conditions (with the “no racial message” condition excluded from the model). The Jackson v. Herbert race contains only white respondents. The Jackson v. Fox race contains only African American respondents. Ideology is measured by way of a 7-point Likert Scale where higher values indicate a greater degree of conservatism.

\*\*\* p < .001; \*\* p < .01; \* p < .05