

Effects of Racial and Racist Appeals on Black Voters

Stephen Maynard Caliendo
North Central College
smcaliendo@noctrl.edu

Charlton McIlwain
New York University
cdm1@nyu.edu



Abstract

We seek to understand how racist appeals by White candidates affect Black respondents' perception of a Black and White candidate in a biracial election contest, as well as how appeals to Black authenticity affect Black respondents' perceptions of two Black candidates vying for office against one another. We offer the results of two experiments conducted with national random samples of African Americans wherein participants were exposed to implicit racial or racist campaign advertisements by a candidate in a fictitious congressional election. Findings reveal that previous work on racist and racial messages are inadequate for explaining the effect of racialized communication in these contexts.

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 2-5, 2009.

The authors contributed equally to this paper; their names appear in alphabetical order.

This data for this study were collected by way of a grant from the Time-Sharing Experiments for Social Sciences (TESS), NSF Grant 0094964, Diana C. Mutz and Arthur Lupia, Principal Investigators.

Effects of Racial and Racist Appeals on Black Voters

Previous research on race and political campaign communication has primarily centered on the perceptions of White voters toward minorities (including minority candidates) (Sigelman et al., 1995; Terkildsen, 1993; Williams, 1990) and the types and effectiveness of racial messages used to prime White racial attitudes (Johnston, 1999; Mendelberg, 2001; Valentino, Hutchings & White, 2002; Valentino, Traugott & Hutchings, 2002). While the extant literature falls short of confirming a direct causal link between racial animosity and vote choice, there is consensus that racial cues are effective in priming Whites' prejudicial attitudes, which can subsequently affect the way Whites think about issues and candidates.

However, there are some limitations with the currently available research. First, African Americans have rarely been included as participants in research regarding the effects of racial appeals (White, 2007), and thus we know little about how racial appeals by White candidates may affect African American voters. Second, most research has focused on how racial appeals affect public opinion toward policy issues, but it has not addressed the effects of those appeals on voters' evaluations of minority candidates specifically. Third, scholars have not yet studied the ways in which minority candidates employ racial appeals (especially against other minority candidates) and how such appeals (insofar as they differ from "racist" appeals) may affect both Black and White candidates.

Priming and Racial Messages

Contemporary research on priming racial stereotypes transcends the context of campaigns (see, for example, Abraham & Appiah, 2006; Chiao et al., 2006; Dixon, 2006; Graham & Lowery, 2004; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005).¹ Other research, which does focus on campaigns, considers mass media reports as potential priming stimuli (Caliendo & McIlwain, 2006; Terkildsen & 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, & White, 2002; Valentino, Traugott, & 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 appeals are constructed through visual imagery and/or race-coded language; used alongside nonracial text, they produce differing effects so that once racial prejudices are primed, they can affect decision making. These conclusions are consistent with a number of related studies (Entman & Rojecki, 2000; Reeves, 1997).²

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 to identify the psychological mechanisms that underlie racial priming. In one study (Valentino, Hutchings, & 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 Mendelberg's studies (news stories), but the results suggest, along with previous research (Brians & Wattenberg, 1996; Jacobs & 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

¹ See Weaver (2007) for a discussion of the psychological processes involved in the common communication constructs of agenda setting, framing and priming.

² For more specific psychological tests of implicit and explicit attitudes, see McConnell & Liebold (2001) and Rydell et al. (2006).

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.

Black Candidates, Voters and Race-Based Appeals

The number of Black candidates running competitively against White candidates has been steadily increasing. Even in electoral scenarios where the majority of voters is White, African Americans voters often make up sizeable portions of the electorate. In these cases, implicit racist appeals may be used by a White candidate (or his or her surrogates) running against a Black candidate to attract the support of White voters. Such messages may be found in ads, however, that are likely to be seen by (and potentially have an effect on) African American voters, as well. Additionally, racial appeals are increasingly being used by Black candidates running against other Black candidates.³ In these cases the appeal most often takes the form of a claim to Black authenticity (McIlwain & Caliendo, in press). Because Black voters are the primary targets of appeals to Black authenticity, it is necessary to understand how they might be affected by this form of racial appeal.

In this study, we seek to understand how racist appeals by White candidates affect Black respondents' perception of a Black and White candidate in a biracial election contest, as well as how appeals to Black authenticity affect Black respondents' perceptions of two Black candidates vying for office against one another. We offer the results of two experiments conducted with national random samples of African Americans wherein participants were exposed to implicitly racial or racist campaign advertisements by a candidate in a fictitious congressional election.

Study Design, Hypotheses & Data

This study is broken into two separate 1 X 2 (post-test only) experiments composed solely of African American participants. The difference between the two iterations of the study is the racial makeup of the candidates in the contest – one is a biracial contest, while the other is a contest between two Black candidates – and the type of message respondents are exposed to (an anti-Black appeal in the first, and an authenticity appeal in the second). Each study includes a control group in which the participants were exposed to no race-based appeal. We compare the “no racial condition” against the “implicit racial condition” for each contest (biracial and all-Black) separately. The primary dependent variables include candidate evaluation and vote choice (see Appendix A for question wording and order). A number of covariates are included to assess predictive models generated. For our biracial election contest conditions, we test two primary hypotheses:

H₁: Black respondents exposed to ads containing an implicit racist appeal from a White candidate running against a Black opponent will evaluate the White candidate less favorably than the

³ While the extant literature uses the term “racial appeal” to refer to appeals by Whites that draw on anti-Black sentiment and are primarily targeted to White voters, racial appeals can and are used by members of all racial groups (McIlwain & Caliendo, in press). Thus, we make a distinction; we use the term “racist” appeal to refer the type of appeal that privileges Whites, while we use the term “racial” appeals to denote appeals by candidates that are racial in nature, but may not target anti-Black sentiment for their efficacy. Racial appeals can, for instance, be made by Black candidates and can target primarily Black voters.

Black candidate and will be less likely to vote for the White candidate, as compared to Blacks who are not exposed to ads with a racist appeal.

H₂: Black respondents exposed to ads containing an implicit racist appeal from a White candidate running against a Black opponent will be more likely to anticipate voting on election day than those exposed to no racist appeal.

Though recent research (White, 2007) calls into question the degree to which African Americans recognize racial appeals, the above hypotheses anticipate that, differently from many Whites, Blacks will recognize implicit racial messages as communicated in the language and visual imagery of political ads. Jamieson (1992), Mendelberg (2001) and Reeves (1997) each provide anecdotal evidence that suggests that Blacks were more acutely aware of the racial message of the Willie Horton ad, and that they were among the first to charge racism. In a pilot study we conducted with advertisements to be used in this experiment, Black respondents exposed to an implicit racial authenticity message by a Black candidate in a race against another Black candidate recognized the message as racial 50 percent of the time. Given this, as well as some of the evidence from Herring, Jankowski & Brown (1999), we hypothesize that when a Black respondent recognizes a racist appeal that recognition is likely to translate into negative feelings for the White candidate making the appeal. In the context of the all-Black election contest, we also test two hypotheses:

H₃: Black respondents will evaluate more favorably a candidate who appeals to racial authenticity than a candidate who does not appeal to racial authenticity.

H₄: Black respondents will be more like to anticipate voting on election day when exposed to an appeal to racial authenticity than when they are not exposed to such an appeal by either of the candidates.

Each of the four hypotheses suggests that a greater sense of racial in-group linkage will be primed when Black respondents are exposed to either a racist appeal by a White candidate against a Black opponent or to an appeal to racial authenticity by a Black candidate running against a Black opponent. This sense of racial group linkage is encapsulated in Dawson's (2001) construct of linked fate.

Stimuli

The current study employs a post-test only design; pretest measures were not taken to avoid priming prior to the introduction of the stimuli. The stimuli were television advertisements for two candidates in a fictitious election scenario in which the primary difference in ad content resides only in the presence or absence of a racist/racial appeal and the race of the candidates (Black/Black vs. White/Black; see Appendix B). Ads with no racial message serve as a control for each scenario. Six fictitious advertisements were used, with participants in each separate iteration viewing two contrast advertisements from one of the four treatment conditions: participants in scenario one saw ads from a biracial contest with either no racist appeal from either candidate or an implicit racist appeal from the White candidate; participants in scenario two saw ads from an all-Black contest with either no appeal to racial authenticity from either candidate or an implicit appeal to racial authenticity from one of the candidates (see Appendix C for descriptions of each advertisement).

Participants

This study was funded and facilitated by TESS (Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences). TESS provides opportunities for researchers to conduct controlled experiments with a nationally-representative random sample of participants. For this project, a national sample of 270 African American adults was chosen for participation.⁴ One hundred twenty-five of the participants were included in the biracial conditions (63 in the control group; 62 in the group with the implicitly racist message from the White candidate). One hundred forty-five participants were included in the group with two Black candidates (75 in the control group; 70 in the group with an authenticity message by one of the Black candidates). Within each condition, approximately half of the participants saw the ads in the reverse order as the other half to guard against potential effects of stimulus order. Demographic information about the participants appears in Table 1.

[Table 1 about here]

Instrumentation – Dependent Variables & Covariates

Four primary dependent variables measure participants' responses to the stimuli. We asked participants to indicate for which candidate they would vote if given the chance and to rate each candidate on a feeling thermometer (the results of which are presented by way of a subtractive index to account for variability amongst participants) (see Kahn & Kenney, 1999; Smith et al., 1999). Participants also indicated how closely each candidate matched their idea of an "ideal" member of Congress (which is also measured by way of a subtractive index) and how likely they would be to actually vote for the candidate of their choice on the day of the election.

In addition to demographic and other attitudinal information (such as ideology), a number of theoretically-driven independent variables are included in the analysis. Participants' degree of linked fate and immersion in Black information networks, as well as views about what kinds of candidates (Black/White) are best able to represent the Black community are taken from Dawson (2001) and are used here to assess various aspects of respondents' racial-group linkage and loyalty that may be primed when exposed to racialized advertising messages.

Results

David Jackson was the preferred candidate for most (54%) of the participants in the study, but his success was dependent upon his opponent. In the race against a White Jim Herbert, Jackson won comfortably with 63% of the vote, but in the race against a Black Jim Herbert, Jackson lost, receiving only 46.5% of the vote to Herbert's 53.5%. This is potentially inconsistent with participants' expressed attitudes (collected after the question about vote choice) about whether "Blacks should always vote for Black candidates when they run," as the mean for participants in both groups (biracial and all-Black) is identical (3.31 on a 4-point scale running from strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [4]). In other words, it appears that when given the choice between David Jackson and a White candidate, Jackson wins in a landslide, even though he is not the candidate of choice when both candidates are Black.

In the biracial scenario, participants were not affected by the implicitly racist message by Jim Herbert. As indicated by the results in Table 2, Jackson has a slightly higher percentage of the vote

⁴ Effect sizes from a pilot study ranged from .10 to .12. According to Cohen (1988), in order to find a small effect size in a 4-group experiment with a power of 80% (one-tailed = .05), the necessary sample size for each independent group is approximately 48. However, because the traditional standard for a small effect size is .20, we needed more participants to detect a smaller effect size: 59 participants per group. Therefore, we requested to have at least 236 participants.

when Herbert invokes race, but the results are not statistically significant; Jackson wins big in both biracial conditions. In the all-Black contest, Herbert is favored (59%) in the condition with no racial message, but when he invokes his message of Black authenticity, his support slips to 41%. Though a chi-square test of those relationships does not yield statistical significance, the results are substantively interesting enough to warrant further investigation.

[Table 2 about here]

A more rigorous examination of these trends appears in Tables 3 through 5. Each provides the results of regression models designed to test effects of a number of variables while holding other factors constant. While there is no direct effect of being exposed to racial messages, a couple of trends emerge.

First, the most powerful predictor of support for Jackson is the belief that Herbert “was making a racial appeal.” In the biracial conditions, belief that Herbert was making a racial appeal resulted in a tendency to vote for Jackson (Table 3), higher net “feelings” of support for Jackson (Table 4) and net support for Jackson as an “ideal Congressman” (Table 5). However, there was no consensus on which of the candidates, if either, played the race card in the biracial context: 53% of participants in both conditions believed that Herbert used race; only 33% of participants thought Jackson used race in the control condition, while 44% of participants in the test condition believed that he did. In the all-Black condition, perceptions of Herbert’s use of the race card worked in a way that cuts against our hypothesis: an implicit appeal to Black authenticity did not result in more support for the candidate who employed the tactic. Vote choice was not statistically affected at all by this perception, but belief that Herbert used race resulted in a greater net feeling thermometer score for Jackson and a greater net belief that Jackson is an ideal Congressman. Further, Jackson’s net support on the feeling thermometer score was reduced when it was perceived that he invoked a racial message. Participants did, however, notice that Herbert was invoking race, though not disproportionately so: 67% believed that he did so in the test condition, as opposed to 56% of participants who believed the message was racial in the control condition. A slim majority of participants also believed that Jackson invoked race, however: 56% in the test condition and 52% in the control group.

Support for Jackson was, predicted by participants’ answer to the question about whether Black folks should vote for Black candidates when they run. Controlling for demographic characteristics, ideology, media attentiveness and other attitudinal measures, belief that Black candidates warrant the support of Black voters predicts a vote for Jackson (Table 3), net support for Jackson (Table 4) and a net perception of Jackson as being the more “ideal” candidate. This is true for participants who saw Herbert’s ad with an implicitly racist message, as well as for those in the control group.

[Tables 3, 4 and 5 about here]

In short, our first and third hypotheses are not supported by these data. A White candidate who makes an implicitly racist appeal against a Black opponent is not punished by Black voters, largely because the White candidate has little support in the first place. A Black candidate who implicitly invokes an appeal to racial authenticity is not rewarded by Black voters, though they do perceive the message to be racial in nature.

Our second and fourth hypotheses center on whether vote turnout would be affected by use of a racial message. Table 6 reveals the results of models that explore that question. While participants in this study mirror the general public in terms of reporting their expectation to vote (42% indicated that they were “very likely” to go to the polls to vote for their candidate of choice, while an additional 49% said that they were “somewhat likely” to do so), none of the theoretically-produced variables predict that behavior. In the biracial context, those who reported being less attentive to politics and government had a greater tendency to believe that they would go to the polls to vote, and age is a statistically significant

predictor in the all-Black condition (older participants were more likely to predict going to the polls). In the biracial context, there is a relationship between a belief in “linked fate” and voting; higher levels of Black identity predict a willingness to go to the polls.

[Table 6 about here]

Discussion

This is a very early stab at an emerging scholarly question. As the number of Black candidates for office increases, and as the context of those contests shifts (from all-Black races in majority-minority districts to all-Black and biracial contests in majority-White districts), it becomes increasingly important to understand the dynamics of the communication that takes place in those elections. While we can be informed by previous research on the effect of explicit and implicit racist messages on White voters, it is clear that those findings are not necessarily applicable to these new situations. Implicitly racist messages that can advantage a White candidate (either in a biracial contest or in an all-White contests) in seeking support of Whites do not work the same with Black members of the electorate. Implicitly racial messages that tap into conceptualizations of Black identity will not resonate with White voters as they have with Black voters – and they may not work the same when the opponent is White. Besides the obvious potential for an effect on vote choice, there is also the possibility of an effect on mobilization, as voters are motivated toward or discouraged from heading to the polls on election day. As Valentino, Hutchings & White (2002) noted in their explanation of their decision to focus only on White participants for their study, “the theory of racial priming must be extended to include and understand the reactions of *all* audience members” (p. 78, emphasis in the original).

The findings here are inconclusive in many ways, but one thing is clear: we cannot rely solely on the extant literature to answer the questions that characterize these new communicative contexts. First, previous research focuses almost exclusively on the impact that implicit racist messages have on White voters’ policy preferences. Our study demonstrates the importance of looking beyond this, at the impact that racial appeals may have on Black voters’ perceptions of the candidates involved in the contest. Our results suggest that the presence of a Black candidate in an election contest against a White opponent already privileges the Black candidate among Black voters. That is, the fact that the candidate is Black makes him or her normatively more preferable than the White candidate. This prior preference for the Black candidate is therefore likely heightened when Black voters perceive that a White candidate “played the race card.” Additionally, our results suggest that Black voters choosing between a Black candidate and a White candidate may exercise heightened racial awareness such that they may even perceive that a racial appeal is made by the White candidate even when no racist appeal is invoked (52% of participants in the control group thought that the White Jim Herbert “maybe” or “definitely” invoked a racial message).

Second, the results of this study demonstrate that White candidates may not exclusively risk a negative backlash from Black voters that eschew candidates’ using race in their communication. Our results show that Black voters similarly punish Black candidates that “play the race card,” even though it comes as an appeal to racial authenticity, rather than a racist appeal that draws on anti-Black sentiment for its efficacy. This result is striking in one respect because it seems to fly in the face of voters in the study who seemed to automatically prefer the Black candidate in the biracial election contest. That is, it doesn’t seem inconsistent among those in our sample to have a racial bias favoring the Black candidate on the one hand, and on the other hand view a Black candidate appealing to racial authenticity more negatively than one who does not.

Given the empirical evidence that Black and White candidates mobilize racial appeals in vastly different ways and for different reasons (McIlwain & Caliendo, in press) this result suggests the need to understand more fully the circumstances of the messages that Blacks consider as “too racial.” Our results

here also suggest the need to understand the circumstances in which White voters do or do not perceive candidates as "playing the race card," especially in biracial election contests where a Black candidate claims that a White candidate has made a racist appeal. That is, previous studies have shown that implicit racist appeals work among White voters because they do not recognize the underlying racist appeal as being "about race." However, what would result if the Black candidate in that scenario criticizes a White opponent for making a racist appeal? Will White voters, like their Black counterparts in this study, view the Black candidate's response as "playing the race card" and respond to the Black candidate less favorably?⁵

What all of this suggests is that perhaps the factor we need to most understand more fully as we move forward in our attempts to better understand the impact of racist and racial appeals among all voters, is voters' definition of "the race card" and the communicative circumstances in which they consider it to have been "played." Is there a single "race card," or are there many? Do they all equally offend, or are some more tolerable than others? Are there circumstances in which the use is acceptable or even expected? Researchers conducting experiments to better understand this would do well to test electoral scenarios not only when one candidate in an election mobilizes race in some way, but when both do (which is actually more typical in real election campaigns). We need to understand whether voters consider a *response* to racialized communication is evaluated similarly to initial appeals to race, as well as the dynamic that exists in which the initial appeal may not be recognized until a response is made. Further, these results are limited to the extent that both appeals to race were made implicitly. While the outcome of an experiment wherein a White candidate makes an explicit racist appeal is not only rather intuitive, but largely irrelevant (since such appeals are very rare in contemporary politics), appeals to Black authenticity are often made explicitly (McIlwain & Caliendo, in press). Experiments that test explicit appeals to Black authenticity, as well as responses to such appeals by the other candidate, are needed to understand not only the response of Black voters to such an exchange, but the effect on Whites, as well.

Finally, this work is relevant to the existing controversial debate regarding racial representation and issues of electoral re-districting policies. This debate hinges, in part, on whether voters rely on racial attitudes to make voting decisions (as suggested by Guinier, 1994; Lai, 1999; and Lublin, 1999) or whether voters are sophisticated enough to sublimate racial attitudes (as suggested by Abrajano, Nagler & Alvaraez, 2003). In short, we need to understand whether it is substantively necessary for members of a social group to be represented by a member of that group. Can men appropriately represent interests of disproportional interest to women? Can Whites represent issues that are of particular concern to Blacks? The answers reside as much in the way that members of the groups perceive such representation as they do in the ways that members of privileged groups perceive their abilities, intentions and effectiveness in representing the interests of historically oppressed groups.

⁵ This dynamic was at work during Barack Obama's candidacy for president. For example, in August 2008, after Obama made a statement that Republicans were trying to make Americans afraid of him, in part because he is Black, a spokesperson for the McCain campaign (and later McCain himself) said that Obama was "playing the race card. . . from the bottom of the deck" (Meade, 2008).

References

- Abraham, L. & Appiah, O. (2006). Framing news stories: The role of visual imagery in priming racial stereotypes. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 17, 183-203.
- Abrajano, M. A., Nagler, J., & Alvarez, M. R. (2003). Race-based versus issue voting: A natural experiment: The 2001 city of Los Angeles elections. Paper presented at the 2003 Midwest Political Science Association Conference.
- Brians, C. L. & Wattenberg, M. P. (1996). Campaign issue knowledge and salience: Comparing reception from TV commercials, TV news and newspapers. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40, 172-193.
- Caliendo, S. M. & McIlwain, C. D. (2006). Minority candidates, media framing, and racial cues in the 2004 elections. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 11(4), 1-25.
- Chiao, J. Y., H. E., Nakayama, K., & Ambady, N. (2006). Priming race in biracial observers affects visual search for Black and White faces. *Psychological Science*, 17(5), 387-392.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dawson, M. C. (2001). *Black visions: The roots of contemporary African-American political ideologies*. Illinois: University of Chicago.
- Dixon, T. 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, R. M. & Rojecki, A. (2000). *The Black image in the White mind: Media and race in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Graham, S. & Lowery, B. S. (2004). Priming unconscious racial stereotypes about adolescent offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, 2, 483-504.
- Guinier, L. (1995). The representation of minority interests. In P. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Classifying by race* (pp. 21-49). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Herring, M., Jankowski, T. B., & Brown, R. E. (1999). Pro-Black doesn't mean anti-White: The structure of African-American group identity. *The Journal of Politics*, 61, 363-386.
- Jacobs, L. R. & Shapiro, R. Y. (1994). Issues, candidate image, and priming: The use of private polls in Kennedy's 1960 presidential campaign. *American Political Science Review*, 88, 527-540.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992). *Dirty politics: Deception, distraction, and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lai, J. S. (1999). Racially polarized voting and its effects on the formation of a viable Latino-Asian Pacific coalition. In *1998-1999 National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac*. Los Angeles: University of California 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.
- 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.
- McConnell, A. R. & Leibold, J. M. (2001). Relations among the Implicit Association Test, discriminatory behavior, and explicit measures of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*, 435-442.
- McIlwain, C. D. & Caliendo, S. M. (in press). Black messages, White messages: The differential use of racial appeals by Black & White candidates. *Journal of Black Studies*.
- Meade, R. (1 August, 2008). Did McCain or Obama play the race card? *Morning Express, CNN.com*. Retrieved March 14, 2009 from <http://mxp.blogs.cnn.com/2008/08/01/did-mccain-or-obama-play-the-race-card/>.
- Mendelberg, T. (2001). *The race card: Campaign strategy, implicit messages, and the norm of equality*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rada, J. A. & Wulfemeyer, K. T. (2005). Color coded: Racial descriptors in television coverage of intercollegiate sports. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *49*(1), 65-85.
- Reeves, K. (1997). *Voting hopes or fears? White voters, Black candidates and racial politics in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., Mackie, D. M., & Strain, L. M. (2006). Of two minds: Forming and changing valence-inconsistent implicit and explicit attitudes. *Psychological Science*, *17*(11), 954-958.
- 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.

- 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.
- Terkildsen, N. & Damore, D. F. (1999). The dynamics of racialized media coverage in congressional elections. *Journal of Politics*, 61, 680-699.
- 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.
- Weaver, D. H. (2007). Thoughts on agenda setting, framing and priming. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 142-147.
- White, I. K. (2007). When race matters and when it doesn't: Racial group differences in response to racial cues. *American Political Science Review*, 101, 339-354.
- Williams, L. F. (1990). White/Black perceptions of the electability of Black political candidates. *National Political Science Review*, 2, 145-164.

Appendix A. Question Wording

1. 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 two candidates?

- David Jackson Jim Herbert

2. If the election were held today, how likely would you be to go to the polls to vote for whomever you indicated above?

- very likely somewhat likely not very likely at all

3. We'd like to get your feelings towards the candidates you saw in the campaign ads by rating of them using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings from 51 degrees to 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the candidate. Ratings from 0 degrees to 49 degrees mean that you don't feel favorable toward the candidate. You would rate the candidate at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward him.

David Jackson _____

Jim Herbert _____

4. Based on what you know about the two candidates, how closely does each of them match your idea of what your congressman should be like?

David Jackson

- extremely closely very closely somewhat closely not very closely at all

Jim Herbert

- extremely closely very closely somewhat closely not very closely at all

5. In the advertisement you viewed from David Jackson, would you say that he was making a racial appeal?

- Definitely Maybe Definitely Not Don't Know

6. In the advertisement you viewed, from Jim Herbert, would you say that he was making a racial appeal?

- Definitely Maybe Definitely Not Don't Know

We would like to ask you some questions about your feelings and beliefs about Black Americans and members of other racial groups.

7. How much do you think what happens generally to Black people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?

- A lot Some Not very much Not at All Don't Know

8. Blacks should always vote for Black candidates when they run.

- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't Know/Don't Care

9. White officials elected from predominantly Black communities represent Black interests just as well as Black elected officials?

- Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't Know/Don't Care

10. 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. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

- extremely liberal
- liberal
- slightly liberal
- moderate
- slightly conservative
- conservative
- extremely conservative
- don't know

11. Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?

- most of the time some of the time only now and then hardly at all

12. We are interested about where people get their information. On average, how many days per week would you say you:

Read a Black newspaper?

_____ 0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7

Read a Black magazine like *Ebony*, *Essence*, *Emerge*, *Black Enterprise* or *Jet*?

_____ 0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7

Watch a Black TV program on cable?

_____ 0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7

Appendix B. Description of Stimuli

Conditions 1 & 2: Black v. White Contest Conditions

In Condition 1 (Jim Herbert [White] v. David Jackson [Black], no racial message – control group), participants view contrast ads from both candidates on the issue of education, neither of which contains implicit or explicit reference to race.

In Condition 2 (implicit racial message) 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 nicely manicured suburban schools contrasted with black and white images of a dilapidated inner-city school, with Black youth playing basketball. The ad by David Jackson from condition 1 is repeated for this condition.

Conditions 3 & 4: Black v. Black Contest Conditions

In Condition 3 (Jim Herbert [Black] v. David Jackson [Black], no racial message – control group) contrast ads from both candidates on the issue of education, neither of which contains implicit or explicit reference to race. The ad by Jackson is the same as in the above conditions. The ad from Herbert is the same as in Condition 1.

In Condition 4 (implicit racial message), Herbert's ad has an identical verbal script as the ad with no racial content, but the images are designed to question Jackson's African American authenticity by showing him in photographs with White students on a college campus (Herbert is shown with Black college students), as well as a color image of Jackson's nicely manicured suburban school where he grew up (a black and white image of Herbert's dilapidated inner-city childhood school is shown). The final line by Herbert implies a contrast about authenticity when he says, "Who is really equipped to fight for this district in Washington? Someone who's been outside it all his life (photo of Jackson), or someone who's been a part of it for all of his (photo of Herbert)?" The ad by David Jackson in condition 3 is repeated for this condition.

Appendix C. Ad Scripts

AD #1 (Used in Conditions 1 and 2 [Black/White, none; Black/White, implicit])

Candidates:	David Jackson vs. Jim Herbert [White]
Race:	Black vs. White
Office:	Congress, 1 st District
Sponsor:	David Jackson for Congress
Title:	“No Difference”
Racial Message:	NONE
Time:	30 sec.

Jackson: What choice do you have in this election? (Jackson Live/Talking head in studio).

Jackson V/O: (upbeat music during Jackson’s plan) You can choose a candidate who believes parents should choose where their children will get the best education, instead of being forced into failing schools (color photo of Jackson/Text [fade in/out]—SUPPORTS SCHOOL CHOICE), or you can choose a candidate whose education plan means simply throwing more money at schools and teachers who aren’t getting the job done (black and white photo of Herbert/Text [fade in/out; doom music during characterization of Herbert’s plan]—AGAINST SCHOOL CHOICE).

You can choose a candidate who believes that the way to strengthen our schools is to impose the tough standards in No Child Left Behind (Photo of Jackson/Text [fade in/out]—FOR TOUGH STANDARDS); or you can choose one who rewards failing teachers and schools who don’t meet high standards of excellence (Photo of Herbert/Text [fade in/out]—AGAINST TOUGH STANDARDS).

Jackson: You have a crucial choice in this election. I’m David Jackson, and I want to be your choice, because I’m the right choice (Jackson Live/talking head in studio [upbeat music]).

Disclaimer: PAID FOR BY JACKSON FOR CONGRESS

.....

AD #2 (Used in Condition 1 [Black/White, none])

Candidates:	David Jackson vs. Jim Herbert [White]
Race:	Black vs. White
Office:	Congress, 1 st District
Sponsor:	Committee to Elect Jim Herbert
Title:	“Choice”
Racial Message:	NONE
Time:	30 sec.

Herbert: The differences between my opponent and me couldn’t be greater. I’ve always been committed to this community. (Herbert, Live/standing/in city park/Cut to side-by-side photos of each candidate).

Herbert V/O: (upbeat music during Herbert’s plan) My opponent says he will look out for the interests of the citizens in the 1st District, but will he? (Side-by-side photos of each candidate: Herbert in color, Jackson in black and white [Jackson text in red, “Schools Outside the District”; Herbert text in cool blue, “Went to School Here”; “doom” music during characterization of Jackson). When I was growing up here in the district, Jackson was playing in playgrounds outside the district. When I was going to college here, Jackson was again outside.

So it is no surprise that my opponent supports vouchers that send your tax dollars to fund special charter schools (photo of Jackson/Text—SUPPORTS VOUCHERS); while I believe we should work to strengthen our public schools (photo Herbert/text—SUPPORTS PUBLIC SCHOOLS).

Jackson would have our children follow in his footsteps. He'd prefer to send our kids to charter schools rather than allow them to go to a public school right here.

Jackson V/O: Who is really equipped to fight for this district in Washington? Someone who has been outside it all his life, or someone who has been a part of it for all of his? (Photo of Jackson side-by-side Herbert).

Disclaimer: PAID FOR BY THE COMMITTEE TO ELECT JIM HERBERT

AD #3 (Used in Condition 2 [Black/White, implicit])

Candidates:	David Jackson vs. Jim Herbert [White]
Race:	Black vs. White
Office:	Congress, 1 st District
Sponsor:	Committee to Elect Jim Herbert
Title:	"Content of our Character"
Racial Message:	Implicit
Time:	30 sec.

Herbert: (upbeat music during Herbert's plan) The differences between my opponent and me couldn't be greater. I've always been committed to this community. (Herbert, Live/walking/in city park/Cut to side-by-side photos of each candidate).

Herbert V/O: My opponent says he will look out for the interests of the citizens in the 1st District, but will he? (Side-by-side photos of each candidate: Herbert in color, Jackson in black and white; "doom" music during characterization of Jackson) When I was growing up here in the district (color photo of school with trees and grass), Jackson was playing in playgrounds in a different district (black and white photo of young boys playing basketball on school playground through fence). When I was going to college in the district, Jackson was again a part of a different community. (Imagery of Blacks in college setting).

So it is no surprise that my opponent supports vouchers that send your tax dollars to fund special charter schools (side-by-side photos: color photo of school with trees and grass [cool blue text, "Supports Public Schools"] and black and white photo of urban school [red text, "Vouchers"]); while I believe we should work to strengthen our public schools. Jackson would have our children follow in his footsteps,; he'd prefer to send our children to charter schools rather than allow them to go to a public school right here.

Herbert V/O: Who is really equipped to fight for this district in Washington? Someone who has been outside it all his life, or someone who has been a part of it for all of his? (Photo of Jackson side-by-side Herbert).

Disclaimer: PAID FOR BY THE COMMITTEE TO ELECT JIM HERBERT

AD #4 (Used in Conditions 3 and 4 [Black/Black, none; Black/Black, implicit])

Candidates:	David Jackson vs. Jim Herbert [Black]
Race:	Black vs. Black
Office:	Congress, 1 st District
Sponsor:	David Jackson for Congress
Title:	"No Difference"
Racial Message:	None
Time:	30 sec.

Jackson: What choice do you have in this election? (Jackson Live/Talking head in studio).

Jackson V/O: (upbeat music during Jackson’s plan) You can choose a candidate who believes parents should choose where their children will get the best education, instead of being forced into failing schools (color photo of Jackson/Text [fade in/out], “Supports School Choice”), or you can choose a candidate whose education plan means simply throwing more money at schools and teachers who aren’t getting the job done (black and white photo of Herbert/Text [fade in/out], “Against School Choice”; “doom” music playing during characterization of Herbert’s plan).

You can choose a candidate who believes that the way to strengthen our schools is to impose the tough standards of No Child Left Behind (color photo of Jackson/Text [fade in/out], “For Tough Standards”), or you can choose one who rewards failing teachers and schools who don’t meet high standards of excellence (Photo of Herbert/Text [fade in/out]—AGAINST TOUGH STANDARDS).

Jackson: You have a crucial choice in this election. I’m David Jackson, and I want to be your choice, because I’m the right choice (Jackson Live/talking head in studio).

Disclaimer: PAID FOR BY JACKSON FOR CONGRESS



AD #5 (Used in Condition 3 [Black/Black, none])

Candidates: David Jackson vs. Jim Herbert [B/lack]
Race: Black vs. Black
Office: Congress, 1st District
Sponsor: Committee to Elect Jim Herbert
Title: “Difference?”
Racial Message: None
Time: 30 sec.

Herbert: The differences between my opponent and me couldn’t be greater. I’ve always been committed to this community. (Herbert, live/standing in Harlem with a predominantly Black crowd moving behind him/Cut to side-by-side photos of each candidate).

Herbert V/O: (“doom” music during characterization of Jackson’s plan) My opponent says he will look out for the interests of the citizens in the 1st District, but will he? (side-by-side photos of each candidate: Herbert in color with cool blue text, “Grew Up Here”; Jackson in black and white with red text stamped across picture, “Grew Up Out of the District”) When I was growing up here in the district, Jackson was playing in new playgrounds outside the district. When I was going to college here (Herbert text changes to, “Went to School Here”), Jackson was again outside (Jackson text changes to, “School Outside the District).

So it is no surprise that my opponent supports vouchers that send your tax dollars to private schools (Jackson text, below photo now, changes to “Supports Vouchers”); while I believe we should work to strengthen our public schools (Herbert text changes to “Supports Public Schools”). Jackson would have our children follow in his footsteps. He’d prefer to send our kids to private schools rather than allow them to go to a charter school right here.

Herbert V/O: Who is really equipped to fight for this district in Washington? (Photo of Jackson side-by-side Herbert). Someone who has been outside it all his life, or someone who has been a part of it for all of his? (Fade to Herbert Photo and disclaimer).

Disclaimer: PAID FOR BY THE COMMITTEE TO ELECT JIM HERBERT



AD #6 (Used in Conditions 4 [Black/Black, implicit])

Candidates: David Jackson vs. Jim Herbert [Black]
Race: Black vs. Black

Office: Congress, 1st District
 Sponsor: Committee to Elect Jim Herbert
 Title: "Black Difference"
 Racial Message: Implicit
 Time: 30 sec.

Herbert: The differences between my opponent and me couldn't be greater. I've always been committed to this community. (Herbert, live/standing in Harlem with a predominantly Black crowd moving behind him/Cut to side-by-side photos of each candidate).

Herbert V/O: My opponent says he will look out for the interests of the citizens in the 1st District, but will he? (Side-by-side photos of each candidate; upbeat music playing during discussion of Herbert's plan; "doom" music playing during characterization of Jackson's plan) When I was growing up here in the district (photo of urban playground), Jackson was playing in new playgrounds outside the district. When I was going to college here, Jackson was again outside. (black and white photos of Jackson in college surrounded by White people).

So it is no surprise that my opponent supports vouchers that send your tax dollars to private schools ("doom" tone playing); (Color shot of school with trees and grass); while I believe we should work to strengthen our public schools (photo of urban school). Jackson would have our children follow in his footsteps. He'd prefer to send our kids to private schools rather than allow them to go to a charter school right here.

Herbert V/O: Who is really equipped to fight for educating the kids of this district in Washington? Someone who has been outside it all his life (side-by-side photos of Jackson/Herbert) or someone who has been a part of it for all of his? (Fade to photo of Herbert & Disclaimer).

Disclaimer: PAID FOR BY THE COMMITTEE TO ELECT JIM HERBERT

Table 1. Profile of Participants

<u>Gender</u>		<u>Geographic Region</u> (based on state of residence)	
Female	52%	Northeast	17%
Male	48%	Midwest	19%
<u>Age</u>		South	51%
18-24	6%	West	12%
25-34	14%	<u>Home Ownership Status</u>	
35-44	21%	Own	62%
45-54	21%	Rent	37%
55-64	22%	Occupied (no rent)	2%
65-74	9%	<u>Household Income</u>	
75+	6%	Mean range	\$35,000 - \$39,999
<u>Education</u>		N=270	
Less than high school	11%	<u>Note:</u> Some totals do not equal 100% due to rounding.	
High school	29%		
Some college	32%		
Bachelor's degree or higher	29%		

Table 2. Effect of Racial Messages on Vote Choice

Biracial Contest

	<u>Vote for Herbert</u>	<u>Vote for Jackson</u>
Herbert's Racist Message	35% (21)	65.0% (39)
No Racial Message (Control)	38.1% (24)	61.9% (39)
Chi-square = .127, p = .852 (2-sided)		

All-Black Contest

	<u>Vote for Herbert</u>	<u>Vote for Jackson</u>
Herbert's Authenticity Message	47.8% (33)	52.2% (36)
No Racial Message (Control)	58.7% (44)	41.3% (31)
Chi-square = 1.698, p = .242 (2-sided)		
N= 144		

Table 3. Vote Choice***Biracial Condition***

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	.134 (.375)	.191 (.403)	.293 (.445)	.325 (.487)
Perception of Jackson's Use of Race			-.408 (.521)	-.587 (.557)
Perception of Herbert's Use of Race			1.962 (.513)***	2.003 (.571)***
Linked Fate				.070 (.328)
Vote for Black Candidates				-.1233 (.536)*
Whites Represent Black Interests				-.115 (.369)
Exposure to Black Media				.225 (.162)
Age		-.369 (.218)	-.416 (.238)	-.534 (.274) ⁺
Gender		-.382 (.420)	-.775 (.467)	-.701 (.530)
Education		-.214 (.244)	-.434 (.273)	-.569 (.316) ⁺
Income		-.006 (.052)	.001 (.058)	.025 (.059)
Northeast		-.251 (.785)	-.183 (.843)	.003 (.934)
Midwest		-.366 (.810)	-.615 (.870)	-.210 (.922)
South		-.648 (.664)	-.559 (.706)	-.258 (.757)
Ideology		.102 (.191)	.148 (.208)	.270 (.233)
Attentiveness		.091 (.248)	.159 (.258)	.039 (.292)
Constant	.486 (.259)	2.615 (1.837)	2.743 (1.945)	6.493 (2.936)*
N	123	119	118	111
Chi-Square	.127	7.058	24.789*	31.111*
Log Likelihood	161.424	149.741	131.082	116.134
Nagelkerke R ²	.001	.079	.258	.333

Table 3. Vote Choice (continued)**All-Black Condition**

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	.437 (.336)	.048 (.390)	-.003 (.397)	-.067 (.417)
Perception of Jackson's Use of Race			-.462 (.440)	-.525 (.451)
Perception of Herbert's Use of Race			.406 (.450)	.576 (.473)
Linked Fate				.188 (.240)
Vote for Black Candidates				-.306 (.374)
Whites Represent Black Interests				-.110 (.312)
Exposure to Black Media				-.003 (.133)
Age		.346 (.208) ⁺	.375 (.212) ⁺	.429 (.222) ⁺
Gender		.537 (.391)	.553 (.393)	.490 (.404)
Education		-.413 (.225) ⁺	-.414 (.226) ⁺	-.376 (.229)
Income		-.061 (.056)	-.064 (.057)	-.045 (.061)
Northeast		.200 (.748)	.228 (.749)	.602 (.813)
Midwest		1.083 (.726)	1.101 (.728)	1.326 (.777)
South		.049 (.637)	.046 (.639)	.345 (.698)
Ideology		.096 (.144)	.095 (.146)	.090 (.157)
Attentiveness		.104 (.254)	.084 (.255)	.024 (.264)
Constant	-.350 (.234)	-1.136 (1.533)	-1.146 (1.556)	-.711 (2.170)
N	144	137	137	133
Chi-Square	1.700	21.007*	22.348*	22.572
Log Likelihood	197.231	167.680	166.339	160.533
Nagelkerke R ²	.016	.190	.201	.209

Note: Coefficients generated by binary logistic regression (standard errors appear in parentheses). The dependent variable is a dichotomous indicator of electoral preference where 0=Herbert and 1=Jackson. In the biracial conditions, Jackson is Black and Herbert is White and invokes an implicitly racist message in the test condition. In the condition where both candidates are Black, Herbert is the candidate who invokes the authenticity message in the test condition. Implicit Message Condition is a dummy variable that represent inclusion in the test (as opposed to the control) experimental condition. Perception of Candidates' Use of Race is collapsed so that participants who believe that a candidate "definitely" or "maybe" played the race card = 1, while those who believe that a candidate "definitely [did] not" = 0. The "no racial message" condition is excluded from the model to prevent saturation. Linked Fate and Vote for Black Candidate are measured with four-point Likert scales where higher values indicate lower levels of Black identity. Whites Represent Black Interests is also measured by a four-point Likert scale, but higher values on this indicator indicate higher levels of Black identity. Exposure to Black Media is a cumulative average of participants' self-reported consumption of Black-oriented newspapers, magazines and cable television news programs ranging from 0 – 7 days per week. Participant's Age is represented by way of a seven-point category with higher values indicating older participants. Participant's Gender is a dichotomous indicator with the higher value indicating female. Participant's Education is measured with a four-point categorical scale with higher values indicating more formal education. Income is a nineteen-point categorical variable where higher values indicate greater levels of household income. Region of the Country is measured by way of four dichotomous (dummy) variables where 1=residence in that area. "West" is omitted from the model to avoid full saturation. Ideology is measured by way of a seven-point Likert scale where higher values indicate a greater degree of conservatism. Attentiveness is a four-point scale of participants' self-reported exposure to "government and public affairs," where higher values represent less attentiveness.

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10

Table 4. Difference in Feeling Thermometer Scores for Candidates***Biracial Condition***

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	5.491 (6.137)	4.980 (6.298)	3.895 (5.868)	1.111 (5.994)
Perception of Jackson's Use of Race			12.039 (6.862) ⁺	14.390 (6.882)
Perception of Herbert's Use of Race			-30.875 (6.350) ^{***}	-30.538 (6.399) ^{***}
Linked Fate				2.444 (3.807)
Vote for Black Candidates				15.205 (6.024) [*]
Whites Represent Black Interests				-4.796 (4.274)
Exposure to Black Media				-2.522 (1.723)
Age		-.011 (2.257)	-.716 (2.075)	.202 (2.160)
Gender		5.059 (6.671)	9.344 (6.215)	9.126 (6.160)
Education		1.572 (3.802)	3.972 (3.534)	5.414 (3.605)
Income		-.292 (.827)	-.299 (.772)	-.846 (.758)
Northeast		3.618 (11.629)	4.909 (10.664)	-2.078 (10.887)
Midwest		7.333 (12.276)	10.510 (11.283)	-.078 (11.629)
South		2.627 (9.829)	1.563 (9.071)	-2.416 (9.061)
Ideology		7.086 (2.983) [*]	6.553 (2.782) [*]	5.085 (2.869) ⁺
Attentiveness		1.698 (3.721)	-.085 (3.431)	.643 (3.520)
Constant	-11.443 (4.357) [*]	-51.474 (28.183) ⁺	-62.938 (26.224) [*]	-91.212 (32.730) ^{**}
N	122	119	118	111
F	.800	.827	2.783 ^{**}	3.064 ^{***}
Adjusted R ²	-.002	-.015	.154	.229

Table 4. Difference in Feeling Thermometer Scores for Candidates (continued)**All-Black Condition**

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	-3.632 (5.914)	.000 (6.479)	1.953 (6.396)	2.678 (6.867)
Perception of Jackson's Use of Race			13.842 (6.947)*	15.164 (7.206)*
Perception of Herbert's Use of Race			-17.799 (7.106)*	-20.412 (7.527)**
Linked Fate				.858 (3.908)
Vote for Black Candidates				.680 (5.943)
Whites Represent Black Interests				1.079 (5.038)
Exposure to Black Media				-1.513 (2.193)
Age		-2.802 (2.109)	-2.951 (2.074)	-3.527 (2.181)
Gender		-4.310 (6.463)	-4.748 (6.347)	-3.594 (6.630)
Education		2.310 (3.655)	2.588 (3.590)	2.105 (3.717)
Income		.650 (.921)	.646 (.909)	.411 (.998)
Northeast		-5.819 (12.221)	-6.790 (12.016)	-10.375 (12.990)
Midwest		-15.795 (11.810)	-15.383 (11.638)	-17.475 (12.421)
South		-7.904 (10.458)	-7.022 (10.290)	-9.429 (11.191)
Ideology		.534 (2.347)	.282 (2.332)	-.102 (2.554)
Attentiveness		-4.970 (4.173)	-3.640 (4.119)	-3.394 (4.324)
Constant	3.293 (4.078)	23.644 (25.385)	20.633 (25.161)	23.689 (35.980)
N	142	136	136	132
F	.377	.830	1.322	1.068
Adjusted R ²	-.004	-.013	.028	.008

Note: Coefficients generated by binary logistic regression (standard errors appear in parentheses). The dependent variable is a construction of separate feeling thermometer scores for each candidate (Herbert – Jackson), so that positive values indicate support for Herbert. In the biracial conditions, Jackson is Black and Herbert is White and invokes an implicitly racist message in the test condition. In the condition where both candidates are Black, Herbert is the candidate who invokes the authenticity message in the test condition. Implicit Message Condition is a dummy variable that represent inclusion in the test (as opposed to the control) experimental condition. Perception of Candidates' Use of Race is collapsed so that participants who believe that a candidate "definitely" or "maybe" played the race card = 1, while those who believe that a candidate "definitely [did] not" = 0. The "no racial message" condition is excluded from the model to prevent saturation. Linked Fate and Vote for Black Candidate are measured with four-point Likert scales where higher values indicate lower levels of Black identity. Whites Represent Black Interests is also measured by a four-point Likert scale, but higher values on this indicator indicate higher levels of Black identity. Exposure to Black Media is a cumulative average of participants' self-reported consumption of Black-oriented newspapers, magazines and cable television news programs ranging from 0 – 7 days per week. Participant's Age is represented by way of a seven-point category with higher values indicating older participants. Participant's Gender is a dichotomous indicator with the higher value indicating female. Participant's Education is measured with a four-point categorical scale with higher values indicating more formal education. Income is a nineteen-point categorical variable where higher values indicate greater levels of household income. Region of the Country is measured by way of four dichotomous (dummy) variables where 1=residence in that area. "West" is omitted from the model to avoid full saturation. Ideology is measured by way of a seven-point Likert scale where higher values indicate a greater degree of conservatism. Attentiveness is a four-point scale of participants' self-reported exposure to "government and public affairs," where higher values represent less attentiveness.

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10

Table 5. Difference in Perceptions of Candidates as an “Ideal Congressman”*Biracial Condition*

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	-.043 (.205)	-.089 (.219)	-.062 (.209)	-.170 (.214)
Perception of Jackson’s Use of Race			-.023 (.241)	.101 (.238)
Perception of Herbert’s Use of Race			-.801 (.223)**	-.848 (.222)***
Linked Fate				.118 (.135)
Vote for Black Candidates				.484 (.209)*
Whites Represent Black Interests				-.236 (.150)
Exposure to Black Media				-.102 (.062)
Age		.024 (.077)	.018 (.073)	.024 (.074)
Gender		.454 (.228)*	.618 (.221)**	.643 (.220)**
Education		.178 (.129)	.247 (.124)*	.297 (.126)*
Income		-.008 (.029)	-.010 (.028)	-.026 (.027)
Northeast		-.033 (.397)	-.022 (.376)	-.217 (.384)
Midwest		-.081 (.422)	-.029 (.400)	-.388 (.405)
South		.030 (.332)	-.060 (.316)	-.236 (.314)
Ideology		.144 (.102)	.154 (.099)	.119 (.101)
Attentiveness		.040 (.128)	.005 (.121)	-.004 (.124)
Constant	-.290 (.140)*	-2.068 (.960)*	-2.814 (.933)**	-3.505 (1.140)**
N	115	112	111	105
F	.044	.688	1.895*	2.575**
Adjusted R ²	-.008	-.029	.088	.194

Table 5. Difference in Perceptions of Candidates as an “Ideal Congressman” (continued)

All-Black Condition

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	-.021 (.233)	.143 (.249)	.200 (.247)	.221 (.266)
Perception of Jackson’s Use of Race			.453 (.273)	.464 (.283)
Perception of Herbert’s Use of Race			-.578 (.277)*	-.659 (.295)*
Linked Fate				-.046 (.154)
Vote for Black Candidates				.078 (.232)
Whites Represent Black Interests				.215 (.198)
Exposure to Black Media				-.016 (.085)
Age		-.037 (.081)	-.039 (.080)	-.043 (.085)
Gender		-.375 (.246)	-.419 (.245) ⁺	-.388 (.255)
Education		.061 (.146)*	.060 (.145)	.025 (.151)
Income		.088 (.037)	.085 (.036)*	.078 (.041) ⁺
Northeast		-.205 (.450)	-.238 (.446)	-.440 (.481)
Midwest		-.564 (.444)	-.556 (.440)	-.739 (.471)
South		-.110 (.386)	-.065 (.382)	-.272 (.414)
Ideology		-.078 (.091)	-.093 (.091)	-.091 (.097)
Attentiveness		-.043 (.158)	.010 (.158)	.043 (.167)
Constant	.072 (.157)	.212 (.963)	.209 (.967)	-.217 (1.365)
N	126	119	119	115
F	.008	1.534	1.724 ⁺	1.274
Adjusted R ²	-.008	.043	.068	.037

Note: Coefficients generated by binary logistic regression (standard errors appear in parentheses). The dependent variable is a measure of net support generated by subtracting responses to a four-point Likert scale for each candidate (Herbert-Jackson), so that positive values indicate support for Herbert. In the biracial conditions, Jackson is Black and Herbert is White and invokes an implicitly racist message in the test condition. In the condition where both candidates are Black, Herbert is the candidate who invokes the authenticity message in the test condition. Implicit Message Condition is a dummy variable that represent inclusion in the test (as opposed to the control) experimental condition. Perception of Candidates’ Use of Race is collapsed so that participants who believe that a candidate “definitely” or “maybe” played the race card = 1, while those who believe that a candidate “definitely [did] not” = 0. The “no racial message” condition is excluded from the model to prevent saturation. Linked Fate and Vote for Black Candidate are measured with four-point Likert scales where higher values indicate lower levels of Black identity. Whites Represent Black Interests is also measured by a four-point Likert scale, but higher values on this indicator indicate higher levels of Black identity. Exposure to Black Media is a cumulative average of participants’ self-reported consumption of Black-oriented newspapers, magazines and cable television news programs ranging from 0 – 7 days per week. Participant’s Age is represented by way of a seven-point category with higher values indicating older participants. Participant’s Gender is a dichotomous indicator with the higher value indicating female. Participant’s Education is measured with a four-point categorical scale with higher values indicating more formal education. Income is a nineteen-point categorical variable where higher values indicate greater levels of household income. Region of the Country is measured by way of four dichotomous (dummy) variables where 1=residence in that area. “West” is omitted from the model to avoid full saturation. Ideology is measured by way of a seven-point Likert scale where higher values indicate a greater degree of conservatism. Attentiveness is a four-point scale of participants’ self-reported exposure to “government and public affairs,” where higher values represent less attentiveness.

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10

Table 6. Likelihood of Going to the Polls to Vote for Candidate of Choice*Biracial Condition*

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	.218 (.366)	.163 (.414)	.162 (.426)	.350 (.490)
Perception of Jackson's Use of Race			-.204 (.491)	-.380 (.550)
Perception of Herbert's Use of Race			-.652 (.457)	-.885 (.509) ⁺
Linked Fate				-.969 (.358)**
Vote for Black Candidates				-.159 (.501)
Whites Represent Black Interests				.329 (.350)
Exposure to Black Media				
Age		.036 (.219)	.021 (.426)	.038 (.490)
Gender		.158 (.435)	.266 (.452)	.512 (.505)
Education		-.411 (.256)	-.370 (.262)	-.447 (.303)
Income		.069 (.054)	.064 (.057)	.081 (.060)
Northeast		-.563 (.806)	-.679 (.814)	-.380 (.947)
Midwest		.199 (.797)	.261 (.798)	.471 (.904)
South		.527 (.658)	.447 (.657)	.619 (.733)
Ideology		-.113 (.203)	-.086 (.209)	-.171 (.245)
Attentiveness		-.870 (.281)**	-.890 (.280)**	-.952 (.325)**
Constant	-.419 (.258)	1.532 (1.926)	1.781 (1.949)	3.370 (2.723)
N	123	119	118	111
Chi-Square	.356	19.617*	22.693*	32.698**
Log Likelihood	167.211	142.915	138.713	119.654
Nagelkerke R ²	.004	.204	.235	.342

Table 6. Likelihood of Going to the Polls to Vote for Candidate of Choice (continued)**All-Black Condition**

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Implicit Racist Message Condition	.374 (.338)	.290 (.381)	.325 (.389)	.420 (.413)
Perception of Jackson's Use of Race			-.582 (.423)	-.554 (.436)
Perception of Herbert's Use of Race			-.227 (.426)	-.210 (.446)
Linked Fate				-.363 (.243)
Vote for Black Candidates				.288 (.362)
Whites Represent Black Interests				.146 (.304)
Exposure to Black Media				.096 (.132)
Age		.396 (.201)*	.444 (.208)*	.431 (.217)*
Gender		.194 (.383)	.253 (.392)	.210 (.402)
Education		-.159 (.217)	-.136 (.221)	-.118 (.227)
Income		.095 (.057) ⁺	.087 (.058)	.075 (.062)
Northeast		-.495 (.724)	-.409 (.732)	-.398 (.780)
Midwest		-.809 (.702)	-.714 (.709)	-.648 (.747)
South		-.577 (.613)	-.509 (.619)	-.487 (.661)
Ideology		.040 (.143)	-.004 (.147)	.020 (.158)
Attentiveness		-.094 (.247)	-.095 (.251)	-.060 (.262)
Constant	-.461 (.237) ⁺	-1.717 (1.523)	-1.401 (1.544)	-2.351 (2.104)
N	144	137	137	133
Chi-Square	1.231	12.993	16.499	16.020
Log Likelihood	195.609	175.284	171.778	165.634
Nagelkerke R ²	.011	.121	.152	.152

Note: Coefficients generated by binary logistic regression (standard errors appear in parentheses). The dependent variable is a binary indicator of participants' self-reported likelihood of going to vote on election day for the candidate they prefer. Vote choice is a dichotomous indicator of electoral preference where 0=Herbert and 1=Jackson. In the biracial conditions, Jackson is Black and Herbert is White and invokes an implicitly racist message in the test condition. In the condition where both candidates are Black, Herbert is the candidate who invokes the authenticity message in the test condition. Implicit Message Condition is a dummy variable that represent inclusion in the test (as opposed to the control) experimental condition. Perception of Candidates' Use of Race is collapsed so that participants who believe that a candidate "definitely" or "maybe" played the race card = 1, while those who believe that a candidate "definitely [did] not" = 0. The "no racial message" condition is excluded from the model to prevent saturation. Linked Fate and Vote for Black Candidate are measured with four-point Likert scales where higher values indicate lower levels of Black identity. Whites Represent Black Interests is also measured by a four-point Likert scale, but higher values on this indicator indicate higher levels of Black identity. Exposure to Black Media is a cumulative average of participants' self-reported consumption of Black-oriented newspapers, magazines and cable television news programs ranging from 0 – 7 days per week. Participant's Age is represented by way of a seven-point category with higher values indicating older participants. Participant's Gender is a dichotomous indicator with the higher value indicating female. Participant's Education is measured with a four-point categorical scale with higher values indicating more formal education. Income is a nineteen-point categorical variable where higher values indicate greater levels of household income. Region of the Country is measured by way of four dichotomous (dummy) variables where 1=residence in that area. "West" is omitted from the model to avoid full saturation. Ideology is measured by way of a seven-point Likert scale where higher values indicate a greater degree of conservatism. Attentiveness is a four-point scale of participants' self-reported exposure to "government and public affairs," where higher values represent less attentiveness.

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05; + p < .10