

**De-Racializing Obama:
White Voters' Evaluations of Minority Candidates**

Jane Junn (contact author)
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Rutgers University
89 George Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
junn@rci.rutgers.edu
908.399.6186

David Andersen
Doctoral candidate
Department of Political Science
Rutgers University
89 George Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
davander@rci.rutgers.edu
973.714.7415

Abstract

How do white voters construct evaluations of non-white candidates, especially when they are cued to focus upon race? This question has moved into the forefront of national politics during the 2008 Presidential election, as Senator Barack Obama has emerged as the candidate to beat for the nomination of the Democratic party. As the campaign moves from the primary to the general election, and if Obama wins the nomination, the campaign will be forced to grapple with how being the first black candidate of a major party should influence election strategy. As we show in this paper, racial cues do not influence all people equally. Using a unique dataset of the Obama-Keyes 2004 Illinois U.S. Senate election, we analyze how variations in racialized portrayals of Barack Obama influenced how white voters evaluated him as a candidate for the Senate. The analysis focuses upon Democratic and Republican partisans and how they react differently to racial cues when constructing their evaluations of Obama.

Months away from the November 2008 U.S. general election, the state primaries and caucuses have already energized voters, extended what was widely predicted to be a condensed and “frontloaded” process, and raised a bevy of questions for political observers. Among the most intriguing is the role of race and ethnicity and how voters evaluate minority candidates. The political space of presidential politics in the U.S. has until the 2008 election been uninhabited by minorities and women. But today, Barack Obama is the candidate to beat among the Democrats, Hillary Clinton remains competitive, and former New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson made an early run for the party’s nomination. The face of U.S. Presidential politics is no longer exclusively that of a white man, and voters in the 2008 Democratic primaries and caucuses provide the best evidence so far that candidates representing intersections of race and gender beyond the default category can win in a range of states and distinctive political environments.

Despite the increasing variety in candidates for national political office and the companion claims (or wishful thinking) of greater tolerance among American voters, the jury, as the saying goes, is still out. Obama’s victories have taken place during the primary season, many in states where participation is restricted to registered Democrats. It remains to be seen how an African American candidate for President will fare with voters in the general election, particularly among Republicans. This question will be answered if Obama wins the nomination, and then only after the general election is over. Results from exit polls and surveys will reveal the demographics of the vote, but may shed less light on other important questions about the underlying reasons for vote choice, particularly the role racial resentment plays in how candidates are evaluated. We are interested in uncovering the dynamics of candidate evaluation within the context of elections with minority candidates. How do voters, particularly whites who still make up the overwhelming majority of voters, respond to racial cues framing minority

candidates? What systematic influence, if any, do short-term communications making implicit reference to the race of the candidate have on how white voters evaluate the characteristics of minority candidates?

Because of the novelty of candidates of color in Presidential politics, very limited sources of systematic data exist to investigate these questions. In this paper we utilize data from a survey among voters in Illinois during the 2004 race for the U.S. Senate. This election featured then-Democratic Illinois State Senator Barack Obama against Alan Keyes, a Republican and conservative commentator. Keyes, who entered the race late, replaced Jack Ryan, the winner of the Republican primary who abruptly withdrew his candidacy during the summer of 2004. This study is unique in that it is one of the only systematic data collections on attitudes about the candidates during the 2004 U.S. Senate race in Illinois. It is unusual in a second important aspect in that we included embedded experiments designed to frame Obama racially to varying degrees. Experiments provide a way to view dynamics without explicitly asking about how race influences candidate evaluations.

Our analysis provides insight into the influence of short-term communications, particularly racial primes, both on the evaluation of candidate qualities as well as attitudes on racial resentment about blacks. We reveal how highlighting Obama as a black man versus more racially neutral portrayals influence white voters' evaluations of Obama's competence and empathy. We also analyze the influence of the set of treatments on racial resentment among white voters in Illinois, looking separately at Democrats and Republicans. While the study design and the experimental stimuli do not correspond directly to classic studies testing implicit versus explicit racial framing, the data nevertheless provide some insight into the dynamics of

racial attitudes among white voters when black candidates constitute their only choices from the political parties.

Racial Attitudes and Elections

Even as respondents on surveys report less overt racism, researchers have discovered enduring relationships between respondents' racial attitudes and their political views. Certain political issues, such as crime (Gilens 1996, Mendelberg 1997, Valentino 1999) and welfare (Peffley, Hurwitz and Sniderman 1997), have long been recognized to carry racial undertones. Other issues, such as government spending have also been linked to race in campaigns, as an even more subtle invocation of the role of race (Valentino, Hutchings and White 2002). Candidates, unwittingly or not, are able to stoke the quiet fires of racial attitudes by invoking these concerns. Voters who are encouraged to think in racial terms, especially in the context of blacks in America, can be manipulated to favor particular political ideals and candidates. The infamous Willie Horton advertisement run by the campaign of Republican George H. Bush during the 1984 election is perhaps the best example of the role that racial cues exert on the attitudes of white voters (Mendelberg 1997). Similarly, invoking issues with racial undertones increases favorability scores for Republican over Democratic candidates, largely because that party is considered to "own" the harsher stances on those issues (Petrocik 1996).

Studies of the role of race in elections have revolved mostly around the context of race related issues, and as the racial issues of integration and affirmative action have receded from the public agenda, other "race coded" issues have replaced them. Until the late 1970's, this was the main avenue for investigating race and politics. A more obvious route for race to enter into politics is through the direct election or candidacy of non-whites. Beginning in the late 1970's and increasing over time has been the entrance of black candidates into elections. Starting on the

local level, particularly with Mayors, but expanding to U.S. House districts, black candidates have become more common, particularly in minority-majority districts. Similarly, minority candidates have entered in larger numbers into state and national level campaigns. Minority candidates, who thirty years ago were confined mainly to districts in which they represented the majority of the population, now compete to win in racially heterogeneous electorates. The entrance of minority, especially black, candidates into public office has been demonstrated to alter the perceptions of whites in the general population in regards to black political leaders (Hajnal 2006). How race influences minority candidate's attempts to first win that public office is less well understood though. White voters, who may have never been presented with a minority candidate before, must simultaneously reconcile covert racial beliefs with perceptions of non-white candidates.

There is also the growing literature on racial attitudes and implicit versus explicit racial priming (Mendelberg 2008; Huber and Lapinski 2008; White 2007). According to Mendelberg's influential book (2001), implicit messages are more powerful because they convey racial stereotypes without signaling to respondents the need to self-monitor in order to appear consistent with the widely accepted norm of equality. Explicit racial priming, on the other hand, is too blatant in its presentation of stereotypes (particularly those most capable of discerning a racial cue), and causes subjects to recognize the negative stereotype. This recognition dampens the expression of negative racial attitudes and renders explicit racial primes less effective in moving racial attitudes. Much of the controversy in this area has revolved around the extent to which implicit primes are more effective at evoking negative racial attitudes among whites. Competing studies marshal evidence, the bulk of it generated from experimental studies, to support or refute the theory of implicit racial priming as a model of political communication.

Despite the disagreement among scholars in this field, there is a growing consensus that the treatment of racial primes in dichotomous terms – as either fully implicit, where stereotypes work by subconscious cues, or entirely explicit where the negative stereotypes are blatant – should be refined instead to exist on a continuum (Mendelberg 2008, p. 118).

In addition, previous work has explored the influence of perceived candidate race on white voters. There have been three traditional approaches: 1) present a single candidate to evaluate, and vary that candidate by race (Colleau et al 1990, Terkildsen 1993, Reeves 1997); 2) present two candidates, one white male and one non-white male, varying the non-white male (McDermott 1998, Sigelman and Sigelman 1982, Sigelman et al 1995); and 3) gather survey data from an actual election involving a minority candidate (Citrin, Green and Sears 1990). Each method has unique strengths and weaknesses. Presenting a single candidate allows for strict control over all aspects of evaluation, and permits easy analysis of how respondents evaluate candidates strictly by varying race. One difficulty with this though is the demonstrated phenomenon of self-monitoring by respondents when dealing with questions about black candidates (Terkildsen 1993).

The pressure to present socially acceptable answers often leads respondents to over-compensate in their answers to mask potentially biased answers. This phenomenon has been noticed both in the decline of “overt racism” scores on traditional surveys as well as in the inflation of ratings of blacks in studies of minority candidate evaluations. Colleau et. al. even discovered in their 1990 paper that black candidates were rated higher than white candidates, holding all else equal, a finding that stood apart from what would have been otherwise anticipated. While one could hope this would be a sign of changing race evaluations in society, it is also possibly, and perhaps more plausibly, the result of self-monitoring by subjects. As

Mendelberg argues, when respondents become aware of race as a salient factor, they overcompensate their evaluations, resulting in higher ratings than would otherwise occur, even under race-neutral situations (Mendelberg 2001). Higher evaluations often do not correspond to true sentiment though. Evidence for this can be found in the recurrent findings that, even as respondents will report supporting and positively evaluating black candidates, such support does not seem to translate into votes at the poll. The repeated phenomenon of black candidates suffering a drop off of support between opinion polls and the final vote is testament to this persistent problem (Tom Bradley v. George Terkildson, CA Governor 1982 and Harold Ford v. Bob Corker, TN Senate 2006).

One way to counter this difficulty is to provide an alternative choice for respondents to “vote” for in surveys, typically a traditional white male. By gathering data about two candidates, and registering how evaluations and vote support for the varied candidate changes based upon their assigned race, it is easier to capture some of the disparities between reporting positive evaluations for a minority candidate, and ultimately supporting them. Having two candidates to explore provides an avenue to test whether reported sentiment actually translates into true vote support. Sigelman and Sigelman, when evaluating sexism, racism and ageism in voting behavior actually discovered that ageism had a more pronounced affect on decreasing voter support for a non-traditional candidate, but ultimately showed that when given the choice between a white male and not-white-male candidate, respondents tend to defer to the white male candidate regardless (Sigelman and Sigelman 1982, Sigelman et al 1995). Respondents in that study, across all demographic characteristics, registered stronger support for candidates who were similar to themselves, across race, gender and age, but still displayed the tendency to defer to white male candidates when asked to vote. As an experiment, it is still questionable whether some of the

responses indicating a willingness to vote for a non-traditional candidate would actually transition to votes in the poll. The tendency to report favorably for non-traditional candidates may continue when respondents realize that their votes are merely for an experiment, and not for true political office.

A third option for examining the role of race in elections is to use actual elections that involve a minority candidate. This is typically done by gathering exit poll data or looking at public opinion surveys conducted during the campaign (Citrin, Green and Sears 1990). The benefit of this method is that it permits an analysis of real-world conditions, comparing how respondents actually evaluate real candidates, and then ultimately how that results in support in the election. The correspondence to the real world that this provides is tempered by the lack of control over the election, and a loss of causal attribution that can be made regarding the significance of race. A persistent problem is that respondents, especially white respondents, typically over-compensate in reporting their support for minority candidates (and race-coded issues), but do not actually provide support in the voting booth (Berinsky 1999, Berinsky 2002). While this provides evidence to the persistence of self-correction among white voters, it tells us little about what drives the evaluation process. In a real world situation, how do whites evaluate black candidates?

A previously unrealistic prospect would be to contrast two non-white male candidates in a large-scale election. By removing the prospect of voting for a white male candidate, respondents (and voters) lose the option to revert to the traditional choice. Instead, they are forced to make candidate evaluations and vote decisions that provide less ability, or motivation, to flee from in the real world vote (though they could simply stay home). As recently as five years ago, such a prospect would seem to have little relevance to the practical world of politics.

And yet in 2004, two prominent campaigns for the U.S. Senate, both in electorally important states, provided no white male options for voters. In Florida, Betty Castor, a Democrat and a white woman opposed Mel Martinez, a Republican of Cuban origin who identifies himself as a Hispanic/Latino. In Illinois, the race for the U.S. Senate seat was between two black men – Democrat Barack Obama and Republican Alan Keyes.

An Unusual Race: the 2004 U.S. Senate Election in Illinois

We collected data in both Florida and Illinois in 2004, but we concentrate our analysis in this paper on the race for the U.S. Senate in Illinois during 2004. The Illinois study was designed well before most had any idea Barack Obama would be a leading contender for the presidency of the United States little more than 3 years later. Indeed, Obama's candidacy as the nominee of the Democratic party for the 2004 U.S. Senate race was unexpected, and less than a month before the primary election was held, Obama trailed in the polls. Obama's main opponents for the Democratic nomination were Blair Hull, a wealthy Chicago businessman and Dan Hynes. Hull and Hines, both white males, enjoyed support from prominent African American elected officials as well as the Chicago Democratic party organization headed by Mayor Richard M. Daley. Hull's campaign for the nomination was well-financed by his own personal fortune, and he enjoyed both name recognition and the lead in the polls. Shortly before the election, however, a scandal involving allegations that Hull had abused his ex-wife surfaced and de-railed his lead. Dan Hynes, the son of the influential Chicago politician Thomas Hynes was also in the race, and ended up with about a quarter of the vote compared to Obama's win with just over 50% of the vote.

Before the 2004 Democratic primary for the U.S. Senate, Barack Obama was a little-known Illinois state Senator from the 13th district. This district is located on Chicago's south side

and includes African American neighborhoods as well Hyde Park, a mostly white and multiracial neighborhood and home of the University of Chicago. Obama had represented the 13th district in the Illinois state house since 1996, but had made a run for the U.S. House of Representative in the 2000 Democratic primary against Bobby Rush. The incumbent won handily in the primary amidst suggestions that Obama – a multiracial Chicago transplant with Hyde Park connections – could not fully empathize with the struggle of African Americans. While Obama’s appeal among African American voters was questioned in the primary race for the U.S. House of Representatives against Bobby Rush, Obama won the 2004 U.S. Senate primary with overwhelming support from voters in Chicago.

The question of Obama’s “authenticity” as a black man and the degree of support he would receive from African American voters in Illinois would surface again during the general election. During the early stages of the campaign, Obama was running against the Republican nominee, Jack Ryan. The U.S. Senate seat had opened up when Peter Fitzgerald, the one-term Republican U.S. Senator who defeated Democrat Carol Mosley Braun six years earlier, decided not to run for re-election. Fitzgerald, a staunch conservative, had often clashed with the Illinois Republican party and was widely expected to be challenged in the Republican primary. Ryan, a retired millionaire investment banker turned school teacher, was forced out of the race in June of 2004 following a scandal involving his ex-wife, actress Jeri Ryan. In disarray, the Illinois Republican party chose Alan Keyes, a conservative African American and a perennial candidate for political office (though typically from his home state of Maryland), to run against Obama in the general election. While Keyes had never lived in Illinois, he established a residence in the state several weeks prior to the announcement of his candidacy as the Republican party

nominee.¹ The presence of two black candidates as nominees from the two major parties was a first.

While the various scandals and twists and turns of the 2004 U.S. Senate race in Illinois made it a fascinating election to watch, the fact that there two black men running makes it an ideal case to study the dynamics of racial attitudes and the influence of short-term communications on racial attitudes and candidate evaluation. During October and November of 2004, a random probability sample of 567 people in Illinois provided responses to the survey we describe below.² Data were collected from 420 whites and 108 blacks, the latter of who were oversampled in an effort to increase the number of observations among African Americans.³ We concentrate our analysis here on the perceptions and attitudes among white voters, and disaggregate them by partisan affiliation, analyzing separately the views of Democrats and Republicans. Before proceeding with the analysis, we describe the experimental manipulations

¹ For more background on the 2004 Obama-Keyes race, and analysis of data from this survey on Keyes, see Harris-Lacewell and Junn 2007.

² Knowledge Networks of Palo Alto, California was contracted to collect the data. The surveys are delivered via the Internet, allowing respondents to complete the questionnaire themselves, and also to view the visual primes used for the embedded experiments. Panel participants are not limited to only those with Internet access. Knowledge Networks provides Internet access as part of the incentive for respondents to participate. The survey population is a random probability sample of residents of the state of Illinois.

³ Samples of Latinos, Hispanics, and other racial minorities are too small to analyze, and are not included here. According to U.S. Census data from 2004, the state of Illinois was 67% white, 15% black, 14% Hispanic, and 4% other at the time of the election.

embedded in the survey and our hypotheses about how these stimuli systematically influence Illinois voters.

There were two experimental manipulations embedded in the Illinois study. Both were delivered to random halves of the survey population. In the first manipulation, half the sample received the following text: “Barack Obama is running for the U.S. Senate. He was a community organizer on Chicago’s south side and was the first black president of the Harvard Law Review. If elected, he would be only the 5th black Senator in U.S. history.” (See Figure 1). The text was accompanied by a headshot photograph of the candidate. This stimulus was designed to highlight the racial identity of Barack Obama as black in a number of ways. He is described as an organizer on the south side of Chicago – a location known to residents of Illinois as a predominantly African American area of the city. In addition, Obama’s position as a black man both at Harvard and potentially in the U.S. Senate is highlighted. There is no emphasis on his political experience, and his educational background at Harvard Law School is mentioned.

<<< Insert Figure 1 About Here >>>

In contrast, the second half of the sample received a different stimulus that attempted to de-racialize Obama, emphasizing his qualifications instead. Respondents who received this prime were shown a photograph of the Illinois state house with the accompanying text: “Barack Obama is running for the U.S. Senate. He is currently an Illinois State Senator. He is a graduate of Harvard Law School, and on the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School.” (See Figure 2). This description and picture of the Illinois capitol building was intended to de-emphasize Obama’s race and highlight his educational, professional, and political background. Instead of focusing on how Obama could empathize with whites, this context discusses Obama in race-neutral terms.

<<< Insert Figure 2 About Here >>>

A second experiment occurred a short time later in the survey, and was again administered to random halves of the respondent population. In this second manipulation, half of the sample in experiment two received a photograph of Obama and African Americans. The photograph was accompanied by the following text: “Barack Obama is an Illinois State Senator and a former community organizer. He and his wife Michelle, a native of Chicago’s south side, have two children.” (See Figure 3). Again, Obama’s connection to the Chicago’s south side and his experience as a community organizer are highlighted here. This stimulus was constructed to convey Obama’s relationship to other African Americans, thereby emphasizing his identity as a black man.

<<< Insert Figure 3 About Here >>>

Alternatively, the second half the sample viewed the text: “Barack Obama gave the keynote address to the 2004 Democratic National Convention where he presented a positive theme of national unity by citing the diversity of his own heritage. He said we have shared values, values that aren’t black or white or Hispanic – values that are American and Democratic.” This text was accompanied by a photograph of Obama with white people. (See Figure 4) This stimulus was designed to prime the idea that Obama transcends traditional racial categories, thereby de-emphasizing his blackness. In so doing, we hypothesized that white voters would feel a stronger connection to Obama. In contrast to the frame using the Illinois state house that did not implicate race, this stimulus explicitly invokes Obama’s multiracial status and highlights his call for racial unity.

<<< Insert Figure 4 About Here >>>

Taken together, respondents in the Illinois survey could have received one of four combinations of the two experiments. These combinations are detailed in Table 1. The quarter of the sample that received the most de-racialized treatment are those who received a combination of Figure 2, the photograph of the Illinois state house, and the language of transcending race accompanied by a picture of Obama with whites in Figure 4. In contrast is the quarter of the sample viewing the most racialized treatments. This set of stimuli explicitly frame Obama as a black man, combining Figure 1, the photograph of Obama’s face, and the picture of Obama with African Americans (Figure 3). This set of stimuli emphasizes the connection Obama has to African Americans by invoking his role as a community activist on Chicago’s south side. In between these more clearly de-racialized (whitened) and racialized (blackened) frames are two more mixed treatments. The first, which we identify as “mixed de-racialized” pairs Figure 1 with Figure 4, and leans toward de-racializing Obama because of the strong message about transcending race, and by picturing white people in the photograph. The other mixed treatment we term “mixed racialized” combining Figure 1 and Figure 3. We reasoned that the effect of combination of the photograph of the Illinois state house and the picture of Obama with black people would have a stronger influence than the other mixed treatment set because Figure 3 implicates race and political activism while picturing Obama with African Americans.

<<< Insert Table 1 About Here >>>

The combination of the two embedded experiments represent gradations of racializing Obama, though they do not conform to the distinctions made in the racial attitudes literature on implicit and explicit primes. Instead, we constructed this set of experimental frames to run along a continuum of more racialized to de-racialized, and the stimuli were created to be relevant to this particular election between Obama and Keyes. Study designs on subjects in experimental

labs can more easily treat stimuli as either explicit or implicit, and do so with a high degree of internal validity. But in this case, we collected data during the course of an actual election, and as a result, our experiment had to conform to the reality of the campaign in progress. Under these circumstances, and with two black candidates running as nominees from the major parties, we decided to adopt a strategy for the experimental stimuli that could reflect the tensions behind support for the candidates rather than attempt to set up theoretically-consistent explicit and implicit primes. In particular, how black was too black for white voters? Could short-term communications framing Obama as a black man but one who transcended race work with white voters?

Neither of these questions directly address the controversy in the racial attitudes and implicit priming literature, but we were faced with a situation where the candidates themselves were explicit primes. In this regard, it is difficult to imagine how either of these candidates could be de-racialized sufficiently to present a purely implicit prime. Throughout the Democratic primary and through the national election, there was enormous and continuous media coverage of the race, and of Obama in particular, especially after Jack Ryan withdrew as the Republican nominee. Ryan's withdrawal received substantial press coverage because of the salacious content of the story behind his decision to depart. Obama also gave a well-publicized speech at the Democratic National Convention in the summer of 2004, and there was no avoiding the fact that both Obama and Keyes are black.

Thus, constrained as we were – or alternatively, blessed – in terms the unique context of this election, we created this set of primes, and designed the study to collect data from respondents receiving the full combination of the two sets of stimuli. We expect those respondents who were randomly assigned to and viewed the pair of racialized frames to be

primed to think of Obama in the most racialized terms as a black man. The set of stimuli, “mixed racialized,” pairs one deracialized image and one racialized prime, and we hypothesize this emphasizes Obama’s race more than the pair of images we term “mixed de-racialized.” This is because the quarter of the sample who received the mixed de-racialized set of stimuli viewed Figure 4, which pictures Obama with white people. We hypothesize this image will have more resonance with white voters in terms of their ability to identify with Obama, and provides a stronger message of de-racialization in comparison to the photograph of the Illinois state house. Finally, the most de-racialized set of stimuli were constructed to portray Obama as beyond race. We hypothesize that white respondents randomly assigned to this pair of primes will show a stronger affinity for Obama in terms of candidate trait evaluation. Next we turn to the results.

White Voters’ Evaluations of Obama

While data from 420 white residents of Illinois were collected in this survey, we analyze in this section of the paper the data from 295 respondents who are likely voters and affiliated with the Democratic and Republican parties⁴. Most studies of white racial attitudes analyze the whole sample together, accounting for differences that might exist between people with high versus low levels of information, and most often measured by level of formal education (Federico 2004; Huber and Lapinski 2006). Interesting patterns often pertain between the identified groups, and while there is controversy about the direction of the findings, there is agreement that racial attitudes among whites are not monolithic. In our view, the most important

⁴ We measure likely voters as those who both report having voted in the 2000 presidential election and also intending to vote in the 2004 election. Of the 420 white respondents, 330 report being in the likely voting category. 35 of those respondents report being completely independent from the Democratic and Republican parties and are excluded from the analysis.

differences in terms of candidate evaluation and racial resentment should be apparent by partisanship. We therefore divided our sample of Illinois voters into those who report identifying with the Democratic party versus those whites who identify as Republicans⁵. Candidates and their advocates run very different advertisements during primary elections with messages tailored to the party faithful compared to commercials directed at a general election audience. Thus, we find it amazing that few analysts examine patterns of difference between voters separated by this important partisan cleavage. We expect distinctive patterns of reaction to the experimental manipulations by party affiliation, though we were not prepared for just how different the results would actually be.

We concentrate on disentangling the systematic effect of the experimental manipulations framing Obama racially on the evaluations white voters gave on two important characteristics of the candidate. In the survey, and after the second experimental manipulation, respondents were asked, “Thinking of Barack Obama, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?” They were given a scale from 1 to 7 with these response categories: 1 “strongly disagree,” 2 “disagree,” 3 “slightly disagree,” 4 “neutral,” 5 “slightly agree,” 6 “agree,” and 7 “strongly agree.” Respondents were asked to select a response for five qualities: “He would make a good U.S. Senator,” “He has qualities that I look for in an elected official,” “He seems

⁵ Partisan identifies were identified over a three question series where they were asked to identify themselves as a Democrat, Republican, Independent or Other. Self-declared Democrats and Republicans were then asked their strength of affiliation, while self-declared Independents and Others were asked if they leaned towards either of the two major parties. Self-Identifiers and “leaners” were coded as partisans, while only those who reported no leanings were coded as Independents.

qualified for office,” “He would probably understand my concerns,” and “He reminds me of people I know.” We combined the first three items into one overall scale, taking the average responses for the statements, and identify the characteristic as ability. We combined the last two items to create a second scale to correspond to candidate empathy⁶.

We rely upon the ability and empathy traits because they are well supported as sources of candidate evaluations. Kinder pioneered the use of four major traits evaluated by voters when comparing candidates: their abilities, their leadership qualities, their empathy and their integrity (Kinder 1983). Respondents do not require all things of all candidates though, and typically desire their presidential candidates to have greater leadership skills, and their congressional candidates to have higher empathy (Miller 1990). Thus, we retain the ability measures and include empathy measures, while ignoring leadership trait scores for these Senate candidates.

Candidate evaluations, once made, are not static, but instead, continually reformed and updated to incorporate new data (Lodge, McGraw and Stroh 1989, Lodge, Steenbergen, and Brau 1995). This on-line processing of data permits respondents to learn a great deal about candidates, and then largely discard the particular bits of information and instead store the summary affective evaluation of that candidate. This model explains both the persistent finding of low levels of political knowledge in the electorate (Delli Carpini and Keeter 2002), while still explaining their ability to function at the ballot box. In real world contexts, this also permits experimental researchers to take advantage of respondents’ knowledge of candidates by presenting new information and examining the differences that this makes in their summary evaluations of the candidates. The aim of this study is to present respondents with varying

⁶ Information about the creation of and the reliability of the scales can be found in Appendix B and C

portrayals of Barack Obama as either a black candidate for Senate, or a race neutral (whitened) candidate, to examine whether this portrayal influences how they subsequently evaluate Obama as a potential Senator.

How are white respondents likely to respond in a situation where there are two minority candidates of the two major parties running against one another in the election? Standard ideas about how candidates evaluate candidates have focused on some of the major predictors of the vote choice. Partisan affiliation is certainly a major predictor of evaluations, with partisan respondents almost always preferring candidates from their own party. Candidates are typically considered to care more about their own groups, but also are viewed as maintaining certain stereotypical qualities. Among non-traditional candidates, such tendencies are amplified. Female candidates are often viewed as more liberal than their objective political stances would otherwise suggest, and also more competent in domestic issues such as education and healthcare (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993, Lawless 2004, Koch 2002). Additionally, female candidates have been demonstrated to receive higher evaluations, based upon respondents egalitarian beliefs, in forming initial impressions of leadership and other candidate traits (Alexander and Andersen 1993). The role of sex has been explored to a greater degree than that of race, but it is likely that they both exert an influence on candidate evaluation (Terkildsen 1993). If such expectations hold true, we would expect that portrayals based upon race might have strong influences upon both the ability and empathy scores reported for the candidates.

Results

Table 2 presents the average scores among white voters, separated by political party evaluating Barack Obama and Alan Keyes on the two composite measures of ability and empathy. Obama won the election by a margin of 70% to 27%, and this favorability is clearly

reflected in comparing the evaluations of the traits of candidates. Among Democrats, Obama is strongly favored in terms of both ability and empathy, easily overwhelming Keyes on both traits. Republicans on the other hand, are slightly more favorable about Obama than Keyes in terms of ability, but just the opposite pattern is apparent on the empathy scores for Keyes among Republicans. All of these differences are statistically significant at $< .001$.

<<< Insert Table 2 About Here >>>

These data are a first indication of just how unusual this election was; even white Republican voters in Illinois did not have consistently more positive evaluations of the Republican candidate. Instead, white Republicans evaluated Obama on ability and empathy as basically equal to Alan Keyes, the nominee from their own political party.

In addition to the candidate evaluation scores for Obama on ability and empathy, we also asked a series of questions measuring racial resentment (Kinder and Sanders 1996; Berinsky 2002). Shortly after the candidate evaluation questions, all respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with the following 5 statements: “It is easy to understand the anger of black people in America,” “Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights,” “Over the past few years blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve,” “Blacks should not push themselves where they’re not wanted,” and “Discrimination against blacks is no longer a problem in the United States.” All coded in the same direction, and taken together, these 5 measures were combined to create a scale of racial resentment⁷. Answered after the

⁷ The 5 questions used are in line with, though not identical to, questions that appear in the ANES as well as other studies looking at racial resentment (Citrin, Green and Sears 1990, Valentino and Sears 2005). Reliability coefficients and correlations are reported in Appendix C, and compare favorably to other racial resentment scales created elsewhere.

experimental manipulations, white Republicans and Democrats in Illinois showed little difference on this scale, with Republicans scoring slightly higher (average 2.81) than Democrats (average 2.57), as shown below in Table 3. These differences are significant at $< .005$, but are both close to the center point of the 5 point scale, as would be expected if whites have traded higher resentment scores for more “neutral” ratings in the center (Berinsky 2002).

<<< Insert Table 3 About Here >>>

What is most interesting is the comparison of the scores on the candidate traits as well as racial resentment by the combination of experimental primes received. We begin by examining the relationship between scores on the ability and empathy traits.

<<< Insert Table 4 About Here >>>

Among white Democrats in Illinois, Obama has strong support in terms of evaluation of his ability, with an average score of 5.68 (on a scale from 1 to 7). There are important differences between the groups receiving distinct combinations of the racialization stimuli. Democrats with the strongest positive assessment of Obama’s ability are those who view him in the most de-racialized and “whitened” portrayal, providing an average score of 6.15 on the ability trait. With each gradation of racialization, white Democrats are less favorable toward Obama’s ability. Those who received the mixed de-racialized primes (photograph of Obama in profile along with the picture of him with white people and the text about transcending race), followed closely behind the whitened prime with an average score of 5.96. Nearly half a point lower in evaluation (5.49) was the group that received the mixed racialized prime where they saw the Illinois state house and then a photograph of Obama with other African Americans. Finally, the most modest evaluations among white Democrats were among the randomly-selected group who received the

most racialized portrayal of Obama. The average score for this group on the ability evaluation was 4.90. These group differences are statistically significant at .008.

In contrast, white Republican voters in Illinois had a more modest average endorsement of Obama's ability, giving him an average overall score of 4.37. The pattern of differences by racialized treatments evident in the data on Democrats is not repeated for Republicans. Instead, white Republicans who received the most strongly racialized portrayal of Obama by viewing the picture of his face, along with the photograph in the second experiment with him and other African Americans, and both of which emphasized his experience as a community organizer on Chicago's south side, reported the *highest* mean evaluation of Obama's ability (4.69). This group was followed closely by those who were randomly selected to view the most heavily de-racialized frame (4.63). The mixed combination of stimuli yielded lower scores across for white Republicans in both groups (4.10 for the "mixed racialized" group, and 4.07 for the "mixed de-racialized" group). While these differences are not statistically significant, their divergence from the pattern for white Democrats in Illinois is noteworthy.

<<< Insert Table 5 About Here >>>

There were similar patterns in the data for the trait of empathy among white Democrats. Again, those who received the most whitened set of primes were most positive about Obama, while those who received the most racialized treatment were the least positive. These differences are also statistically significant. Among white Republican voters in Illinois, there is also a similar though more pronounced pattern for rating Obama's empathy by the experimental stimuli. The most positive group is the respondents who received the strongest racialized treatment about Obama (4.24), followed next by the group with the mixed racialized pair of frames (3.92). The group viewing the most whitened portrayal of Obama is next (3.78), followed by the mixed-

deracialized group (3.53). The trend among white Democrats to evaluate Obama as less empathetic as he is portrayed more as a black candidate may not be that surprising. Respondents have previously demonstrated closer attachments to those candidates who are portrayed as more like themselves (Sigelman and Sigelman 1982). What is perhaps more interesting is that white Republicans show no statistically significant reaction to altered portrayals, though the results indicate that as Obama's portrayal emphasized his race the most, white Republican's reported their highest empathy scores (4.24). This would appear to be a clear indication of an over-correction in reporting empathy scores.

<<< Insert Table 6 About Here >>>

In terms of the racial resentment scale, the results among Democrats and Republicans in terms of the four groups of experimental stimuli are distinctive. Where there were statistically significant results for white Democratic voters with respect to the candidate traits, on racial resentment there are none. Table 6 shows that white Democrats in each of the four experimental groups did not differ in terms of their attitudes of racial resentment about blacks as a function of the racialized or de-racialized primes they viewed about Obama. In contrast, there is a strong and statistically significant relationship among the experimental primes and racial resentment among white Republican voters in Illinois. The pattern of those differences is very interesting, showing that quarter who received the most racialized set of primes portraying Obama as a black man, reporting the lowest levels of racial resentment. This finding is consistent with the results from studies of explicit racial priming that show the most explicit references to race and racial stereotypes are recognizable by subjects and serve as cues for them to overcompensate and self-correct their responses to fall in line with the norm of equality (Mendelberg 2001).

Alternatively, the group who saw the most whitened treatment of Obama had a nearly identical score on racial resentment to those who viewed the mixed white treatment, and both of these scores are actually higher on racial resentment against blacks than the fully racialized treatment. The group of white Republicans receiving the mixed black frame presented the most negative attitudes against blacks, scoring 3.07 on the racial resentment scale. This finding is consistent with the notion that implicit appeals – those reminding respondents about race and racial stereotypes about blacks without doing so explicitly – have the strongest influence in evoking negative racial attitudes. What is most interesting about these findings on the relationship between the experimental manipulation and racial resentment are the patterns of difference between white Democrats and Republicans. Democrats' sense of racial resentment against blacks is impervious to manipulation with the racialized frames of Obama; there are no discernible observed differences in attitudes about blacks when people see different racial representations of Obama. On the other hand, white Republicans are strongly influenced by the experimental frames, reporting the lowest level of racial resentment when presented with the most explicit representation of Obama as black.

Data in their bivariate form, while revealing, tell only part of the story about what influences voters' evaluations of Barack Obama. We are interesting in revealing what individual-level factors among voters – Democrat and Republican alike – induce higher or more modest evaluations of Obama's ability and empathy. To examine this set of questions, we estimated regression models using a method of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) predicting both Obama's ability score and empathy score. Included as explanatory variables in the model are dummy variables for three of the four experimental conditions, the mixed black treatment, the mixed white treatment, and the de-racialized treatment. The racialized treatment is the excluded

category. In addition, we specified the model to also include strength of partisanship, gender, income, church attendance, age, and education, all “usual suspects” in equations estimating candidate traits. Table 7 displays the estimated standardized OLS coefficients for white Democrats and Republican voters in Illinois.

<<< Insert Table 7 About Here >>>

The patterns we saw among Democrats being more favorable toward Obama in terms of ability as a function of the de-racialized experimental treatments persists in the regression model. Holding other factors constant, those white Democrats who viewed Obama as de-racialized or saw the mixed white frame were more likely to report a higher sense of his ability. Obama also scores higher in ability among the well-educated and among women, where the coefficients are large, positive, and statistically significant. Interestingly, those with higher incomes, holding all else constant, are less likely to give Obama higher ratings on ability. White Republican voters, on the other hand, show a strikingly different pattern. The explanatory power of this model estimated among Republicans is actually slightly higher than it is for white Democrats, and most of the estimated coefficients are negative. The whiter the primes frame Obama, the lower the ratings are among Republicans in evaluations of his ability. Similarly, strong partisans and those who attend church more regularly are more likely to provide lower evaluations of Obama’s ability. In contrast, the well-educated and women are more likely, all else equal, to rate Obama higher on ability.

<<< Insert Table 8 About Here >>>

For ratings on Obama’s empathy scores, the patterns are somewhat different. Among white Democrats, the model fit is slightly better than in the equation estimated for ability, and for this trait, being a strong party identifier makes people more likely to rate Obama higher on

empathy, as does being female and well-educated. Income again is negative, and viewing the de-racialized frame of Obama produces higher scores on empathy. Among Republicans the pattern is much the same as it is for ability, though the model fit is substantially lower. For empathy scores among white Republicans in Illinois, only being female systematically increases Obama's ratings, while frequent church attendance, and the two mixed experimental treatments (mixed black and mixed white) are negative, meaning voters in these categories systematically rated Obama lower on empathy than those in the excluded category of people who saw Obama as fully racialized as a black man. This finding is further evidence of a response bias, as it indicates that when Obama is portrayed more as a black candidate, and thus *farther* from the white republican respondent, they report feeling that he is *more* empathetic of their situation.

Taken together, these results paint a fascinating picture of the dynamics of candidate evaluation in a race for an open U.S. Senate seat where both of the candidates from the two major parties are black. Following the findings of the implicit and explicit racial primes literature, white Republican voters appear to self-monitor when they are exposed to the most racialized – and therefore, most explicit – portrayal of Obama as a black man. Both the ability and empathy scores for white Republicans in Illinois are the highest for this group of voters. These differences remain even in a multivariate regression model, and are joined by gender and education in one equation, as positive predictors of Obama's candidate traits. White Democrats, on the other hand, showed an entirely different relationship to the experimental primes racializing Obama than did Republicans. The more de-racialized the portrayal of Obama, the more positively Democrats rated Obama in terms of both ability and empathy. Other contributing factors to stronger candidate evaluation on ability and empathy are gender, education, and strong partisanship, while higher incomes predict evaluations in the opposite direction.

White respondents, when broken down by partisan affiliation, respond very differently to the treatments they are presented with. A final area of interest is whether the variations in Obama's portrayal would elicit different feelings of racial resentment among respondents. Aside from rating the candidate as either able or empathetic, focusing on race may also cue white respondents to update their feelings about blacks in general. Hajnal demonstrated that black incumbents alter white constituents' racial attitudes, and it is possible that candidate portrayal could do the same. Table 9 reports the results of an additional OLS regression model that replaces respondent evaluations of Obama as the dependent variable with reported racial resentment scores.

<<< Insert Table 9 About Here >>>

The model explains variance among Republicans more than it does for Democrats (.228 compared to .137, respectively), but also points to several interesting commonalities and differences. Among both Democrats and Republicans, gender and education are strong predictors of racial resentment. Women of both parties report lower resentment scores, as do the higher educated. Among Democrats alone, strength of partisanship also plays a role, with stronger identification with the Democratic Party tending to produce lower racial resentment scores. The treatments appear largely to have no effect, with both the mixed black and the most whitened treatment not producing a statistically significant result from the excluded condition where race was most heavily emphasized. The mixed whitened condition, where Obama was portrayed as a black candidate, but pictured with whites, produced a significantly higher racial resentment score though, the only positive indicator among white Democrats.

White Republicans demonstrate different patterns again. Church attendance joins sex and education as being significant negative predictors of racial resentment scores, indicating that

those who reported attending church more frequently reported lower resentment scores. Age works in the opposite direction however, indicating that older white Republicans report higher scores than younger. Most interestingly is the finding that all of the treatment conditions have significant and positive coefficients. This indicates that the treatment in which Obama was portrayed as primarily a black candidate and then pictured with blacks tended to produce lower racial resentment scores. Somewhat unusual though is the finding that the positive coefficients decrease as they move from the mixed black treatment to the whitened treatment. This indicates that white Republicans reported increasing levels of racial resentment towards blacks as Obama was portrayed increasingly as a black candidate, until the most overt treatment was reached. At that point, reported racial resentment scores fall to their lowest levels, holding all else constant.

De-Racializing Obama

During the January and February 2008 Democratic contests, Obama fought a battle on both sides, attempting to maintain a consistent image for African-American voters who worried about him as “not being black enough,” and against fellow Democratic candidates who described him as “the first mainstream African-American who is articulate, and bright, and clean and good looking” (*Time Magazine*, Feb 1, 2007). Continuing on through the March primaries, the Obama campaign has faced numerous questions about the role that race play within the electorate. Race, certainly within the context of this election, is very much a moving target, continually re-constructed by the dynamics of the campaign. One of the most interesting findings in our analysis of voters’ evaluations of Obama during the 2004 Illinois election for the U.S. Senate is the distinctive and strong positive influence of de-racializing Obama among white Democrats. Short-term communications that emphasized Obama’s race-neutral qualifications and highlighted his appeal as a multiracial candidate attempting to transcend race, had a consistent and positive

influence on perceptions of the candidate among Democrats. These results are perhaps not surprising, and the strategies of the Obama campaign during the primaries suggests that his advisors already recognize the power of counter-stereotypical messages that frame Obama as black but “articulate, and bright, and clean” (White 2007).

Among white Republicans, no such pattern was found, and instead, these voters responded to the most explicit racialization of Obama with systematically higher evaluations as compared to people assigned to groups who viewed Obama in more racialized terms. These results suggest that racial appeals that are more explicit – portraying Obama as a black man associated with community organizing and the south side of Chicago – activates a self-regulating mechanism among white Republicans, who then systematically correct their responses. This finding is consistent with Mendelberg’s and others’ research findings on the significant of explicit racial primes. How Obama should run in the general election, when attempting to appeal to voters from both parties, very much remains an unanswered question. For when subjects know to self-monitor, it indicates racial attitudes are at work though observed in what appear to be counterintuitive ways.

This examination of the sentiment among white Democrats and Republicans shows just how important it is to disaggregate data. When analyzed together, all of the differences in candidate evaluation as a function of the experimental manipulations gets cancelled out. But when the data are separated by party affiliation, the distinctive processes of candidate evaluation can be revealed. Racial priming is clearly alive and well within the context of short-term communications, and as we demonstrate from these data, in the case of a real election between two black candidates for national office.

While it appears that there has been a diminution in the discontinuity in polling data showing support for Obama and election outcomes, it is far too soon to conclude that racial resentment, implicit attitudes about blacks, and the power of negative stereotypes will no longer affect the first leading black candidate for the presidency of the United States. Will white Democrats continue to vote for Obama if competitors run advertisements highlighting Obama's blackness? Our experimental data show that reminding white voters, even Democrats, that Obama is black and framing him racially, dampens their assessment of both his ability and empathy. Will Republicans vote for a black man? Our data tell us even less about this complex dynamic, but it is clear that white Republicans as well as Democrats evaluate candidates based on how they are framed racially.

Appendix A: Description of Variables

Variable Name	Variable Label and Type	Description
StrongID	Strength of Identification	0 = Independent 3 = Strong Partisan
Female	Sex (Dummy)	1 = Female
Income		0 = Less than \$5000 17 = \$175,000 or more
ChrchAtt	Church Attendance	1 = Never 6 = More than once a week
Age		1 = 18 - 24 2 = 25 - 34 3 = 35 - 44 4 = 45 - 54 5 = 55 - 64 6 = 65 - 74 7 = 75 or older
Educ	Education Level Attained	1 = Less than High School 2 = High School Graduate 3 = Some College 4 = College Graduate or higher
RaceRsnt	Racial Resentment (5 point scale)	1 = Low Racial Resentment 5 = High Racial Resentment
RaceEmph	Racialized Treatment (Dummy)	1 = Received Obama Headshot, and the "Obama with Blacks" Treatment
MixBlack	Mixed Racialized Treatment (Dummy)	1 = Received Illinois Statehouse picture, and the "Obama with Blacks" Treatment
MixWhite	Mixed Whitened Treatment (Dummy)	1 = Received Obama Headshot, and the "Obama with Whites" Treatment
Whitend	Whitened Treatment (Dummy)	1 = Received Illinois Statehouse picture, and the "Obama with whites" Treatment

Appendix B: Construction of Scales

Racial Resentment	Average score of 5 5-point questions:
(Reversed) BlkAngr	It is easy to understand the anger of black people in America
BlkDmnd	Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights
BlkDsrv	Over the past few years blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve
BlkPush	Blacks should not push themselves where they're not wanted
BlkNoPrb	Discrimination against blacks is no longer a problem in the United States
	1 Strongly Disagree
	2 Disagree
	3 Neither agree nor disagree
	4 Agree
	5 Strongly Agree

Obama's Ability	Average score of 3 7-point questions:
GdSen	He would make a good US Senator
Qualy	He has qualities that I look for in an elected official
Qualf	He seems qualified for office
	1 Strongly Disagree
	4 Neutral
	7 Strongly Agree

Obama's Empathy	Average score of 2 7-point questions
Undrs	He would probably understand my concerns
Remnd	He reminds me of people I know
	1 Strongly Disagree
	4 Neutral
	7 Strongly Agree

Appendix C: Correlations and Alpha Scores for All White Respondents

<u>Racial</u>		Alpha = 0.762				
<u>Resentment</u>						
-		BlkAngr	BlkDmnd	BlkDsrv	BlkPush	BlkNoProb
BlkAngr		-	-	-	-	-
BlkDmnd		.260**	-	-	-	-
BlkDsrv		.238**	.619**	-	-	-
BlkPush		.199**	.552**	.524**	-	-
BlkNoProb		.323**	.406**	.401**	.419**	-

<u>Obama's Ability</u>		Alpha = 0.965		
-		ObaGdSen	ObaQuals	ObaQualf
ObaGdSen		-	-	-
ObaQuals		.934**	-	-
ObaQualf		.895**	.877**	-

<u>Obama's Empathy</u>		Alpha = 0.855	
-		ObaUndrs	ObaRmnd
ObaUndrs		-	-
ObaRmnd		.750**	-

** - sig. at .01, two-tailed

Appendix D: Descriptives for Illinois Subjects

Illinois: Likely Voters Only

Variable	White Democrats		White Republicans	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Party ID	-	-	-	-
Strong ID	2.15	0.77	2.20	0.78
Female	0.45	0.50	0.45	0.50
Income	10.95	3.85	11.56	3.47
ChrchAtt	2.87	1.64	3.90	1.72
Interest	2.09	0.93	2.05	0.86
Age	3.97	1.68	4.13	1.75
Education	2.66	1.05	2.82	1.01
ObaAbil	5.68	1.65	4.37	1.58
ObaEmp	5.08	1.63	3.86	1.39
KeyAbil	2.42	1.54	4.20	1.54
KeyEmp	2.52	1.51	3.94	1.61
RaceRsnt	2.57	0.70	2.81	0.67
ObaVote	0.95	0.21	0.47	0.50
	N = 138		N = 137	

References

- Alan I. Abramowitz, Alan I. A Comparison of Voting for US Senator and Representative in 1978. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 74, No. 3. (Sep., 1980), pp. 633-640.
- Alexander, Deborah and Kristi Andersen. Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 3. (Sep., 1993), pp. 527-545.
- Berinsky, Adam J. The Two Faces of Public Opinion. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 43, No. 4. (Oct., 1999), pp. 1209-1230.
- Berinsky, Adam J. Political Context and the Survey Response: The Dynamics of Racial Policy Opinion. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 64, No. 2. (May, 2002), pp. 567-584.
- Citrin, Jack, Donald Philip Green and David O. Sears. White Reactions to Black Candidates: When Does Race Matter? *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 1. (Spring, 1990), pp. 74-96.
- Colleau, Sophie M., Kevin Glynn, Steven Lybrand, Richard M. Merelman, Paula Mohan, James E. Wall. Symbolic Racism in Candidate Evaluation: An Experiment. *Political Behavior*, Vol. 12, No. 4. (Dec., 1990), pp. 385-402.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. What Americans Know About Politics and Why it Matters. 1997. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Federico, Christopher M. "When do Welfare Attitudes Become Racialized? The Paradoxical Effects of Education," American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 48, No. 2 (2004), pp. 374-391.
- Funk, Carolyn L. Bringing the Candidate into Models of Candidate Evaluation. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 3. (Aug., 1999), pp. 700-720.
- Gilens, Martin. "Race Coding" and White Opposition to Welfare. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 90, No. 3. (Sep., 1996), pp. 593-604.
- Goldenberg, Edie N. and Michael W. Traugott. Congressional Campaign Effects on Candidate Recognition and Evaluation. *Political Behavior*, Vol. 2, No. 1. (1980), pp. 61-90.
- Hajnal, Zoltan. Changing White Attitudes Towards Black Political Leadership. 2006. Cambridge University Press.
- Harris-Lacewell, Melissa and Jane Junn. 2007. "Old Friends and New Alliances: How the 2004 Illinois Senate Race Complicates the Study of Race and Religion," *Journal of Black Studies* 2007 38: 30-50.
- Huber, Gregory A., and John Lapinski. "The 'Race Card' Revisited: Assessing Racial Priming in

- Policy Contests,” *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 48, No. 2 (2006), pp. 375-401.
- Huber, Gregory A., and John Lapinski. “Testing the Implicit-Explicit Model of Racialized Political Communication,” *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (March 2008), pp. 125-134.
- Huddy, Leonie and Nayda Terkildsen. Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 37, No. 1. (Feb., 1993), pp. 119-147.
- Huddy, Leonie and Nayda Terkildsen. The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 3. (Sep., 1993), pp. 503-525.
- Hurwitz, Jon and Mark Peffley. Public Perceptions of Race and Crime: The Role of Racial Stereotypes. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 41, No. 2. (Apr., 1997), pp. 375-401.
- Kinder, Donald R. Presidential Traits: Pilot Study Report to the 1984 NEWS Planning Committee and NES Board. 1983.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Tali Mendelberg. Cracks in American Apartheid: The Political Impact of Prejudice among Desegregated Whites. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 57, No. 2. (May, 1995), pp. 402-424.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Lynn M. Sanders. Divided by Color. 1996. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, Donald R., Mark D. Peters, Robert P. Abelson and Susan T. Fiske. Presidential Prototypes. *Political Behavior*, Vol. 2, No. 4. (1980), pp. 315-337.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Nicholas Winter. Exploring the Racial Divide: Blacks, Whites, and Opinion on National Policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 45, No. 2. (Apr., 2001), pp. 439-456.
- Koch, Jeffrey W. Gender Stereotypes and Citizens' Impressions of House Candidates' Ideological Orientations. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 46, No. 2. (Apr., 2002), pp. 453-462.
- Lawless, Jennerfer L. Women, War and Winning Elections: Gender Sterotyping in the Post 9-11 Era. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. X. (XXX., XXXX), pp. XXX-XXX.
- Lodge, Milton, Kathleen M. McGraw, Patrick Stroh. An Impression-Driven Model of Candidate Evaluation. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, No. 2. (Jun., 1989), pp. 399-419.
- Lodge, Milton, Patrick Stroh, John Wahlke. Black-Box Models of Candidate Evaluation. *Political Behavior*, Vol. 12, No. 1, Cognition and Political Action. (Mar., 1990), pp. 5-18.

Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 89, No. 2. (Jun., 1995), pp. 309-326.

McDermott, Monika L., Race and Gender Cues in Low-Information Elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No. 4. (Dec., 1998), pp. 895-918.

Mendelberg, Tali. Executing Hortons: Racial Crime in the 1988 Presidential Campaign. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 1, Special Issue on Race. (Spring, 1997), pp. 134-157.

Mendelberg, Tali. *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality.* 2001. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mendelberg, Tali. "Racial Priming Revived," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (March 2008), pp. 109-123.

Miller, Arthur H. Public Judgments of Senate and House Candidates. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 4. (Nov., 1990), pp. 525-542.

Oliver, J. Eric and Tali Mendelberg. Reconsidering the Environmental Determinants of White Racial Attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44, No. 3. (Jul., 2000), pp. 574-589.

Peffley Mark, Jon Hurwitz, Paul M. Sniderman. Racial Stereotypes and Whites' Political Views of Blacks in the Context of Welfare and Crime. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 41, No. 1. (Jan., 1997), pp. 30-60.

Petrocik, John R. Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections: With a 1980 Case Study. *American Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 40, No. 3 (Aug., 1996), 825-850.

Reeves, Keith. Voting Hopes or Fears?: White Voters, Black Candidates, and Racial Politics in America. 1997. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sigelman, Lee and Carol K. Sigelman. Sexism, Racism, and Ageism in Voting Behavior: An Experimental Analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 4. (Dec., 1982), pp. 263-269.

Sigelman, Carol K, Lee Sigelman, Barbara J. Walkosz and Michael Nitz. Black Candidates, White Voters: Understanding Racial Bias in Political Perceptions. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 1. (Feb., 1995), pp. 243-265.

Sniderman, Paul M., and Philip E. Tetlock. Symbolic Racism: Problems of Motive Attribution in Political Debate. *Journal of Social Issues* 42(Summer 1986), pp. 129-50.

Terkildsen, Nayda. When White Voters Evaluate Black Candidates: The Processing Implications of Candidate Skin Color, Prejudice, and Self-Monitoring. *American Journal of Political Science*,

Vol. 37, No. 4. (Nov., 1993), pp. 1032-1053.

Valentino, Nicholas A. Crime News and the Priming of Racial Attitudes During Evaluations of the President. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 63, No. 3. (Autumn, 1999), pp. 293-320.

Valentino, Nicholas A., Vincent L. Hutchings and Ismail K. White. Cues That Matter: How Political Ads Prime Racial Attitudes during Campaigns. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1. (Mar., 2002), pp. 75-90.

Valentino, Nicholas A. and David O. Sears. Old Times There Are Not Forgotten: Race and Partisan Realignment in the Contemporary South. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 49, No. 3. (Jul., 2005), pp. 672-688.

Weisberg, Herbert F. and Jerrold G. Rusk. Dimensions of Candidate Evaluation. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4. (Dec., 1970), pp. 1167-1185.

Tables

Table 1: Combinations of Experimental Manipulations

	<u>Experiment 1:</u> Obama as black (Figure 1: headshot)	<u>Experiment 1:</u> Obama deracialized (Figure 2: Illinois state house)
<u>Experiment 2:</u> Obama as black (Figure 3: with African Americans)	1. Racialized: black and seen with blacks	2. Mixed racialized: deracialized but seen with blacks
<u>Experiment 2:</u> Obama beyond race (Figure 4: with whites)	3. Mixed de-racialized: black but seen with whites	4. De-racialized: deracialized and seen with whites

Table 2: Average Scores on Candidate Traits for Obama and Keyes:
White Voters in Illinois by Partisanship

	Democrats on Obama	Republicans on Obama	Democrats on Keyes	Republicans on Keyes
Ability	5.68	4.37	2.42	4.20
Empathy	5.08	3.86	2.52	3.94
N	138	137	138	137

Table 3: Average Scores on Racial Resentment:
White Voters in Illinois by Partisanship

	Democrats	Republicans
Racial Resentment	2.57	2.81
N	138	137

Table 4: ANOVAs of Obama's Ability by 2x2 treatment:
White Voters by Partisanship

Treatment	White Democrats			White Republicans		
	N	Mean	Std Dev	N	Mean	Std Dev
Whitened	43	6.15	0.98	39	4.63	1.54
MixWhite	32	5.96	0.95	33	4.07	1.75
MixBlack	33	5.49	1.86	35	4.10	1.68
RaceEmph	30	4.90	2.36	31	4.69	1.24
Total	138	5.68	1.65	137	4.37	1.58
	F Stat = 4.124 Sig. = .008***			F Stat = 1.523 Sig. = .211		

Table 5: ANOVAs of Obama's Empathy by 2x2 treatment:
White Voters by Partisanship

Treatment	White Democrats			White Republicans		
	N	Mean	Std Dev	N	Mean	Std Dev
Whitened	43	5.53	1.17	39	3.78	1.23
MixWhite	32	5.34	1.14	33	3.53	1.58
MixBlack	33	4.93	1.81	35	3.92	1.34
RaceEmph	30	4.33	2.14	31	4.24	1.36
Total	138	5.08	1.63	137	3.86	1.39
F Stat = 3.783 Sig. = .012**				F Stat = 1.483 Sig. = .222		

Table 6: ANOVAs of Racial Resentment by 2x2 treatment:
White Voters by Partisanship

Treatment	White Democrats			White Republicans		
	N	Mean	Std Dev	N	Mean	Std Dev
Whitened	43	2.59	0.74	39	2.79	0.70
MixWhite	32	2.74	0.71	33	2.80	0.62
MixBlack	33	2.41	0.65	35	3.07	0.72
RaceEmph	30	2.56	0.67	31	2.53	0.54
Total	138	2.57	0.70	137	2.81	0.67
F Stat = 1.263 Sig. = .290				F Stat = 3.765 Sig. = .012***		

Table 7: Obama's Ability Score

	White Democrats Only			White Republicans Only		
Variable	Std. Coef	Std. Error	Sig.	Std. Coef	Std. Error	Sig.
(Constant)						
Strong ID	0.135	0.095	0.132	-0.200	0.082	0.015**
Female	0.191	0.045	0.022**	0.284	0.046	0.001***
Income	-0.186	0.109	0.030**	0.144	0.122	0.108
ChrchAtt	-0.116	0.069	0.163	-0.225	0.064	0.008***
Age	0.004	0.093	0.969	-0.025	0.084	0.791
Education	0.298	0.076	0.002***	0.183	0.079	0.070*
MixBlack	0.154	0.065	0.127	-0.228	0.060	0.025**
MixWhite	0.179	0.067	0.085*	-0.273	0.062	0.008***
Whitened	0.303	0.062	0.005***	-0.109	0.059	0.285
Adjstd R2	0.156			0.174		
sig.	0.000***			0.000***		
	N = 136			N = 136		

*** - sig. at > .01

** - sig. at > .05

* - sig. at > .10

Table 8: Obama's Empathy Score

	White Democrats Only			White Republicans Only		
Variable	Std. Coef	Std. Error	Sig.	Std. Coef	Std. Error	Sig.
(Constant)						
Strong ID	0.240	0.091	0.006***	-0.104	0.076	0.224
Female	0.316	0.043	0.000***	0.281	0.042	0.002***
Income	-0.227	0.105	0.007***	0.015	0.112	0.870
ChrchAtt	-0.081	0.066	0.310	-0.203	0.059	0.021**
Age	-0.004	0.089	0.966	0.104	0.078	0.292
Education	0.258	0.073	0.007***	0.076	0.073	0.472
MixBlack	0.179	0.062	0.067*	-0.174	0.056	0.101*
MixWhite	0.150	0.064	0.135	-0.287	0.057	0.008***
Whitened	0.280	0.059	0.007***	-0.214	0.054	0.046**
Adjstd R2	0.208			0.090		
sig.	.000***			0.012***		
	N = 136			N = 136		

*** - sig. at >.01

** - sig. at > .05

* - sig. at > .10

TABLE 9: Racial Resentment

Variable	White Democrats Only			White Republicans Only		
	Std. Coef	Std. Error	Sig.	Std. Coef	Std. Error	Sig.
(Constant)						
Strong ID	-0.200	0.060	0.028**	0.079	0.051	0.315
Female	-0.150	0.029	0.073*	-0.272	0.028	0.001***
Income	0.032	0.069	0.710	-0.012	0.075	0.885
ChrchAtt	0.095	0.044	0.257	-0.156	0.039	0.055*
Age	0.093	0.059	0.334	0.167	0.052	0.068*
Education	-0.367	0.048	0.000***	-0.310	0.049	0.002***
MixBlack	-0.087	0.041	0.394	0.366	0.037	0.000***
MixWhite	0.208	0.042	0.048**	0.263	0.038	0.008***
Whitened	0.053	0.039	0.618	0.175	0.037	0.077*
Adjstd R2	0.137			0.228		
sig.	0.001***			0.000***		
	N = 135			N = 136		

*** - sig. > .01

** - sig. > .05

* - sig. > .10

Figures

Figure 1: Obama Portrayed as a Black Candidate



Figure 2: Race Neutral Portrayal of Obama



Figure 3: Obama Portrayed with Blacks



Figure 4: Obama Portrayed with Whites

