

## *Appendix*

This appendix provides detailed information on the multiple data sources and methodology used to obtain the findings discussed in the text.

### *Chapter 3*

To examine party images over time, I employ survey data collected over the past fifty years. Since 1952, the American National Election Study (ANES)<sup>1</sup> has included open-ended questions that have solicited respondents' perceptions of the two major parties. While the same questions have not been asked for every survey year, two comparable questions permit the examination of respondents' images of the two major parties with respect to race over time. The first pair of questions, originally used by Matthews and Prothro (1964) and employed in subsequent studies of party image (see, e.g., Trilling 1976), asks respondents if there is anything in particular that they like/don't like about the Democratic/Republican Party. The second question asks respondents whether they perceive any differences between the Democratic

1. The American National Election Study (ANES) is a series of national surveys fielded continuously since 1948. The ANES is designed to collect data on Americans' social backgrounds, political predispositions, social and political attitudes, perceptions and evaluations of groups and candidates, opinions on questions of public policy, and political participation. Carried out by the Survey Research Center (SRC) or the Center for Political Studies (CPS) of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, the ANES is based on representative cross-section samples of between 1,000 and 2,000 voting-age citizens living in private households. Each study contains information from interviews conducted with 1,000–2,000 respondents interviewed before and after presidential elections and occasionally after congressional elections (ANES).

and Republican Parties and, if so, what these differences are. Both questions are coded similarly, denoting when a respondent perceived either party as having a positive or negative position toward racially identified groups. By positive, I mean responses indicating that a party was problack or racially liberal. Similarly, negative responses denoted when a respondent indicated that a party was bad for blacks and other minorities or was racist. For each year, responses from the entire sample were aggregated, and the percentage of negative responses was subtracted from the percentage of positive responses to give a summary response. The frequency of these responses permits discussion of the clarity of popular perceptions of the parties' racial symbolism.

I also use responses to the following question:

*Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every possible effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks and other minority groups. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help minorities because they should help themselves. Where would you place the Democratic/Republican Party on this scale?*

The scale runs from 1 to 7, where 1 is "Government should help minority groups" and 7 is "Minorities should help themselves." This question has appeared repeatedly on the ANES since 1970. For each year, I compared the mean placement of each party on this scale for all respondents and then compared the mean placement for blacks and whites separately. I use responses to this question for a couple of reasons. First, it is the only question that asks respondents to evaluate the two parties on race in multiple years. Second, this item is not tied to any particular policy. Rather, it requires respondents to make a general assessment of the parties' willingness to address social and economic inequalities.

To examine contemporary party images, I conducted a series of focus groups and qualitative interviews. Focus groups and interviews seem particularly well suited given the task at hand. Because I am trying to allow people to define in their own words what the two major parties stand for, I need a format that facilitates unrestricted inquiry. I need to assess the full range of considerations people bring to bear when evaluating a party. Unlike survey questions, including open-ended questions, focus group and qualitative interview questions permit me to probe and follow up on responses to get at such issues.

Moreover, the incorporation of focus group data is essential because it facilitates the interaction among participants and encourages them to challenge and probe each other's ideas and responses. Naturally, while the qualitative portion of this study cannot match the polling data in sample size (thereby sacrificing the ability to generalize), the depth of qualitative research allows a kind of "pattern-matching" (D. Campbell 1975, 182). As Lin (1998) argues, this type of research permits researchers to uncover people's conscious and unconscious explanations for what they do or believe. The qualitative data allow me to ask respondents' specifically about their perceptions of the two major parties on race. In addition, this inquiry allows me to examine what it means when a respondent indicates that a party is "bad for African Americans" or is "racist."

As mentioned earlier, the qualitative data presented in this chapter are the product of a series of focus groups and qualitative interviews. To get a broad range of responses, I recruited subjects by race, sex, and partisanship. The participants in each of the focus groups were matched according to their race and partisanship. Given that the questions were somewhat racially sensitive, interviewers were also matched by race.

The first African American group consisted of four women between the ages of 35 and 60 whom I recruited while attending a public policy conference in Washington, D.C., in the early fall of 2000. Two of the women were from the Midwest, and two were from the South. All of the women had baccalaureate degrees. The second focus group also consisted of four African American women, but these women were much younger, ranging in age from 18 to 20. All were students at the University of Michigan: two were from Michigan, one was from New Jersey, and the fourth was from Colorado. This focus group was conducted in Michigan, also in the early fall of 2000. Both focus groups lasted approximately two hours.

To balance out the female focus groups, I also conducted interviews with three college-educated African American males between the ages of 23 and 31. One man was from Michigan, one was from South Carolina, and the third was from New York. The interviews were conducted during November 2000, and each interview lasted between 30 and 40 minutes.

The first white focus group was conducted during the fall of 2001. This group consisted of one female and two male University of Michi-

gan students between the ages of 18 and 21 recruited from an introductory world politics course. The second focus group also consisted of University of Michigan undergraduates. To ensure ample representation of Republican views, I solicited the help of an assistant to recruit Republican students—two male and one female—to participate in this group. Again, the students' ages ranged from 18 to 21. The third focus group consisted of nonstudent participants recruited from an Ann Arbor business. Participants in this group ranged in age from 21 to about 45. The second and third focus groups were conducted during the spring of 2003. With the exception of one student in the first white focus group who was from New York, all of the participants were from Michigan. None of the participants in the white focus groups had completed college. Each of the focus groups lasted approximately two hours. Table A1 summarizes the characteristics of the respondents quoted in chapter 3.

#### Chapter 4

To examine the media's framing of the 2000 Republican convention, I conducted a quantitative content analysis of the media's coverage of the convention. According to Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (1998),

Quantitative content analysis is the systematic and replicable examination of symbols of communication, which have been assigned

**TABLE A1. Summary of Respondent Characteristics**

Respondent Number	Age	Race	Sex	Education
1	18–21	Black	Female	Some college
2	18–21	Black	Female	Some college
3	21–35	Black	Male	College degree
4	18–21	Black	Female	Some college
5	35+	Black	Female	College degree
6	35+	Black	Female	College degree
7	21–35	Black	Male	College degree
8	21–35	Black	Male	College degree
9	18–21	White	Male	Some college
10	18–21	White	Male	Some college
11	35+	White	Female	High School
12	18–21	White	Female	Some college
13	18–21	White	Female	Some college
14	18–21	White	Female	Some college
15	21–35	White	Male	Some college

numeric values according to valid measurement rules, and the analysis of relationships involving those values using statistical methods, in order to describe the communication, draw inferences about its meaning, or infer from the communication to its context, both of production and consumption. (21)

Thus, I quantified the frequency with which the media referred to the Republicans' race strategy, the tone the media used in their overall coverage of the convention, and the relationships between these two factors as well as how these factors interacted with the source of the coverage and the proximity to different convention events.

This chapter relies on print media coverage of the 2000 Republican convention. The data are drawn from three nationally circulated newspapers (the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *Washington Post*) and a sample of thirteen African American news sources (the *Baltimore Afro-American*, the *Jacksonville Free Press*, the *Los Angeles Sentinel*, the *New York Amsterdam News*, the *New York Beacon*, the *New York Voice*, the *Oakland Post*, the *Sacramento Observer*, the *Speakin' Out News*, the *Philadelphia Tribune*, the *Tennessee Tribune*, the *Voice*, and the *Washington Informer*). The analyses includes news articles, editorials, opinion columns, and letters to the editor from July 24 (one week before the convention) through August 10 (one week after the convention). Articles from the two nationally circulated newspapers were downloaded from LEXIS-NEXIS Academic Universe.<sup>2</sup> Articles appearing in black newspapers were obtained from Ethnic NewsWatch.<sup>3</sup> Articles were included in the sample if "Republican convention" appeared in the headline or in the lead paragraph. This coding rule allowed me to confine the sample of articles to those whose primary focus was the Republican convention. Each article was assigned a unique identification number and then coded for the story's tone, racial references, and appearance relative to the convention. The sample included 197 articles. As table 5 shows, 8.6 percent of the articles were drawn from the black newspapers, and 91.4 percent of the articles were drawn from the *Los Angeles Times*, the *New York Times*,

2. LEXIS-NEXIS Academic Universe is an electronic collection of news and other reference information.

3. Ethnic NewsWatch is also an electronic collection of news information, but the information contained on this site is restricted to ethnic and minority news sources. To maximize the number of articles in the sample, all African American newspapers available online were included in the search.

and the *Washington Post*. To draw comparisons to other Republican National Conventions, I also include content analyses of print news coverage of the 1988, 1992, and 1996 conventions.<sup>4</sup>

Each article was coded for valence, race references, presence of discussion of platform, and presence of discussion of conference attendees. To code valence, an article was coded as negative if the author of the article explicitly criticized or used quotes from outside sources (without rebuttal) to criticize the Republican Party or its candidates. An article was coded as positive if the author of the article explicitly praised or used quotes from outside sources (without rebuttal) to praise the Republican Party or its candidates. An article was coded as neutral if the article contained neither criticism nor praise or presented both sides of an argument. For these analyses, only the news articles were examined, since editorials, letters to the editor, and so on are expected to have some biases. An article contained a race reference if the article discussed the race of the convention delegates, the race of the performers or speakers appearing during the convention, the reaction (or anticipated reaction) of African American/minority voters to the convention, or the Republican Party's emphasis on inclusion or diversity. To gauge the amount of coverage devoted to the Republican Party's platform relative to coverage of those present at the convention, the articles were coded 1 if the article discussed the GOP's platform or its position on a specific issue and 0 if the article did not. Similarly, articles were coded 1 if the article mentioned the presence of any specific constituencies, delegates, speakers, or entertainers at the convention and 0 if the article did not.

As Holsti (1969) argues, “[I]f research is to satisfy the requirement of objectivity, measures and procedures must be reliable; i.e., repeated measures with the same instrument on a given sample of data should yield similar results” (135). Thus, to ensure reliability in coding, an additional coder was solicited to code a subsample of 50 randomly

4. The content analysis for past conventions was confined to one newspaper, the *New York Times*. However, the same coding rules applied. The 1988 Republican National Convention was held August 15–18 in New Orleans. Articles for this year appeared between August 9 and August 24. The 1992 convention was held in Houston on August 17–21. The coding period for this year was August 11–27. Finally, the 1996 Republican National Convention in San Diego was held August 12–15. Articles in 1996 were coded from August 6 through August 21. A total of 103 articles were coded—16 from 1988, 36 from 1992, and 51 from 1996.

selected articles independently of the primary coder. The results from the two coders were then compared. Overall, the agreement between the two coders was fairly high. According to Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (1998), the standard minimum level of agreement should be 80 percent. Of the 50 articles selected from the sample, 90 percent were coded the same for platform, 90 percent of racial references were coded consistently, 92 percent were coded the same for tone, and 96 percent were coded the same for presence. To control for the possibility of agreement by chance, the Scott's pi was calculated for the four variables. When controlling for chance, a Scott's pi of 70 percent or greater is an acceptable level of reliability. The percentage of expected agreement by chance—that is, the level of agreement expected if the two coders randomly assigned the articles to categories—for the platform variable is 50 percent. The coding results for this study yielded a Scott's pi of .80. For the race reference variable, the expected agreement by chance is .65 and the Scott's pi is .72. With respect to tone, the expected agreement by chance is 49 percent and the Scott's pi is .84. Finally, the expected agreement by chance for the presence variable is 50 percent and the Scott's pi is .92. Even controlling for chance, the coding met the generally accepted standard of agreement.

### *Chapter 5*

In chapter 5, I rely on two data sources to increase both the internal and external validity of my results. First, to get a general sense of how convention exposure resonated in the electorate, I use secondary analysis of the Gallup Organization's Post-GOP Convention Poll,<sup>5</sup> which was conducted by telephone on August 4–6, 2000, only a few days after the close of the Republican convention. The polling sample included a national probability sample of 1,051 adults. In addition, the poll also included an oversample of 319 African American adults, resulting in a total *N* of 1,370. Respondents were asked a series of questions about politics, including their level of attentiveness to the convention; how well they believed the Republican Party reached out to blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities; and their likelihood of voting for George W. Bush.

To get at the precise causal relationship between convention exposure and subsequent perceptions and evaluations of the Republican

5. This data set was obtained from the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research.

Party, I conducted the 2002–2003 Party Image Study, which incorporated an experiment into its design. The experiment sought to replicate exposure to the 2000 Republican National Convention and to incorporate the different framing of the convention people might have encountered in the media. Using data from the content analysis, the experiment incorporates three versions of the convention. In this experiment, subjects were asked to read a series of three newspaper articles that they were told had originally appeared in various newspapers over the preceding couple of years. The first and third articles were actual newspaper articles slightly edited to establish length uniformity. The second article took one of four forms, three of which were contrived and one of which was a real article used as a control.

The three contrived articles discussed the 2000 Republican convention. The headline of the first read, “Republicans Open Convention.” The body of the article contained the following information: (1) the Republican Party was finally catching up with the Democrats in the art of appealing to swing voters; (2) the 2000 convention program featured numerous speakers and entertainers in support of the GOP’s platform; (3) the 2000 convention was part of an ongoing outreach effort to increase support among the electorate; (4) swing voters generally agreed with the Republican Party on moral and education issues but would vote Democrat if the election were held tomorrow; (5) Theodore Williams, chairman of the Voters Project, believed that the Republican outreach effort constituted an unprecedented attempt to reach out to swing voters but admitted that he was unsure about how voters would respond; and (6) GOP leaders were aware that they had little chance of winning the majority of the swing vote but knew that every vote would count in what was predicted to be a tight election. The article was accompanied by a picture of convention attendees captioned, “Excitement sweeps convention attendees at the opening of the 2000 Republican National Convention.” This article sought to recreate convention events, absent any references to the show of diversity displayed during the convention.

The second article was nearly identical to the first except that it depicted the Republican Party as reaching out to African American voters rather than swing voters. The headline read, “Republicans Open Convention, with a More Diverse Look.” The body of the article contained the following information: (1) the Republican Party was finally catching up with the Democrats in the art of appealing to black voters;



(2) the 2000 convention program featured numerous African American speakers and entertainers in support of the GOP's platform; (3) the 2000 convention was part of an ongoing outreach effort to increase support among the black electorate; (4) black voters generally agreed with the Republican Party on moral and education issues but would vote Democrat if the election were held tomorrow; (5) Theodore Williams, chairman of the Black Voters Project, believed that the Republican outreach effort constituted an unprecedented attempt to reach out to black voters but admitted that he was unsure about how black voters would respond; and (6) GOP leaders were aware that they would have little chance of winning the majority of the black vote but knew that every vote would count in what was predicted to be a tight election. The article was accompanied by a picture of about thirty well-dressed African American men and women on stage at the 2000 Republican National Convention captioned, "Prominent African American leaders gather on stage at the opening of the 2000 Republican National Convention." This article is sought to re-create the Republican Party's attempt to appear racially inclusive at the convention.

The third contrived article was identical to the second except that it explicitly stated that the Republican Party had not changed its platform despite its attempt to appear racially inclusive. The body of the article contained the following additional information: (1) the 2000 convention program featured numerous black speakers and entertainers in support of the GOP's *traditional* platform; (2) Ed Jones, convention coordinator, was quoted as saying, "We've got a great message *and our ideas and principles remain unchanged*"; (3) Jones also stated that although the party's policy positions remained the same, the display of diversity illustrated the Republican Party's enthusiasm about sharing its message with black voters; (4) Theodore Williams, chairman of the Black Voters Project, believed that the Republican outreach effort constituted an unprecedented attempt to reach out to black voters but admitted that he was unsure about how black voters would respond *since Republicans hadn't actually changed their platform*. This manipulation sought to examine whether differences in media framing affect individuals' reactions to the GOP outreach effort. Specifically, this manipulation examined whether explicitly highlighting that the changes in the Republican Party were cosmetic rather than substantive minimized the effect of this campaign strategy.

As stated earlier, the fourth article is a control treatment. This par-

ticular article is about the effects of acid rain and contains absolutely no information about the Republican Party or political party conventions. The purpose of the control is to determine attitudes when subjects are not primed to think about the Republican Party or the convention.<sup>6</sup>

To obtain enough variance in the demographic characteristics and political predispositions within the sample, I recruited nonstudent subjects from a number of locations, including various hotel lobbies in Washtenaw County, Michigan. In addition, I oversampled among African Americans to make interracial comparisons across subjects. To ensure the inclusion of enough African Americans, subjects were recruited from a number of black venues, including churches, barber-shops, and hair salons. The study was in the field from September 2002 to March 2003. Including the black oversample, I recruited 302 subjects (172 whites and 130 blacks) for the experiment.

The subjects were randomly assigned to one of the four treatments. The experiment was embedded in a questionnaire. In addition to reading the articles, the subjects were asked a number of questions designed to assess their level of media usage, political interest and participation, party identification, and ideological orientation. Subjects were also asked to answer questions about their racial attitudes, policy preferences, the political parties' policy preferences, and their affective response to the political parties. Finally, the subjects were asked to provide standard demographic information such as education, age, gender, race, and religion.

I am primarily interested in whether watching the convention

6. Before administering the experiment, the treatments were pretested on a group of undergraduates from the University of Michigan. Included in the student sample were 52 students recruited from various political science courses. The purpose of the pretest was to ensure that the subjects could observe the subtle differences among the manipulations. The results of the pretest indicated that 76 percent of the subjects who received one of the two articles about the GOP's outreach efforts to African Americans correctly indicated that the Republican convention featured many African Americans. Only 4 percent of the subjects who read either the control article or the swing voter article indicated that they read an article indicating that the 2000 Republican National Convention featured many African Americans. Of the subjects who received the swing voter article, 85 percent correctly indicated that they read an article about the Republican Party reaching out to swing voters, compared to 17 percent who did not read that article. All of the subjects in the control group recognized that they had read an article about acid rain, and none of the subjects in the other three treatment groups indicated that they had read an article about acid rain. Finally, 64 percent of the subjects who read the article explicitly stating that the Republican Party had not changed its platform indicated that the Republican Party had not changed its platform in 2000, compared to 0 percent in the control treatment group and 54 percent in the other two treatment groups.

affected people's perception of the racial components of the Republican Party's image. Measuring these perceptions required a question that asked respondents to interpret the racial meaning of the party's activities (i.e., whether the party is problack). This meaning should be derived without any mention of specific policies or personas in the actual question wording. To measure this concept, I use an item included on the Gallup survey: "Would you say the Republican Party is generally doing a good job or a bad job these days, of reaching out to blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities?" Responses were coded 1 for a good job, 0 for a bad job, .5 if a response was mixed/neither. For consistency, this measure was included on the experimental questionnaire.

These analyses also sought to examine the impact of convention exposure on candidate evaluations and vote preference. Discovering that the Republican Party altered people's perceptions of its racial symbolism represents only an intermediate step in the causal chain leading to vote choice. To gauge candidate preference in the survey analyses, I use the responses to the following question: "Now, if Al Gore were the Democratic Party's candidate and George W. Bush and Dick Cheney were the Republican Party's candidates, who would you be more likely to vote for?" A vote for Bush/Cheney was coded 1, while a vote for Gore was coded 0. Because the experiment was conducted two years after the 2000 presidential election, I used responses to a George W. Bush feeling thermometer instead of vote choice. In this question, subjects were asked to rate Bush on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 to 49 meant that the subject did not feel favorably toward Bush, 50 was neutral, and 51 to 100 meant that the subject had particularly warm (favorable) feelings toward Bush.

The primary independent variable in these analyses is convention exposure. In the survey, convention exposure is measured by self-reported convention watching. If respondents watched a great deal of the convention, their responses were coded 1; if respondents watched none or little of the convention, their responses were coded 0. Responses were dichotomized in this way because it was assumed that maximum exposure to the convention would ensure that convention watchers were exposed to the Republican race strategy. Because exposure to the convention is manipulated directly in the experiment, degrees of exposure to the convention are represented by the experimental conditions.

Studies have found that political inference tends to be a function of an individual's political preferences (Conover and Feldman 1989). Therefore, in examining the impact of watching the GOP convention on perceptions of the Republican Party on racial outreach, I also included several measures of the respondents' political predispositions and demographic characteristics.

First, I included the respondents' party identification and ideology as additional measures of political predispositions. Party identification in the Post-GOP Convention Poll was coded using a two-part question, resulting in a 5-point scale running from Republican (0) to Democrat (1). In the experiment, party identification is measured using a 7-point scale that ran from Republican (0) to Democrat (1). I include party identification because I expect any evaluation (not just affective evaluation but evaluation in terms of propensity to do something, i.e., reach out to minorities) of a party to be a function of prior evaluations of that party (Downs 1957; Jackson 1975; Fiorina 1981). Because the data are cross-sectional and there is no measure of perceptions of the Republican Party before the convention, party identification proxies as a measure of previous evaluations. I also include the respondents' ideology as an additional measure of political predispositions. Ideology is measured in the Post-GOP Convention Poll using a 5-point scale running from very conservative (0) to very liberal (1). In the 2002–2003 Party Image Study, ideology is measured with a similarly coded 7-point scale.

Finally, I include demographic variables that measure gender, race, income, education, and age. The inclusion of the respondents' race is particularly important, given the relevance of the Republican campaign appeals to the African American community.<sup>7</sup> Because of previous interaction and experience with the GOP, I expect the race variable to act as a political predisposition, anchoring the effect of watching the convention (see chapter 1).

Tables A2–A8 present the results.

### Chapter 6

The content analysis in this chapter relies on print media coverage of the 2000 election. The data are drawn from the *New York Amsterdam*

7. The survey sample included 390 African Americans and 954 non-African Americans, of whom 859 were white. Hispanics, Asians, and other minority groups were included only in the analyses utilizing the entire sample. Otherwise, the analyses only included blacks and whites.

**TABLE A2. Perceptions of the Republican Party's Racial Symbolism**

	All	Whites	Blacks
Watching the convention	<b>.070</b> (.03)	<b>.103</b> (.04)	-.018 (.06)
Gender	<b>.044</b> (.03)	<b>.067</b> (.03)	-.035 (.05)
Age	<b>-.001</b> (.00)	<b>-.002</b> (.00)	.000 (.00)
Education	-.011 (.01)	<b>-.020</b> (.01)	.009 (.02)
Income	<b>-.030</b> (.01)	<b>-.026</b> (.01)	<b>-.037</b> (.02)
Party identification	<b>-.473</b> (.03)	<b>-.394</b> (.04)	<b>-.631</b> (.07)
Ideology	<b>-.142</b> (.06)	<b>-.283</b> (.08)	.006 (.08)
Black	<b>-.123</b> (.03)		
Constant	<b>1.135</b> (.08)	<b>1.221</b> (.10)	<b>.953</b> (.12)
N	1,096	712	329
R-squared	.27	.23	.20

Source: Post-GOP Convention Poll.

Note: Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

*News* and the *New York Times*. The analyses include news articles, editorials, opinion columns, and letters to the editor for the period November 7 (Election Day) through December 13 (when Al Gore conceded the election). Articles from the *New York Times* were downloaded from LEXIS-NEXIS Academic Universe. Those from the *New York Amsterdam News* were downloaded from Ethnic NewsWatch. Articles were included in the sample if “Republican Party” appeared in the headline or in the lead paragraph. This coding rule allowed me to confine the sample of articles to those whose primary focus was on the Republican Party. One hundred articles were included in this sample—88 from the *New York Times* and 12 from the *New York Amsterdam News*. Each article was assigned a unique identification number and then coded for the presence of different themes, including the Florida recount and the discussion of racial minorities.

To gauge public opinion, I rely on the 2002 ANES, which consists of pre- and postelection surveys. Data collection for this study began in

**TABLE A3. The Impact of Convention Frames on Perceptions of the Republican Party's Racial Symbolism**

	Whites	Blacks
Race-neutral	.048 (.08)	-.008 (.09)
Race-no platform	<b>.138</b> (.09)	.012 (.11)
Race-platform	.062 (.08)	-.050 (.08)
Gender	<b>.079</b> (.06)	-.013 (.07)
Age	.000 (.00)	<b>-.004</b> (.00)
Education	<b>.068</b> (.04)	-.022 (.04)
Income	<b>-.021</b> (.01)	<b>-.022</b> (.02)
Party identification	<b>-.264</b> (.15)	-.001 (.15)
Ideology	<b>-.441</b> (.14)	.004 (.12)
Constant	<b>.565</b> (.18)	<b>.754</b> (.21)
<i>N</i>	135	90
<i>R</i> -squared	.22	.15

*Source:* 2002–2003 Party Image Study.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

September 2002 and ended in December 2002. The survey was conducted by telephone, and the sample included a national probability sample of 1,807 adults who participated in the 2000 ANES and an additional 1,175 adults interviewed in 2002. Respondents were asked a series of questions about politics, including whether they voted and for whom, their attitudes toward the 2000 election, and their evaluations of different candidates and groups in society.

I was interested in whether attitudes toward the 2000 election affected people's perceptions of the Republican Party and its ability to represent different groups. To measure these perceptions, I used a series of questions that asked respondents to evaluate whether the

**TABLE A4. The Joint Effects of Race and Party Identification on Perceptions of the Republican Party's Racial Symbolism by Convention Exposure**

	Did Not Watch	Watched
Party identification	<b>-.414</b> (.04)	<b>-.455</b> (.08)
Black	-.035 (.09)	.106 (.12)
Black × Party identification	-.124 (.10)	<b>-.362</b> (.14)
Gender	.038 (.03)	.027 (.05)
Age	<b>-.002</b> (.00)	.002 (.00)
Education	-.015 (.01)	.016 (.02)
Income	<b>-.035</b> (.01)	-.006 (.02)
Ideology	<b>-.150</b> (.07)	-.105 (.13)
Constant	<b>1.187</b> (.09)	<b>.750</b> (.18)
N	837	204
R-squared	.23	.42

*Source:* Post-GOP Convention Poll.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

Republican or Democratic Party was better for a particular group. Specifically, I used questions that asked respondents to evaluate the parties' ability to represent blacks, whites, women, men, the poor, and the rich. Responses were coded 1 for Democrat, 0 for Republican, and .5 if a respondent saw little difference between the two parties.

I also examined the impact of attitudes toward the 2000 election on attitudes toward George W. Bush. To do so, I used responses to a Bush feeling thermometer. In this question, subjects were asked to rate Bush on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 to 49 meant that the subject did not feel favorably toward Bush, 50 was neutral, and 51 to 100 meant that the subject had particularly warm (favorable) feelings toward Bush.

The primary independent variable in these analyses is attitudes toward the 2000 election. To measure these evaluations, I used

**TABLE A5. The Joint Effects of Race and Party Identification on Perceptions of the Republican Party's Racial Symbolism by Experimental Treatment Conditions**

	Control	Race-Neutral	Race-No Platform	Race-Platform
Black	<b>.324</b> (.15)	.134 (.22)	.230 (.22)	.143 (.20)
Party identification	<b>-.691</b> (.16)	<b>-.306</b> (.22)	<b>-.602</b> (.23)	<b>-.466</b> (.21)
Black × Party identification	<b>-.063</b> (.05)	-.043 (.07)	<b>-.100</b> (.06)	-.064 (.06)
Constant	<b>.745</b> (.09)	<b>.555</b> (.13)	<b>.766</b> (.13)	<b>.659</b> (.11)
<i>N</i>	64	68	68	70
<i>R</i> -squared	.25	.03	.10	.08

*Source:* 2002–2003 Party Image Study.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

responses to the following question: “All things considered, would you say that the 2000 presidential election was decided in a way that was fair or unfair? Do you feel strongly or not strongly that it was fair/unfair?” Responses were coded 1 if a respondent believed strongly that the election was fair, .67 if his or her approval of the election was not strong, .33 if the respondent disapproved not strongly of the 2000 election, and 0 if the respondent disapproved strongly.

I also included several measures of the respondents' political predispositions and demographic characteristics. First, I included the respondents' party identification and ideology as additional measures of political predispositions. Party identification was coded using a two-part question, resulting in a 7-point scale running from Republican (1) to Democrat (7). I also included the respondents' ideology as an additional measure of political predisposition. Ideology was measured using a 7-point scale running from very conservative (1) to very liberal (7). Finally, I included demographic variables that measured gender, race, income, education, and age.

Tables A9–A11 present the results.

### Chapter 7

Chapter 7 relies on experimental data collected as part of the 2005 Party Image Study, which took place in June–August 2005. This study



**TABLE A6. Voting for George W. Bush Based on Convention Exposure and Perceptions of the Republican Party's Racial Symbolism by Race**

	Whites	Blacks
Racial symbolism	<b>.571</b> (.33)	<b>1.483</b> (.53)
Watching the convention	<b>-1.491</b> (.72)	<b>1.014</b> (.64)
Racial symbolism × Watching the convention	<b>2.617</b> (.93)	.192 (1.40)
Gender	.351 (.30)	<b>-1.076</b> (.63)
Age	-.007 (.01)	-.006 (.01)
Education	<b>-.200</b> (.11)	<b>-.546</b> (.22)
Income	<b>.246</b> (.10)	.071 (.15)
Ideology	<b>-2.966</b> (.73)	<b>3.029</b> (.96)
Party identification	<b>-4.924</b> (.42)	<b>-5.662</b> (1.07)
Constant	<b>4.473</b> (.98)	<b>3.880</b> (1.90)
N	616	282
Log pseudo-likelihood	-164.01	-67.35

*Source:* Post-GOP Convention Poll.

*Note:* Estimates are logistic regression coefficients with robust standard errors. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

sought to expose people to a scenario in which a political party attempted to reshape its image without changing its platform and to measure the extent to which people perceived differences in the party. To do so, I conducted an experiment. There were two versions of the experiment—one for the Democratic Party (which is used in chapter 8) and one for the Republican Party (chapter 7). Each version presented subjects with one of three scenarios. Table A12 provides the exact question wording for the Republican version of the experiment. The first scenario, which is the race-neutral condition, simply informed subjects that the party was attempting to reach out to voters who did not currently align with that party. In the race-no platform condition, the Republican Party was reaching out to African Americans, while the

**TABLE A7. George W. Bush Feeling Thermometer Based on Convention Exposure and Perceptions of the Republican Party's Racial Symbolism by Race**

	Whites	Blacks
Race-neutral treatment	<b>-32.755</b> (12.78)	-8.381 (19.00)
Race-no platform treatment	<b>-27.917</b> (11.40)	<b>-19.322</b> (11.78)
Race-platform treatment	<b>-29.521</b> (9.41)	<b>-25.560</b> (10.71)
Racial symbolism	-2.075 (5.53)	-3.445 (13.16)
Racial symbolism × Race-neutral treatment	-5.150 (7.66)	20.307 (23.31)
Racial symbolism × Race-no platform treatment	<b>48.298</b> (12.73)	<b>23.745</b> (14.86)
Racial symbolism × Race-platform treatment	<b>43.042</b> (12.62)	<b>55.223</b> (19.03)
Gender	-4.796 (3.85)	3.399 (7.02)
Age	-.030 (.14)	.002 (.21)
Education	<b>-5.445</b> (2.52)	-.586 (3.25)
Income	.472 (.74)	1.674 (1.18)
Party identification	<b>8.781</b> (2.52)	1.033 (7.07)
Ideology	<b>-35.581</b> (10.67)	-9.222 (11.63)
Constant	<b>47.501</b> (8.55)	<b>37.321</b> (23.27)
<i>N</i>	117	83
<i>R</i> -squared	.51	.20

*Source:* 2002–2003 Party Image Study.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

Democratic Party was attempting to distance itself from African Americans. The race-platform condition was identical to the race-no platform condition except that subjects were told explicitly that the parties had not changed their platforms. Finally, I included a control group where subjects did not read anything about the parties.

To obtain enough variance in the demographic characteristics and

**TABLE A8. The Effects of Watching the Convention among Southern Whites**

	Racial Symbolism	Vote Intent
Racial symbolism		.232 (.70)
Watching the convention	<b>.103</b> (.06)	<b>-3.002</b> (1.71)
Racial symbolism × Watching the convention		<b>5.284</b> (1.90)
Gender	.058 (.06)	.184 (.70)
Age	<b>-.002</b> (.00)	.02 (.02)
Education	-.030 (.02)	-.185 (.19)
Income	-.021 (.02)	.273 (.23)
Party identification	<b>-.409</b> (.08)	<b>-5.917</b> (.97)
Ideology	<b>-.250</b> (.15)	-.740 (1.28)
Constant	<b>1.312</b> (.18)	2.841 (2.27)
<i>N</i>	185	169
<i>R</i> -squared	.24	
Log pseudo-likelihood		-36.34

*Source:* Post-GOP Convention Poll.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors for the racial symbolism model and logistic regression coefficients with robust standard errors for the vote intent model. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (one-tailed test).

political predispositions within the sample, I recruited nonstudent subjects from a number of locations, including hotel lobbies in Austin, Texas, and an art fair in Ann Arbor, Michigan. In addition, I oversampled among African Americans to make interracial comparisons across subjects. To ensure the inclusion of enough African Americans, subjects were recruited from the Conference on Christian Education, which is part of the National Baptist Convention, a historically black denomination. Including the black oversample, I recruited 436 subjects for the experiment (226 blacks, 59 southern whites, and 151 non-southern whites).

**TABLE A9. Impressions of the Republican Party's Image on Race Based on Perceived Fairness of the 2000 Election**

	Blacks	Whites
Perceived fairness of 2000 election	-.156 (.04)	.013 (.04)
Age	.001 (.00)	<b>.002</b> (.00)
Party identification	<b>.032</b> (.01)	.009 (.01)
Income	-.001 (.01)	-.006 (.01)
Black	-.008 (.05)	-.079 (.05)
Female	-.031 (.03)	.035 (.03)
Education	.009 (.01)	-.007 (.01)
Ideology	.013 (.01)	.013 (.01)
Constant	<b>.535</b> (.10)	<b>.286</b> (.10)
<i>N</i>	398	398
Adjusted <i>R</i> -squared	.19	.027

*Source:* 2002 American National Election Study.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (two-tailed test).

As stated earlier, the subjects were randomly assigned to one of six treatments or a control. The experiment was embedded in a questionnaire. In addition to reading the experimental treatment, the subjects were asked a number of questions designed to assess their level of political participation, party identification, and ideological orientation. Subjects were also asked to answer questions about their racial attitudes and the political parties. Finally, the subjects were asked to provide standard demographic information such as education, age, gender, race, and religion. The entire questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete. After subjects completed the study, they received \$10 in cash for their participation.

Figure 18 presents the means of the Republican Party's placement on the racial symbolism dimension. To determine the statistical

**Table A10. Impressions of the Republican Party's Image on Gender and Class Based on Perceived Fairness of the 2000 Election**

	Women	Men	Rich	Poor
Perceived fairness of 2000 election	<b>-.109</b> (.04)	-.016 (.04)	.047 (.03)	<b>-.094</b> (.03)
Age	<b>-.002</b> (.00)	<b>.003</b> (.00)	.000 (.00)	.000 (.00)
Party identification	<b>.037</b> (.01)	.006 (.01)	<b>-.041</b> (.01)	<b>.059</b> (.01)
Income	.005 (.01)	.003 (.01)	-.004 (.01)	.003 (.01)
Black	-.020 (.06)	<b>.103</b> (.06)	.055 (.04)	-.026 (.04)
Female	-.032 (.03)	.004 (.03)	.024 (.02)	-.011 (.02)
Education	.014 (.01)	.009 (.01)	<b>-.017</b> (.01)	.010 (.01)
Ideology	<b>.023</b> (.01)	.016 (.01)	-.008 (.01)	<b>.026</b> (.01)
Constant	<b>.458</b> (.09)	<b>.346</b> (.09)	<b>.449</b> (.07)	<b>.418</b> (.07)
<i>N</i>	389	390	788	790
Adjusted <i>R</i> -squared	.22	.03	.13	.29

*Source:* 2002 American National Election Study.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (two-tailed test).

significance, I conducted  $t$ -tests between the control condition and the race-neutral and racialized conditions. The significance level for all analyses was  $p < .10$  (one-tailed test).

### Chapter 8

Chapter 8 relies on experimental data collected as part of the 2005 Party Image Study. As discussed in chapter 7, the 2005 Party Image Study sought to expose people to a scenario in which a political party attempted to reshape its image and measure the extent to which people perceived differences in the party. (See the preceding section for a more detailed discussion of the experiment.) Chapter 8 uses the Democratic version of the question wording experiment.

Table A13 provides the exact question wording for the Democratic

**TABLE A11. George W. Bush  
Feeling Thermometer**

Perceived fairness of 2000 election	<b>19.775</b> (1.94)
Age	-.002 (.04)
Party identification	<b>-3.552</b> (.43)
Income	.066 (.34)
Black	-2.138 (2.59)
Female	1.685 (1.27)
Education	<b>-.846</b> (.45)
Ideology	<b>-3.037</b> (.53)
Constant	<b>83.470</b> (4.59)
<i>N</i>	784
Adjusted <i>R</i> -squared	.50

*Source:* 2002 American National Election Study.

*Note:* Estimates are OLS coefficients. Standard errors appear in parentheses under coefficient estimates. Bold coefficients are significant at the  $p < .10$  level (two-tailed test).

version of the experiment. The first scenario, which is the race-neutral condition, simply informed subjects that the party was attempting to reach out to voters who did not currently align with that party. In the race–no platform condition, the Democratic Party was reaching out to Republican-leaning voters while distancing itself from black voters. The race–platform condition was identical to the race–no platform condition except that subjects were told explicitly that the party had not changed its platform. Finally, I included a control group where subjects did not read anything about the party. For the analyses in this chapter, I combined both racialized treatment groups into one. Before doing so, I estimated the effect of each treatment group on the dependent variable. The difference between the two racialized treatment groups relative to the control group was statistically indistinguishable from zero.

**TABLE A12. 2005 Party Image Study Experimental Treatment Groups**

Control	How much do you think that the Republican Party has changed over the last few years?
Race-neutral	<p>During its 2004 national convention, the Republican Party tried to appeal to Democratic-leaning voters. The 2004 convention program featured a number of liberal Republican leaders. At the same time, many of the conservative speakers featured at past conventions were not asked to give speeches at the 2004 convention. This outreach effort is an ongoing strategy that began at the 2000 Republican National Convention.</p> <p>How much do you think that the Republican Party has changed over the last few years?</p>
Race-no platform	<p>During its 2004 national convention, the Republican Party tried to appeal to Democratic-leaning voters by reaching out to African Americans. The convention program featured a number of black Republican leaders. At the same time, many of the conservative speakers featured at past conventions were not asked to give speeches at the 2004 convention. This outreach effort is an ongoing strategy that began at the 2000 Republican National Convention.</p> <p>How much do you think that the Republican Party has changed over the last few years?</p>
Race-platform	<p>During its 2004 national convention, the Republican Party tried to appeal to Democratic-leaning voters by reaching out to African Americans. While the party's principles and platform remain unchanged, the convention program featured a number of black Republican leaders. At the same time, many of the conservative speakers featured at past conventions were not asked to give speeches at the 2004 convention. This outreach effort is an ongoing strategy that began at the 2000 Republican National Convention.</p> <p>How much do you think that the Republican Party has changed over the last few years?</p>

The dependent variable used throughout this chapter was an item similar to the one used to measure the Republican Party's racial symbolism. Specifically, I used responses to the following question: "Would you say the Democratic Party is generally doing a good job or a bad job these days reaching out to blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities?" Responses were coded 1 if subjects believed that the Democratic Party did a good job, 0 if the party did a bad job, and .5 if the party did neither a good nor bad job. The figures in this chapter present the means of the Democratic Party's placement on the racial symbolism dimension. To determine the statistical significance, I conducted *t*-tests between the control condition and the race-neutral and racialized conditions. The significance level for all analyses was  $p < .10$  (one-tailed test).

**TABLE A13. 2005 Party Image Study Experimental Treatment Groups**


---

Control	How much do you think that the Democratic Party has changed over the last few years?
Race-neutral	<p>During its 2004 national convention, the Democratic Party tried to appeal to Republican-leaning voters. The convention program featured a number of conservative Democratic leaders. At the same time, many of the liberal speakers featured at past conventions were not asked to give speeches at the 2004 convention.</p> <p>How much do you think that the Democratic Party has changed over the last few years?</p>
Race–no platform	<p>During its 2004 national convention, the Democratic Party tried to appeal to Republican-leaning voters by distancing itself from African Americans. The convention program featured a number of conservative Democratic leaders. At the same time, many of the black speakers featured at past conventions were not asked to give speeches at the 2004 convention.</p> <p>How much do you think that the Democratic Party has changed over the last few years?</p>
Race-platform	<p>During its 2004 national convention, the Democratic Party tried to appeal to Republican-leaning voters by distancing itself from African Americans. While the party's principles and platform remain unchanged, the convention program featured a number of conservative Democratic leaders. At the same time, many of the black speakers featured at past conventions were not asked to give speeches at the 2004 convention.</p> <p>How much do you think that the Democratic Party has changed over the last few years?</p>

---