Co-Ethnic Endorsements, Out-Group Candidate Preferences, and Perceptions in Local Elections

Abstract

Black and Latino voters support co-ethnic candidates at high rates in local elections. What is less clear is how Black and Latino voters respond to out-group candidates when they do not have the option to support a co-ethnic candidate. I posit that when race and ethnicity become salient in a campaign, endorsements from Black and Latino leaders and organizations increase support for out-group candidates among Blacks and Latinos. I find that this hypothesis is strongly supported among Blacks. However, the same is not true for Latinos, most likely because of the political heterogeneity of the group. Using data from a survey experiment, I show that Black endorsements of minority out-group candidates are persuasive for Blacks, while comparable endorsements from Latinos are not as influential among Latinos.
Introduction

Politics inevitably involves a struggle over the distribution of resources. Groups may form based on race, ethnicity, partisanship, or in support or opposition to a particular policy, to compete for access to the power to decide how resources should be distributed. Ideally, groups will have one of their own group members at the table when resources are allocated. We see evidence of this, as partisanship remains a strong predictor of candidate preferences in elections. Race and ethnicity have also been proven to be strong predictors of vote choice in the political arena. Most local elections lack partisan cues and voters do not always have the opportunity to vote for a candidate from their own racial and ethnic group. This leads to an important question: what happens when Blacks and Latinos do not have the option to support an in-group candidate? I develop a theory of co-ethnic endorsement in order to help us better understand Black and Latino voting behavior in local elections when they do not have the option to support a co-ethnic candidate, particularly when a member of another minority group is on the ballot. Co-ethnic endorsements, though common, have only been studied sporadically (Barreto et al. 2008; Campbell et al. 1960). These endorsements may come from local, state, and national politicians; local organizations, newspapers, and clergy. They send co-ethnics a signal that a particular candidate will represent the group well when a co-ethnic candidate is not on the ballot. I argue, that when race or ethnicity is salient—by highlighting a racial or ethnic issue, Black and Latino voters are more likely to rely on co-ethnic endorsements.

There is plenty of evidence showing that Black and Latino voters support their in-group candidates when they have the opportunity. The theory of Racial Voting suggests that Blacks and Latinos will vote for in-group candidates, barring a serious reason to do otherwise (Bullock and Campbell 1984; Hero 1992). Recent scholarship has confirmed this is the case for Blacks

---

1 Most local elections are nonpartisan (DeSantis and Renner 1991).
(Philpot and Walton 2007) and Latinos (Barreto 2007). Barreto’s study of co-ethnic voting in local elections in Denver, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco, provides some of the strongest evidence that Latinos act as a group and vote for co-ethnic candidates in local elections (2007). He finds this is true regardless of party (a Green Party Candidate in San Francisco) and ideology (a conservative candidate in Houston). Barreto finds that districts with large Latino populations overwhelmingly vote for the Latino candidate in each election a Latino candidate was on the ballot (Barreto 2007, p. 432-434). His data also show that districts with large Black populations voted for the Black candidate when given the option (Barreto 2007, p. 433). Yet, in many elections, Blacks and Latinos may not have the option to vote for a candidate from their in-group. I researched the race of the candidates in the 96 elections used in the larger Hajnal and Trounstine (2014) dataset and Blacks had the option to vote for a Black candidate in 65 Elections. Latinos had the opportunity to vote for a Latino candidate in 24 Elections. How do Black and Latino voters decide which candidate to vote for when they cannot select a co-ethnic candidate?

In order to answer this question, I present data from a survey experiment where I create a fictional campaign situation (to remove the effects of campaign spending and explicitly omit partisan cues) and manipulate three factors that help explain candidate preference: the race of the candidate, the racial/ethnic salience of the campaign, and the presence or absence of co-ethnic endorsements to determine the causal mechanisms at work. I show that under certain conditions, co-ethnic cues matter for Blacks and Latinos and help explain when Blacks and Latinos are willing to support out-group candidates. In the next section, I provide evidence that local elections provide a unique opportunity to test my claims.

**Local Elections: Moving Beyond Partisanship**
Research on local elections finds that the following factors matter: political resources available to the candidate, endorsements from local organizations and newspapers, candidate achievements, ideology, candidate issue positions, incumbency, campaign spending, and, yes, partisanship (Abrajano, Nagler, and Alvarez 2005; Kaufmann 2004; Krebs 1988; Lieske 1989; Oliver and Ha 2007). In addition to these factors, race and ethnicity may also matter. In order to test this claim, Hajnal and Trounstine created “a data set that includes the vote choice for 56,000 respondents across 63 elections for different local offices in five cities (New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, and Detroit) between 1985 and 2005” (2014, p. 69). The authors conclude that the race and ethnicity of voters are important factors in these elections, even when they control for partisanship, ideology, class, and other demographic factors. The relationship between racial and ethnic identity and vote choice in these elections is strong for all groups (Hajnal and Trounstine 2014). This does not mean that partisanship does not matter, but it does suggest that race and ethnicity may be more important in these elections than previously thought. I build on Hajnal and Trounstine’s (2014) finding and seek to identify some of the factors that lead racial and ethnic minorities to vote for one candidate over another. I argue that by considering the race of the candidate and the racial and ethnic context of the campaign, co-ethnic endorsement can help us understand why racial and ethnic voters vote as a bloc in local elections. The first factor to consider is the race and ethnicity of the candidates themselves.

Candidate Characteristics

Local elections serve as the initial venue for racial and ethnic minorities to gain access to political representation and incorporation (Browning, Marshall, and Tabb 1984; Dahl 1962; Wolfinger 1965). According to Dahl (1962), co-ethnic surnames served as cues to make it easy for co-ethnics to vote for the candidate from their in-group. More recently, there is evidence to
suggest that the racial or ethnic group identity of the candidates matter to Blacks and Latino voters, with a decided preference for co-ethnic representatives (Barreto 2007; Bullock and Campbell 1984; Dawson 1994; Hero 1992; Perez 2013; and Philpot and Walton 2007). What is less clear is how Black and Latino voters respond to out-group candidates. There are reasons to expect Blacks and Latinos respond to out-group candidates differently. Some scholars show that Latinos indicate that they feel closer to Whites than Blacks; Blacks often state that they feel close to Latinos (Kaufmann 2003; McClain et al. 2006). In more recent studies both Blacks and Latinos rate the respective minority out-group members higher on feeling thermometers than do Whites in the 2012 American National Election Study, although the difference is larger for Blacks than Latinos. Evidence from Mayoral elections show some instances where Latinos support Black candidates (Chicago 1983, Houston 1997, Los Angeles 1973, and New York 2009) and instances where they did not (Houston 2009 and the New York 2013 Democratic Primary). It is difficult to know why Latinos supported Black candidates in some cases and not others. Specifically, although Blacks may be more likely to prefer Latino candidates, it is unclear how Latinos would respond to co-ethnic endorsements of Black candidates. It is possible that a co-ethnic endorsement might help both groups believe that a particular candidate can represent the group. The second factor to consider is the potential for co-ethnic endorsements to signal to Blacks and Latinos that a candidate is good for the group and why these particular cues may be important to Black and Latino voters in the absence of a co-ethnic candidate.

**Endorsements and Preferences**

---

With only a few exceptions, researchers have failed to consider the role of a potentially powerful source cue: the co-ethnic endorsement. Co-ethnic endorsements have the potential to send a clear message to voters: although this candidate is not a co-ethnic, this candidate will represent us well in the political arena. Campbell et al. hypothesized about the relationship between Black endorsements and the Black vote in the 1952 Presidential Elections (1960). The data show that when a majority of Black leaders supported Stevenson, Blacks voters did as well. Four years later, when the Black leadership was not unified behind a single candidate, the Black vote was split (1960, 316). Whereas Campbell et al. suggest that unified endorsements from Black leaders led to unified Black support for the candidate they endorsed, that research left several questions unanswered (1960). Kuklinski and Hurley (1994) find that among Blacks, the race of the cue-giver trumps the ideology of the cue-giver with respect to Black support for affirmative action policies. Irrespective of the ideology of the Black leader, when he endorses the notion that Blacks should stop making excuses, Blacks agree with this statement. Yet, when the statement is attributed to no one, Black support for the statement is extremely low. Implicit in this study is that Blacks trust Black leaders because of their shared identity.

The case that co-ethnic endorsements serve as a useful cue among Latinos may prove to be more difficult to make, given the potential conflict between pan-ethnic and national-origin identifiers and the political heterogeneity of the group (Beltran 2010; Kaufmann 2003; Masuoka 2008). Research on Latino endorsements and candidate preferences is also limited. Barreto et al. note that endorsements were one factor that helped explain Latino support for Clinton in the 2008 Democratic Primary (2008). In data collected in Texas and California, Latino Decisions found that respondents indicated that endorsements from select individuals would make them
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3 Latino Decisions is the leading firm for Latino Public Opinion (http://www.latinodecisions.com).
more likely to vote for a candidate. In both states, an endorsement from the Cesar Chavez Foundation was cited as a useful endorsement. While Kaufmann calls on Latino leaders to help improve Black-Latino relations, there is no causal evidence that this works. This paper allows me to test this claim among Latinos.

Co-ethnic endorsements may serve as a proxy that a particular candidate will represent the group interests well. This paper contributes to the literature on cues and explicitly tests the relationship between co-ethnic endorsements and candidate preferences and perceptions among Blacks and Latinos. Despite research on a variety of groups and various cues and cue sources, co-ethnic cues have not been explored in-depth. Much of the work on cues is experimental because this allows the researcher to control which messages are sent to which groups. Outside of the lab, scholars have considered how social group membership and endorsements influence candidate preferences among citizens (Rappaport, Stone and Abramowitz 1990). Using survey data collected at the 1988 Democratic Convention, Rappaport et al. find that while union endorsements influence union members’ candidate preferences, endorsements from a women’s organization did not influence candidate preferences among women (1990). This suggests that not all social group members use endorsements the same way and that cues alone may not be enough. Co-ethnic endorsements and candidate characteristics may explain Black and Latino vote choice, which leads me to my first two hypotheses:

$H_1$: Co-ethnic endorsements will be effective in raising support for the targeted candidate among Blacks and Latinos.

$H_2$: Co-ethnic endorsements will be persuasive to Blacks and Latinos when the candidate receiving the endorsement is a minority.

---

6 The California Data also showed that respondents would rely on an endorsement from Antonio Villaraigosa.
Although previous literature suggests that endorsements and the race of the candidate alone can explain vote choice among Blacks and Latinos, I argue that when Blacks and Latinos are thinking about their racial and ethnic identities, co-ethnic endorsements will work better. The third and final factor to explore is the context of the election and how issues that highlight race and ethnicity help create that context for Black and Latino voters.

**Racial and Ethnic Salience in the Campaign Context**

The previous sections examined two factors (candidate characteristic and endorsements) that might explain Black and Latino vote choice in local elections. Missing from these explanations are contextual factors that distinguish one election from another. I posit that heightened racial/ethnic saliency in a campaign may increase the importance of racial and ethnic identities for Blacks and Latinos. Of course, issue positions matter in most elections (Downs 1957; Oliver and Ha 2007), but here the focus is specifically on racial and ethnic issues. These issues are unique because voters often know how they feel about racial issues (Converse 1964). Previous research shows that race or ethnicity may become salient in a campaign through issues that relate to race and ethnicity and there is evidence to suggest that when campaigns focus on racial and ethnic issues, voters behave differently than when campaigns focus on nonracial issues (Barreto 2007; Campbell et al. 1960; Gilens 1999; Kaufmann 2004; Mendelberg 2001; Pantoja, Ramirez, and Segura 2001; Reeves 1997; White 2007). Yet, minority candidates are often advised not to focus on race, so as not to alienate White voters (Hero 1992; Perry 1991). Racial and ethnic salience is perhaps the most important factor to understand Black and Latino support for out-group candidates in local elections. Simply put, the endorsements and the race of the candidates alone are not as likely to influence vote choice because Blacks and Latinos may not be thinking about their racial and ethnic identities until racial and ethnic issues are mentioned in
the campaign. The presence of racial and ethnic issues should *enhance* the effects of endorsements. This is because racial and ethnic salience makes minorities’ racial and ethnic identity salient in their vote considerations. Given this, I make the following two hypotheses:

**H₃**: Co-ethnic endorsements will be more persuasive among Blacks and Latinos when race/ethnicity is salient.

**H₄**: Co-ethnic endorsements will be more persuasive among Blacks and Latinos when the endorsed candidate is a minority and race/ethnicity is salient.

**Methods and Procedures**

In order to test my hypotheses, I developed a 2X2X2 experimental design. The benefit of the experimental design is precisely to isolate the causal mechanisms, which is not possible using the real-world election data (Kinder and Palfrey 1993). The drawback of the experiment is that it lacks external validity. Real-world elections are messier than the experimental conditions used here. Campaigns often focus on more than one issue and voters may have prior opinions about the endorsers and the candidates in the election. This makes the experiment a cleaner and less ambiguous test of the relationship between endorsements and preferences among Blacks and Latinos. This particular experimental design is relatively conservative in that the more liberal candidate never embraces a racially liberal policy platform, so it is merely the presence of racial and ethnic issues that cue the respondents. This design may limit some of the complexity involved in a real-world election, but it nevertheless provides invaluable information regarding the specific causal mechanisms that may be at work.

To deliver the treatment, I designed eight mostly identical newspaper articles, complete with photographs of the candidates, which differed only along the three factors identified above (the race of the candidate, the presence of a co-ethnic endorsement, and racial/ethnic salience).
All of the articles focus on an environmental company seeking to renew its trash-burning contract. The conservative candidate always supports the contract renewal because the city needs more time to develop a recycling program. The liberal candidates always oppose the contract renewal and support an immediate recycling program. The story ends with a fact about the percentage of voters who felt the environment was important in the election. In every article, the conservative candidate and is depicted in the accompanying photograph as a middle-aged White American. In order to determine if the race of the candidate influences candidate preferences among Black subjects, the more liberal candidate is depicted as White in half of the experimental cells and as Latino in the other half. For Latino subjects, the liberal candidates are White in half of the experimental cells and Black in the other half. To test my claims about endorsements in the Black sample, half of the treatments provide no endorsement, while in the other half the “Local Association of Black Leaders” endorses the more liberal candidate. For the Latino sample, half of the treatments provide no endorsement, while in the other half of the treatments the “Local Association of Latino Leaders” endorses the liberal candidate. These generic organizations are meant to signal co-ethnic leader support for the endorsed candidate (Barreto et al. 2008; Campbell et al. 1960; Kuklinksi and Hurley 1994).

The articles where race/ethnicity is not salient only focus on the environmental company. In order to determine the role of racial/ethnic saliency, in the articles where race/ethnicity is salient, the articles still focus on the environmental company and the contract renewal except in these versions the story also says that the company “received the contract, despite several bids
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5 I selected the environmental issue because it was an issue that cities have jurisdiction over, but was ostensibly, nonracial. Further, it was an issue that had two clear policy options: burn the trash or increase recycling. The racial and ethnic aspects were added to the debate (affirmative action and English only) to highlight race and ethnicity, but note make the issue racial or ethnic in nature.
from minority companies and a promise from the city to use the newly enacted Affirmative Action laws” or “received the contract, despite several concerns about the company's English Only policy and a promise from the city to end business with such companies.” In these treatments, the liberal candidates still oppose the contract for the same [non-racial] reasons listed in the environment only articles. The versions of the story that highlight the racial/ethnic issues also end with a fact about the percentage of voters who felt Affirmative Action/English Only was important in the election. Table 1 summarizes the experimental treatments (for full treatments see Appendices A and B). The treatments are as follows:

Following other race and politics experiments, these data come from a community sample of Black and Latino adults collected in the summer of 2009 and spring of 2010 (see for example Hutchings et al. 2004; Valentino, Hutchings, and White 2002; White, Laird, and Allen 2014). For the Black sample, the author and Black research assistants attended community events in the greater Detroit metro area. These events were not political in nature. Respondents were approached and asked to complete a short political survey in exchange for $5 cash. The surveys were completed in a paper and pencil format. Respondents read the fictional news article (see Appendix A and B) and then answered a short questionnaire assessing their support for the candidates for mayor. For the Latino sample, the author employed a similar strategy with Latino research assistants in the greater Detroit metro area and Southern California where about half of the surveys were collected using the paper and pencil format. However, in order to complete the data collection, the author also contacted Latino organizations to recruit respondents to the online version. The organizations were not told they were being contacted because they were Latino
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6 One event was Juneteenth in Ann Arbor, MI. The other event was Arts, Beats, and Eats in Pontiac, MI. These events were places where large numbers of African Americans were available to take the survey.
organizations. These respondents were emailed a $5 gift card. Comparisons between the online and paper surveys indicate there are no differences between the two samples (see Appendices C and D). Respondents in both samples are much more educated, younger, and slightly less Democratic than the American National Election Study 2008 for Blacks and slightly more Democratic than the Latino National Survey (Table 2). Yet, despite these minor differences from larger national surveys, I believe these results are reliable as they were collected in a similar manner as other race and politics experiments (Hutchings et al. 2004; Valentino, Hutchings, and White 2002; White, Laird, and Allen 2014), they come from a nonstudent sample, and are not dramatically different from nationally representative samples. Finally, while this sample is generally more educated, previous research suggests these respondents are more likely to be voters (Leighley and Vedlitz 1999; Verba and Brady 1996).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Out-group Candidates, Endorsements, and Racial Saliency Among Blacks and Latinos

Candidate preference was measured with the following question: "If the election were held today, which candidate would you vote for?" Response options for the treatments that featured two White Candidates were "Jeremy Boardman," "Henry Brewer," or "Undecided." In the treatments that featured a White and a Latino Candidate, response options were "Jeremy Boardman," "Anthony Gonzales," or "Undecided." Responses were recoded into a dichotomous variable where "1" indicates the respondent selected the more liberal candidate and a "0" indicates the respondent selected the more conservative candidate or "Undecided." Roughly 40% of the subjects said they would vote for the more liberal candidate. In order to test my

---

7 Text of recruitment email: “Are you interested in Politics? How would you like to make $5 for simply giving your opinion? Simply complete this short political survey and you can receive a $5 gift card to Amazon. Amazon carries music, books, shoes, clothing, etc.” The link to the survey was then embedded in the email.
8 Only 20 respondents in any treatment cell selected Jeremy Boardman.
hypotheses among Blacks, I used logistic regression analysis to estimate support for candidate 2 by treatment group as compared to the baseline. Recall, in the baseline treatment, subjects read an article where there was no endorsement, two White candidates, and race was not salient. The functional form of the models for Blacks is as follows:

Candidate Preference Among Blacks =
\[ B_1 (\text{Latino Candidate Treatment}) + B_2 (\text{Endorsed White Candidate Treatment}) + B_3 (\text{Endorsed Latino Candidate Treatment}) + B_4 (\text{White Candidate with Race Salient Treatment}) + B_5 (\text{Latino Candidate with Race Salient Treatment}) + B_6 (\text{Endorsed White Candidate with Race Salient Treatment}) + B_7 (\text{Endorsed Latino Candidate with Race Salient Treatment}) + \text{Constant} \]  

Candidate preference among Latinos was measured using the same question: “If the election were held today, which candidate would you vote for?” I recoded this in the exact same manner as in the previous analyses, where a 0 indicates a preference for “Boardman” or “Undecided” and a 1 indicates a preference for “Brewer” or “Jackson.” Roughly 52% of the subjects said they would vote for either Brewer or Jackson. In the baseline article, subjects read an article where there was no endorsement, two White candidates, and ethnicity was not salient. I then used logistic regression analysis to assess the levels of support for candidate 2 compared to the baseline treatment. The functional form of the model is as follows:

Candidate Preference Among Latinos =
\[ B_1 (\text{Black Candidate Treatment}) + B_2 (\text{Endorsed White Candidate Treatment}) + B_3 (\text{Endorsed Black Candidate Treatment}) + B_4 (\text{White Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment}) + B_5 (\text{Black Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment}) + B_6 (\text{Endorsed White Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment}) + B_7 (\text{Endorsed Black Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment}) + \text{Constant} \]  

Recall that my hypotheses for Blacks focus on the direction and magnitude of the following coefficients: \( B_2, B_3, B_6 \) and \( B_7 \). The results in Table 3-column 1 show that there are

\[ \text{Only 15 respondents said they would vote for Jeremy Boardman.} \]
some differences in levels of support for candidate 2 by the treatment groups among Blacks. First, co-ethnic endorsements alone do not move Black voters to prefer the endorsed candidate ($B_2$). This provides no support for $H_1$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be effective in raising support for the targeted candidate among Blacks. When the liberal Latino candidate receives a Black endorsement ($B_3$), Blacks are more likely to indicate support for the candidate (1.72 $p<0.01$, for a two-tailed test). This provides support for $H_2$ that co-ethnic endorsements will be persuasive to Blacks when the candidate receiving the endorsement is a minority. When a White liberal candidate receives a Black endorsement and the article mentions the city’s new affirmative action law ($B_6$), Blacks also prefer him to the baseline liberal White candidate (1.12 $p<0.05$, for a two-tailed test). This provides some support for $H_3$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be more persuasive among Blacks when race/ethnicity is salient. Finally, the endorsed Latino candidate ($B_7$) receives more support than the baseline liberal White candidate when race is salient (3.11, $p<0.001$ for a two-tailed test), which provides support for $H_4$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be more persuasive among Blacks when the endorsed candidate is a minority and race/ethnicity is salient.10 On the one hand, these results are not quite consistent with Campbell et al. who found a relationship between endorsements and preferences in the 1952 Presidential Election (1960). Campbell et al. had the benefit of partisan cues in their study of endorsements and presidential candidate preference among Blacks, which may help explain their findings. That is, there was also more than one factor in their study: the endorsements and partisanship. In this experiment, endorsements alone are not enough, but when the candidate is a minority or race is made salient, the endorsements work well among Blacks. These results provide support for the co-ethnic endorsement theory. When race is salient, by highlighting a

---

10 Among Blacks $B_3, B_6,$ and $B_7$ are statistically significantly different from the baseline and $B_7$ is statistically significantly different from $B_3$ and $B_6$. 
racial issue, Black voters are more likely to rely on co-ethnic endorsements when faced with out-group candidates. This is especially true when the endorsed candidate is a minority.

[TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE]

The results above provide new insights into the relationship between co-ethnic endorsements and candidate preferences and perceptions among Blacks—Black endorsements are persuasive to Blacks, especially in the context of racial issues. When the candidate is Latino though, the endorsement alone is enough to move Black voters. The other goal of this paper is to explore these relationships among Latinos. Recall that Latinos indicate strong levels of co-ethnic voting (Barreto 2007), vote as a bloc in local elections (Hajnal and Trounstine 2014), indicate that they often do not feel close to Blacks (Kauffman 2003; McClain et al. 2006), and may rely on co-ethnic endorsements under certain conditions (Barreto et al. 2008). While scholars have called on Latinos leaders to help foster better cross racial alliances (Kaufmann 2003), it is not clear that Latinos will find these calls persuasive. The experiment allows me to test these claims about co-ethnic endorsements and out-group candidate preferences and perceptions directly.

The results in Table 4-column 1 indicate that co-ethnic endorsements, the race of the candidate, and highlighting ethnic issues are not persuasive to Latinos. Latinos in this sample did not express different levels of support for candidate 2, even when more than one factor was present in the treatment. The estimates are small and not significant, though some of them move in the correct direction, they are not different from the baseline treatment. While Barreto et al. found that endorsements help explain candidate preference among Latinos in the 2008 Democratic Primary; the endorsements in this study did not move Latinos to prefer a particular out-group candidate (2008). This might be because the election Barreto et al. studied featured a
nationally recognizable candidate (Clinton) and only considered Democrats. Again, more than one factor was present in that study as well: endorsements and partisanship.

**The Potential for Coalitions: Perceived Candidate Sympathy Among Blacks and Latinos**

The results above show that together, the race of the candidate, endorsements, and racial issues, influence candidate preference among Blacks. This is not the case among Latinos. However, candidate preference is only one way to evaluate the validity of my theory. Candidate preference represents the closest measure to voting in this study, but it is also important to know how these three factors shape the way Black and Latino voters perceive out-group candidates and their sympathy towards Blacks and Latinos as a group. This may help us better understand how the racial context of a campaign, candidate race, and co-ethnic endorsements can foster the development of cross-racial electoral coalitions. I maintain that the interaction of these factors is important in part because they signal to Black and Latinos voters that a candidate will address group-specific concerns, even if they are not members of their racial/ethnic group. The functional model for these analyses are as follows:

Perceived Candidate Sympathy Among Blacks = $B_1 (Latino\ Candidate\ Treatment) + B_2 (Endorsed\ White\ Candidate\ Treatment) + B_3 (Endorsed\ Latino\ Candidate\ Treatment) + B_4 (White\ Candidate\ with\ Race\ Salient\ Treatment) + B_5 (Latino\ Candidate\ with\ Race\ Salient\ Treatment) + B_6 (Endorsed\ White\ Candidate\ with\ Race\ Salient\ Treatment) + B_7 (Endorsed\ Latino\ Candidate\ with\ Race\ Salient\ Treatment) + Constant$  \( (3) \)

Perceived Candidate Sympathy Among Latinos = $B_1 (Black\ Candidate\ Treatment) + B_2 (Endorsed\ White\ Candidate\ Treatment) + B_3 (Endorsed\ Black\ Candidate\ Treatment) + B_4 (White\ Candidate\ with\ Ethnicity\ Salient\ Treatment) + B_5 (Black\ Candidate\ with\ Ethnicity\ Salient\ Treatment) + B_6 (Endorsed\ White\ Candidate\ with\ Ethnicity\ Salient\ Treatment) + B_7 (Endorsed\ Black\ Candidate\ with\ Ethnicity\ Salient\ Treatment) + Constant$  \( (4) \)
Perceived candidate sympathy was measured with the following question: "Which candidate cares about people like you?" Response options for the treatments that featured two White Candidates were "Jeremy Boardman," "Henry Brewer," or "Undecided." In the treatments that featured a White and a Latino Candidate, response options were "Jeremy Boardman," "Anthony Gonzales," or "Undecided." Responses were recoded into a dichotomous variable where "1" indicates the respondent selected "Henry Brewer" or "Anthony Gonzales," and a "0" indicates the respondent selected "Jeremy Boardman" or "Undecided." Roughly 30% of the subjects said either Brewer or Gonzales cared about people like them. To explore this relationship among Latinos, I used the same question: "Which candidate cares about people like you?" to create dichotomous dependent variable such that a 0 means the subject indicated “Boardman” or “Undecided” and a 1 means the subjects indicated “Brewer” or “Jackson.” Roughly 37% of the subjects said either Brewer or Jackson cared about people like them.

In Table 3-column 2, I examine the relationship between the treatment effects and perceived candidate sympathy. These results mirror the previous results among Blacks. Endorsements are persuasive to Blacks when the candidate is a minority or when racial issues are mentioned. The combination of elite endorsements and racial salience prompt Blacks to view the liberal candidate as concerned about their needs, even when he is depicted as White. These results provide further support for the co-ethnic endorsement theory, at least among African Americans.

Turning to Table 4-column 2, I remind the reader that my hypotheses among Latinos focus on the direction and magnitude of coefficients $B_2, B_3, B_6$ and $B_7$. An examination of Table 4-column 2 allows me to directly test my hypotheses among Latinos. Latinos who read about the endorsed White candidate ($B_2$) were not more likely to prefer that candidate. This provides no
support for $H_4$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be effective in raising support for the targeted
candidate among Latinos. This is not consistent with the previous literature, which suggests that
endorsements will move Latinos (Barreto et al. 2008). When subjects read about the endorsed
Black candidate ($B_3$), but ethnicity was not salient, they are also more likely to perceive the
candidate as sympathetic (2.14, $p<0.01$, for a two-tailed test). This provides some support for
$H_2$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be persuasive Latinos when the candidate receiving the
endorsement is a minority. However, the co-ethnic endorsement theory predicts that co-ethnic
endorsements will be persuasive when Latinos are thinking about their Latino identity. In fact,
the greatest difference in positive perceptions of candidate 2 comes when Latinos read about the
endorsed White candidate and ethnicity is salient ($B_6$) (2.39, $p<0.01$, for a two-tailed test), which
provides support for $H_3$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be more persuasive among Latinos
when race/ethnicity is salient. Latinos were more likely to prefer the out-group candidate when
there were issues present and that candidate received an endorsement. Finally, when subjects
read about the endorsed Black candidate and ethnicity was salient ($B_7$), they were more likely to
perceive him as sympathetic compared to the baseline White candidate (2.17, $p<0.01$, for a two-
tailed test). This provides support for $H_4$, that co-ethnic endorsements will be more persuasive
among Blacks and Latinos when the endorsed candidate is a minority and race/ethnicity is
salient.\footnote{Among Latinos, $B_3$, $B_6$, and $B_7$ are statistically significantly different from the baseline, $B_6$ and $B_7$ are statistically significantly different from $B_3$, but $B_6$ and $B_7$ are not statistically significantly different from one another.} Despite Latinos indicating that they do not feel close to Blacks, the results here show
that they are more likely to support Black candidates when they receive an endorsement,
regardless of whether or not ethnicity is salient. Taken together, these results provide support for
the co-ethnic endorsement theory: when ethnicity is salient, by highlighting a racial or ethnic
issue, Latino voters are more likely to rely on co-ethnic endorsements, when the candidate is
Black or White. That Latinos perceive the endorsed White candidate when ethnicity is salient as sympathetic is consistent with previous literature that shows that Latinos feel closer to Whites (Kaufmann 2003; McClain et al. 2006). The finding that Latinos perceive an endorsed Black candidate as sympathetic to Latinos when ethnic issues are mentioned provides useful insight into the potential for Black-Latino electoral alliances.

**Potential for Black-Latino Coalitions**

In order to understand the magnitude of the treatment effects, I present the marginal effects (the likelihood of preferring candidate 2, given the treatment) for those who read a particular treatment compared to those who read the baseline treatment, which is set to zero (see figures 1-4). Figure 1 shows that Black subjects were more likely prefer the endorsed Latino candidate (0.34, p<0.01, for a two-tailed test). The endorsed Latino candidate when race was made salient also did quite well among Blacks (0.61, p<0.000, for a two-tailed test). The results in Figure 1 also show that the endorsed White candidate when race is made salient also does well among Blacks (0.22, p<0.05, for a two-tailed test). These results are mirrored with respect to perceived candidate sympathy (figure 2). Endorsements are persuasive to Blacks in this sample when the endorsed candidate is a minority and/or when racial issues are mentioned.

Shifting the focus to the Latino sample, again, there are no treatment effects for candidate preference (see figure 3). The likelihood of preferring candidate 2, compared to the baseline is essentially zero. Turning to figure 4, we see that Latinos in the sample were more likely to perceive the endorsed Black candidate (regardless of ethnic issues) as sympathetic to Latinos (0.45, p < .01, for a two-tailed test). They also perceived the endorsed White candidate when ethnic issues are mentioned (0.50, p<0.01, for a two-tailed test) as sympathetic. While co-ethnic endorsements did not move Latinos when it came to candidate preferences, Latinos did respond
to co-ethnic endorsements with respect to perceived candidate sympathy. Taken together, the data show that both Latinos and Blacks respond to co-ethnic source cues, racial and ethnic issues in a campaign, and the race of the candidate, under certain conditions.

[FIGURES 1-4 ABOUT HERE]

These results provide some insights into the potential for a Black-Latino coalition. Overall, Blacks rely on co-ethnic endorsements when the candidate is Latino (regardless of issues) and when the candidate White and in the context of issues. This is also the case when asked to indicate which candidate is sympathetic to Blacks. Latinos are not as easily persuaded. When it comes to candidate preferences, the co-ethnic endorsements do not work at all. However, when asked to indicate which candidate is sympathetic to Latinos, the co-ethnic endorsements do work for the White candidate when issues are present and for the Black candidate, regardless of issues. These results suggest that the most viable Black-Latino coalition would come in the form of a Latino candidate led coalition. That candidate’s strategy should include outreach to the Latino community (to ensure co-ethnic support) and endorsements from Black leaders, organizations, and politicians to garner Black support.

Conclusion

In this paper, I presented experimental data designed to rigorously test the relationship between co-ethnic endorsements, the race of the candidate, and racial/ethnic saliency in the campaign and out-group candidate preferences and perceptions in local elections. This data is the first of its kind and is a first step to better understanding the causal mechanisms at work when Blacks and Latinos are exposed to co-ethnic cues and their response to out-group candidates. For Blacks, when racial issues are mentioned in the presence of co-ethnic endorsements, Blacks express greater support for out-group candidates. This is especially true when that candidate is
Latino, but an endorsed White candidate in a campaign context with racial issues also did well among Blacks in this sample. The data also show that a Latino candidate with endorsements does not need racial issues to gain Black support.

Among Latinos, there is a weaker relationship between co-ethnic endorsements, candidate characteristics, ethnic issues and candidate preference. However, they were moved by co-ethnic endorsements, candidate characteristics, and ethnic issues in response to perceived out-group candidate sympathy. I interpret these results to mean that there is the potential for a Black-Latino coalition under the right conditions, particularly when there is a Latino candidate with Black leader support. These results are also more than simple social desirability (Suhay 2014). For both Blacks and Latinos, endorsements alone are not enough. This is different from previous research on co-ethnic endorsement most likely because previous research also considered partisanship (Barreto et al. 2008 and Campbell et al. 1960).

The findings presented here are consistent with previous research on African Americans, which shows that there is a strong commitment to the sense of the group in the political arena (Dawson, 1994). White (2007) finds that among Blacks, explicit messages about race help activate feelings of in-group identity. This has not always been the case among Latinos, and the findings presented here are consistent with previous research among Latinos (Masuoka 2006; Sanchez and Masuoka 2010). While Blacks demonstrate high levels of linked fate, lasting feelings of linked fate among Latinos have not been observed (Sanchez and Masuoka 2010). The results are also consistent previous research that shows that there are lower turnout rates among Latinos. Hajnal and Trounstine (2005) show that several local election outcomes would have been different if Latino voter turnout had been higher. Michaelson (2005) shows that with contact, Latino voters are more likely to turnout in local elections as well.
Several factors might explain low levels of linked fate among Latinos: First, Latinos may still prefer their national origin group identity to a pan-ethnic identity (Beltran 2010, Masuoka 2008). Masuoka finds that among those who self-identify as Latinos, there is a greater commitment to Latino political issues than those who self-identify with their national origin group (2008). Second, the group is quite heterogeneous and researchers cite the ways in which experiences with immigration, assimilation, and discrimination help shape these identity choices (Beltran 2010; Masuoka 2008; Sanchez and Masuoka 2010; Segura and Rodrigues 2006). The research on Latino identity suggests that the ideal co-ethnic source cue for Latinos may come in several forms ranging from the many national origin identity groups to a pan-ethnic identity. Yet, Barreto provides strong evidence that Latinos act cohesively when a Latino candidate runs for mayor (2007). Without a co-ethnic candidate on the ballot, campaign issues may create a context where identity becomes important, which may help Latinos use co-ethnic cues to determine which candidate will represent them well in the political arena.

There is still a lot of work to be done in the area of co-ethnic endorsements vote choice in local elections. Given the many identity choices available to Latinos, it may be that the co-ethnic cue was not the correct cue for many of the respondents (Masuoka 2008). Future research should focus on identity choices and potential source cues that might be persuasive (Beltran 2010; Kaufmann 2003; Masuoka 2008). While Sanchez (2006) finds that Latinos apply a Latino group consciousness to support for Bilingual education policies, Pantoja, Ramirez, and Segura (2001) find that Latinos will mobilize around immigration issues. Future research should consider immigration as an issue to try to make ethnicity salient among Latinos. Additionally, this paper uses a generic endorsement, but not all endorsements are created equally. Endorsements from other politicians, trusted community leaders, and ethnic news sources might be viewed as more
credible than endorsements from newcomers or clergy. Further research using a variety of endorsement sources is needed to better understand which endorsements work well and which ones do not. Finally, future research should consider the role of endorsements for candidates that do not share the ideology of the group or are on the wrong side of the issues. One place this might be particularly interesting is through Black church endorsements for conservative candidates because of social issue positions. Yet, recent research on Blacks and social pressures show that even when other Blacks offer support for Republican candidates (Romney), Blacks are still hesitant to express support for the Republican candidate (White, Laird, and Allen 2014). Local nonpartisan elections may provide an interesting place to test these claims.

The treatments in this study are designed to mimic a low information electoral situation (McDermott 1997, 1998). The candidates were unknown, the local organization was unknown, and there was no information about the partisanship of the candidates. In low information contests, voters may rely on information short cuts or stereotypes or imply ideology or partisanship, but it is still possible to make decisions that are beneficial for their self-interest (Arceneaux and Kolodny 2009; Conover and Feldman 1989; Gerber and Phillips 2003; Lupia 1994; Squire and Smith 1988). Despite the benefits of the experiment (controlling the three factors of interest) there may be some reasons to be cautious of these results given the findings of Chong and Druckman (2010) and Druckman and Nelson (2003) who find there are often differences between the lab and the real world. Future research should consider co-ethnic endorsements and candidate preferences in a real election in order to provide external validity to this study. Yet, despite the potential limitations, these data do provide us with the first causal information about how Blacks and Latinos respond to co-ethnic cues under a variety of conditions. These data tell us that candidates can benefit from endorsements, but only under the
right conditions. For Latino candidates, simply receiving a Black endorsement can move Black voters. For Black candidates, the bar is a little higher to get movement among Latinos, yet the results suggest that seeking Latino endorsements may be an important first step in showing Latino voters that a candidate is sympathetic to the community. White candidates must also seek out Latino endorsements in the context of issues that are important to Latinos.
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Table 1: Summary of Experimental Treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b/i</th>
<th>c/j</th>
<th>d/k</th>
<th>e/l</th>
<th>f/m</th>
<th>g/n</th>
<th>h/o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 1</td>
<td>White/Democrat</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 2</td>
<td>White/Democrat</td>
<td>Latino/Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Latino/Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Latino/Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Latino/Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salient Issues</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
<td>No Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Sample(^\text{12})</th>
<th>Latino Sample(^\text{13})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partisanship</strong></td>
<td>24% Strong Democrat</td>
<td>16% Strong Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38% Weak Democrat</td>
<td>11% Weak Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% Democrat</td>
<td>38% Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23% Independent</td>
<td>4% Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% Republican</td>
<td>1% Strong Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Income</strong></td>
<td>$40,001 to $50,000</td>
<td>$50,001 to $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>29% Some College</td>
<td>36% Some College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29% Completed College</td>
<td>31% Completed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19% Advanced Degree</td>
<td>24% Advanced Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
<td>28% Extremely Liberal</td>
<td>15% Extremely Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19% Liberal</td>
<td>35% Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% Moderate or Middle of the road.</td>
<td>19% Moderate or Middle of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td>19-65</td>
<td>18-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born in the US</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Only in the Home</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration</strong></td>
<td>13% increased a lot</td>
<td>23% increased a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% increased a little</td>
<td>26% increased a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32% remain the same</td>
<td>26% remain the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% decreased</td>
<td>10% decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection Locations</strong></td>
<td>Detroit Metro Area</td>
<td>Detroit Metro Area (84)(^\text{14})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern CA (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern CA (47)(^\text{15})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York City (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) 85% of ANES Blacks said Democrat, 47% said strong. The sample is slightly less Democratic.

\(^{13}\) In the Latino National Survey, the ages ranged from 18 to 97. Only 50% identified as Democrats, while 17% said Republicans and 12% said Independents. 29% of the sample was born in the United States and 66% said they were born in some other country. Of the 66% born outside of the US, 70% were born in Mexico. Additionally, 35% preferred to use the term Hispanic to identify themselves, 33% said either Latino or Hispanic was fine, and only 13% preferred the term Latino. Finally, 62% asked that the survey be administered in Spanish. All Latino surveys collected in the Detroit Metro Area were collected via paper.

\(^{14}\) All of these surveys were completed using the paper format.

\(^{15}\) Nine surveys were completed using the paper format.
Table 3: Co-Ethnic Endorsements are useful Cues to Blacks Under some Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate Selection (Baseline= 2 White Candidates (a))</th>
<th>Candidate Cares (Baseline= 2 White Candidates (a))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.50** (0.45)</td>
<td>-2.19*** (0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Candidate Treatment (b)</td>
<td>0.72 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.21 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed White Candidate Treatment (c)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.58)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed Latino Candidate Treatment (d)</td>
<td>1.72** (0.56)</td>
<td>1.79* (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Candidate with Race Salient Treatment (e)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.59)</td>
<td>1.39 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Candidate with Race Salient Treatment (f)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.64)</td>
<td>1.04 (0.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed White Candidate with Race Salient Treatment (g)</td>
<td>1.12* (0.57)</td>
<td>1.65* (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed Latino Candidate with Race Salient Treatment (h)</td>
<td>3.11*** (0.63)</td>
<td>3.41*** (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-154.16</td>
<td>-129.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 for a two-tailed test.
This analysis uses logistic Regression to estimate Candidate Selection and Beliefs that the candidate cares about people like them Among Black Respondents.
No endorsement, White vs. White, Race Not Salient (a) (33), No Endorsement, White vs. Latino, Race Not Salient (b) (35), Endorsement, White vs. White, Race Not Salient (c) (30), Endorsement, White vs. Latino, Race Not Salient (d) (36), Endorsement, No Endorsement, White vs. White, Race Salient (e) (32), No Endorsement, White vs. Latino, Race Salient (f) (32), Endorsement, White vs. White, Race Salient (g) (32), Endorsement, White vs. Latino, Race Salient (h) (36)
Table 4: Co-Ethnic Endorsements May Provide Useful Cues for Latino Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate Selection (Baseline=2 White Candidates)</th>
<th>Candidate Cares (Baseline=2 White Candidates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.39)</td>
<td>-1.99 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Candidate Treatment (i)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.59)</td>
<td>1.07 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed White Candidate Treatment (j)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.01 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed Black Candidate Treatment (k)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.56)</td>
<td>2.14** (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment (l)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.59)</td>
<td>1.23 (0.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment (m)</td>
<td>-0.18 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.36 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed White Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment (n)</td>
<td>0.55 (0.56)</td>
<td>2.39** (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed Black Candidate with Ethnicity Salient Treatment (o)</td>
<td>0.23 (0.56)</td>
<td>2.17** (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-130.68</td>
<td>-113.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 for a two-tailed test.
This analysis uses logistic Regression to estimate Candidate Selection and the Belief that the candidate cares about people like them Among Latino Respondents
No endorsement, White vs. White, Race Not Salient (a) (26), No Endorsement, White vs. Black, Race Not Salient (i) (21), Endorsement, White vs. White, Race Not Salient (j) (24), Endorsement, White vs. Black, Race Not Salient (k) (26), No Endorsement, White vs. White, Race Salient (l) (22), No Endorsement, White vs. Black, Race Salient (m) (24), Endorsement, White vs. White, Race Salient (n) (25), Endorsement, White vs. Black, Race Salient (o) (25)
Figure 1: Support for Out-group Candidates Among Blacks
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Figure 2: Perceived Out-Group Candidate Sympathy Among Blacks
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Figure 3: Support for Out-group Candidates Among Latinos
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Figure 4: Perceived Out-Group Candidate Sympathy Among Latinos
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