Supplemental Appendix

Table SA1: List of Black and Latino Candidates by State , Party, Win/Loss, Margin of Victory, and Percent of CCES Respondents Who Correctly Identified Their Race or Were Not Sure of the Race of the Candidate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State | District | Candidate Name | Race/Ethnicity | Party | Won | MOV | Percent Identified Correctly | % Not Sure |
| AR | 2 | Elliot | Black | D | No | -19.6 | 91.40% | 3.23% |
| CA | 19 | Goodwin | Black | D | No | -29.4 | 12.50% | 54.69% |
| MI | 2 | Johnson | Black | D | No | -33.7 | 50.00% | 43.97% |
| MI | 3 | Miles | Black | D | No | -22.2 | 30.07% | 27.97% |
| SC | 1 | Frasier | Black | D | No | -36.7 | 17.65% | 39.22% |
| TX | 22 | Rogers | Black | D | No | -37.7 | 55.93% | 38.14% |
| AL | 7 | Sewell | Black | D | Yes | -45 | 72.60% | 23.29% |
| CA | 9 | Lee | Black | D | Yes | 73.5 | 81.42% | 5.31% |
| CA | 33 | Bass | Black | D | Yes | 72.2 | 35.29% | 42.65% |
| CA | 35 | Waters | Black | D | Yes | 58.6 | 89.55% | 7.46% |
| CA | 37 | Richardson | Black | D | Yes | 45.2 | 39.68% | 30.16% |
| FL | 3 | Brown | Black | D | Yes | 31.7 | 82.26% | 12.10% |
| FL | 17 | Wilson | Black | D | Yes | Uncontested | 85.72% | 10.00% |
| FL | 23 | Hastings | Black | D | Yes | 58.8 | 63.01% | 27.40% |
| GA | 2 | Bishop | Black | D | Yes | 5.8 | 94.44% | 5.56% |
| GA | 4 | Johnson | Black | D | Yes | 49.4 | 78.15% | 17.88% |
| GA | 5 | Lewis | Black | D | Yes | 47.4 | 82.30% | 13.27% |
| GA | 13 | Scott | Black | D | Yes | 38.8 | 68.71% | 21.09% |
| IL | 1 | Rush | Black | D | Yes | 64.5 | 93.53% | 2.88% |
| IL | 2 | Jackson | Black | D | Yes | 66.7 | 96.80% | 2.40% |
| IL | 7 | Davis | Black | D | Yes | 65.4 | 87.38% | 9.70% |
| IL | 10 | Seals | Black | D | Yes | -2.2 | 56.52% | 19.30% |
| IN | 7 | Carson | Black | D | Yes | 21.1 | 91.72% | 5.52% |
| LA | 2 | Richmond | Black | D | Yes | 31.1 | 83.93% | 10.71% |
| MD | 4 | Edwards | Black | D | Yes | 83.6 | 73.68% | 16.84% |
| MD | 7 | Cummings | Black | D | Yes | 52.4 | 88.04% | 8.70% |
| MI | 13 | Clarke | Black | D | Yes | 60.9 | 20.31% | 32.81% |
| MI | 14 | Conyers | Black | D | Yes | 56.9 | 85.94% | 3.13% |
| MN | 5 | Ellison | Black | D | Yes | 43.6 | 75.38% | 9.23% |
| MO | 1 | Clay | Black | D | Yes | 50 | 81.90% | 12.07% |
| MO | 5 | Cleaver | Black | D | Yes | 9.1 | 97.41% | 1.72% |
| MS | 2 | Thompson | Black | D | Yes | 23.9 | 91.43% | 6.78% |
| NC | 1 | Butterfield | Black | D | Yes | 18.6 | 26.47% | 30.88% |
| NC | 12 | Watt | Black | D | Yes | 29.8 | 77.14% | 16.19% |
| NJ | 10 | Payne | Black | D | Yes | 72.4 | 64.18% | 19.40% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State | District | Candidate Name | Race/Ethnicity | Party | Won | MOV | Percent Identified Correctly | % Not Sure |
| NY | 11 | Clarke | Black | D | Yes | 81.2 | 78.79% | 18.18% |
| NY | 15 | Rangel | Black | D | Yes | 70 | 78.26% | 10.14% |
| OH | 11 | Fudge | Black | D | Yes | 65 | 82.35% | 12.94% |
| PA | 2 | Fattah | Black | D | Yes | 78.6 | 93.98% | 3.61% |
| SC | 6 | Clyburn | Black | D | Yes | 26.5 | 88.73% | 7.04% |
| TX | 9 | Green | Black | D | Yes | 52.8 | 76.83% | 13.41% |
| TX | 18 | Lee | Black | D | Yes | 42.9 | 97.56% | 1.22% |
| TX | 30 | Johnson | Black | D | Yes | 54.1 | 88.41% | 5.80% |
| VA | 3 | Scott | Black | D | Yes | 42.9 | 60.58% | 23.08% |
| WI | 4 | Moore | Black | D | Yes | 39.5 | 84.26% | 12.04% |
| DC | 0 |  | Black | D |  |  |  |  |
| FL | 13 | Golden | Black | D | No |  | 37.57% | 44.20% |
| CA | 37 | Parker | Black | R | No | -45.2 | 69% | 23% |
| CO | 7 | Frazier | Black | R | No | -11.69 | 83% | 11% |
| IL | 2 | Hayes | Black | R | No | -67 | 56% | 33% |
| IN | 7 | Scott | Black | R | No | -21.1 | 47% | 32% |
| MD | 4 | Broadus | Black | R | No | -67.2 | 25% | 58% |
| MD | 5 | Lollar | Black | R | No | -29.7 | 73% | 19% |
| MS | 2 | Marcy | Black | R | No | -23.9 | 55% | 26% |
| NC | 13 | Randall | Black | R | No | -11 | 48% | 32% |
| NY | 15 | Faulkner | Black | R | No | -70 | 21.00% | 42% |
| TN | 9 | Bergmann | Black | R | No | -48.9 | 75% | 6% |
| TX | 30 | Broaden | Black | R | No | -54.1 | 46% | 25% |
| FL | 22 | West | Black | R | Yes | 8.8 | 90% | 7% |
| SC | 1 | Scott | Black | R | Yes | 26.5 | 76% | 12% |
| CA | 40 | Avalos | Latino | D | No | -33.6 | 77.78% | 19.75% |
| CO | 3 | Salazar | Latino | D | No | -4.3 | 78.18% | 10.00% |
| FL | 9 | De Palma | Latino | D | No | -42.8 | 27.89% | 35.76% |
| FL | 25 | Garcia | Latino | D | No | -9.1 | 82.14% | 8.93% |
| MI | 10 | Yanez | Latino | D | No | -47 | 19.59% | 58.76% |
| TX | 16 | Reyes | Latino | D | No | 21.5 | 93.10% | 4.60% |
| TX | 23 | Rodriguez | Latino | D | No | -5 | 92.66% | 4.59% |
| TX | 27 | Ortiz | Latino | D | No | -0.8 | 85.51% | 10.14% |
| AZ | 4 | Pastor | Latino | D | Yes | 39.4 | 49.02% | 30.39% |
| AZ | 7 | Grijalva | Latino | D | Yes | 6 | 93.30% | 1.00% |
| CA | 31 | Becerra | Latino | D | Yes | 67.6 | 83.80% | 15.25% |
| CA | 34 | Roybal-Allard | Latino | D | Yes | 54.4 | 40.00% | 35.00% |
| CA | 38 | Napolitano | Latino | D | Yes | 47 | 40.00% | 28.00% |
| CA | 39 | Sanchez | Latino | D | Yes | 30.7 | 92.98% | 3.51% |
| State | District | Candidate Name | Race/Ethnicity | Party | Won | MOV | Percent Identified Correctly | % Not Sure |
| CA | 47 | Sanchez | Latino | D | Yes | 13.7 | 88.10% | 4.76% |
| IL | 4 | Gutierrez | Latino | D | Yes | 63.1 | 92.06% | 4.76% |
| NM | 3 | Lujan | Latino | D | Yes | 14 | 91.92% | 4.04% |
| NY | 12 | Velazquez | Latino | D | Yes | Uncontested | 67.44% | 23.26% |
| NY | 16 | Seranno | Latino | D | Yes | Uncontested | 89.19% | 8.11% |
| TX | 15 | Hinojosa | Latino | D | Yes | 14.1 | 89.47% | 5.26% |
| TX | 20 | Gonzalez | Latino | D | Yes | 29.2 | 87.88% | 7.07% |
| TX | 28 | Cuellar | Latino | D | Yes | 14.3 | 85.37% | 14.63% |
| AZ | 4 | Contreras | Latino | R | No | -39.4 | 51% | 35% |
| IN | 1 | Leyva | Latino | R | No | -20 | 11% | 36% |
| NM | 1 | Barela | Latino | R | No | 3.6 | 81% | 11% |
| NY | 2 | Gomez | Latino | R | No | -13.4 | 51% | 20% |
| NY | 10 | Muniz | Latino | R | No | -83.7 | 65% | 24% |
| **OR** | **1** | **Cornilles** | **Latino** | **R** | **No** | **-12.8** | **2%** | **25%** |
| **TN** | **5** | **Hall** | **Latino** | **R** | **No** | **-14.1** | **2%** | **19%** |
| FL | 18 | Ros-Lehtinen | Latino | R | Yes | 37.8 | 80% | 6% |
| FL | 21 | Diaz-Balart | Latino | R | Yes | Uncontested | 81% | 9% |
| FL | 25 | Rivera | Latino | R | Yes | 9.1 | 81% | 10% |
| ID | 1 | Labrador | Latino | R | Yes | 9.7 | 77% | 14% |
| TX | 17 | Flores | Latino | R | Yes | 25.2 | 48% | 13% |
| TX | 23 | Canseco | Latino | R | Yes | 5 | 91% | 6% |
| TX | 29 | Morales | Latino | R | Yes | -30.5 | 87% | 9% |
| False | Positive |  | Black | D | Yes | . | Black  N=34 | Other N=69 |
| False | Positive |  | Black | R | Yes |  | Black  N=25 | Other N=82 |
| False | Positive |  | Black | D | No |  | Black  N=48 | Other N=273 |
| False | Positive |  | Black | R | No |  | Black  N=72 | Other N=214 |
| False | Positive |  | Latino | D | Yes |  | Latino  N=74 | Other N=142 |
| False | Positive |  | Latino | R | Yes |  | Latino  N=39 | Other N=177 |
| False | Positive |  | Latino | D | No |  | Latino  N=74 | Other N=142 |
| False | Positive |  | Latino | R | No |  | Latino  N=90 | Other N=250 |

Table SA2: OLS Regression Predicting Partisanship (1=Strong Dem…7=Strong Rep) With **Objective Measures** of Black and Latino Candidates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model A: Black Candidates |  | Model B: Latino Candidates |
| Black\*Black Dem Cand (W) | -0.11\* | Latino\*Latino Dem Cand (W) | -0.11 |
|  | (0.06) |  | (0.11) |
| Black\*Black Rep Cand (W) | 0.96\*\* | Latino\*Latino Rep Cand (W) | 0.30\*\* |
|  | (0.38) |  | (0.13) |
| Black\*Black Dem Cand (L) | -0.40\* | Latino\*Latino Dem Cand (L) | -0.32 |
|  | (0.21) |  | (0.40) |
| Black\*Black Rep Cand (L) | -0.21\*\* | Latino\*Latino Rep Cand (L) | 0.03 |
|  | (0.11) |  | (0.16) |
| Black Dem Cand (W) | 0.04 | Latino Dem Cand (W) | 0.22 |
|  | (0.05) |  | (0.27) |
| Black Rep Cand (W) | 0.04 | Latino Rep Cand (W) | 0.01 |
|  | (0.11) |  | (0.08) |
| Black Dem Cand (L) | 0.03 | Latino Dem Cand (L) | 0.02 |
|  | (0.06) |  | (0.07) |
| Black Rep Cand (L) | 0.12\* | Latino Rep Cand (L) | 0.04 |
|  | (0.07) |  | (0.06) |
| Female | -0.11\*\*\* | Female | -0.11\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) |  | (0.02) |
| Black | -1.40\*\*\* | Black | -1.44\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) |  | (0.03) |
| Latino | -0.24\*\*\* | Latino | -0.25\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) |  | (0.03) |
| Other | -0.10\*\*\* | Other | -0.10\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) |  | (0.03) |
| Age | -0.00\*\*\* | Age | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |  | (0.00) |
| Income | 0.00\*\*\* | Income | 0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |  | (0.00) |
| Education | 0.02\*\*\* | Education | 0.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |  | (0.00) |
| Ideology | 0.87\*\*\* | Ideology | 0.87\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |  | (0.00) |
| PVI | -0.00\*\*\* | PVI | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |  | (0.00) |
| South | 0.04\* | South | 0.02 |
|  | (0.02) |  | (0.02) |
| Percent Black District | -0.00 | Percent Black District | 0.00 |
|  | (0.00) |  | (0.00) |
| GOP Win | 0.07\*\*\* | GOP Win | 0.06\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) |  | (0.02) |
|  |  | Generation | -0.01 |
|  |  |  | (0.02) |
|  |  | FL | 0.04 |
| Constant | 0.08 |  | 0.12 |
|  | (0.07) |  | (0.08) |
| Observations | 39,147 |  | 39,056 |
| R-squared | 0.59 |  | 0.59 |

Source: 2010 Cooperative Congressional Election Study. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table SA3: Robust Regression Predicting Partisanship (1=Strong Dem…7=Strong Rep)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Black\*Black Dem Cand (W) | -0.20\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) |
| Black\*Black Rep Cand (W) | 0.44\* |
|  | (0.25) |
| Black\*Black Dem Cand (L) | -0.51\*\*\* |
|  | (0.18) |
| Black\*Black Rep Cand (L) | -0.27\*\* |
|  | (0.12) |
| Black Dem Cand (W) | 0.04 |
|  | (0.05) |
| Black Rep Cand (W) | 0.05 |
|  | (0.10) |
| Black Dem Cand (L) | -0.08 |
|  | (0.06) |
| Black Rep Cand (L) | 0.18\*\*\* |
|  | (0.07) |
| Female | -0.08\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) |
| Black | -1.33\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) |
| Latino | -0.21\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) |
| Other | -0.12\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) |
| Age | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |
| Income | 0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |
| Education | 0.02\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |
| Ideology | 0.93\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |
| PVI | -0.00\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) |
| South | 0.04\*\* |
|  | (0.02) |
| Percent Black District | -0.00 |
|  | (0.00) |
| GOP Win | 0.08\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) |
| Constant | -0.15\*\* |
|  | (0.07) |
| Observations | 39,036 |
| R-squared | 0.62 |

Source: 2010 Cooperative Congressional Election Study. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Notes: Robust regression uses an iterative process which first identifies each observations Cook’s Distance score (Measure of an outlier based on the leverage of the observation and the size of the residual). Robust regression then provides less weight to individuals whose residuals are greatest. In sum, respondents who are outliers are weighted less and this minimizes the influence of outliers.

Table SA4: Mediation Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Abs. Democrat Ideol Diff | Abs. Repub Ideol Diff |
| Average Mediation Effect | -.19 (-27, -.12) | -.05 (-.08, -.01) |
| Direct Effect | -.42 (-.55, -.29) | -.42 (-.55, -.28) |
| Total Effect | -.62 (-.77, -.47) | -.47 (-.61,-.32) |
| % Of Total Effect Mediated | .32 (.26,.42) | .10 (.07, .14) |

The results presented above are based on two mediation analyses predicting the mediating effects of absolute differences between a respondent’s ideology and the respondent’s perceived ideology of either the A: Democratic or B: Republican Party. The mediation model first estimates a regression predicting the mediators value (in model A: Absolute Democrat Ideology Diff, Model B: Absolute Republican Ideology Difference)

Table SA5: Match Results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model A | Model B | Model C | Model D |
|  | Match: Black Dem (W) vs. Other | Match: Black Rep (W) vs. Other | Match: Black Dem (L) vs. Other | Match: Black Rep (L) vs. Other |
| Black Dem Cand (W) | **-0.16\*\*** | -0.41 | -1.21 | 0.09 |
|  | **(0.07)** | (1.24) | (2.73) | (0.07) |
| Black Rep Cand (W) | -0.71 | **0.57\*\*\*** | 0.69\*\*\* | -0.04 |
|  | (4.88) | **(0.22)** | (0.23) | (2.22) |
| Black Dem Cand (L) | 0.66 | -0.59\*\* | **-0.38\*\*** | -0.37 |
|  | (7.92) | (0.26) | **(0.17)** | (1.60) |
| Black Rep Cand (L) | 0.13 | -1.08 | -1.96\* | **0.01** |
|  | (0.10) | (1.15) | (1.12) | **(0.09)** |
| Female | -0.30\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* | -0.36\*\*\* | -0.30\*\*\* |
|  | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.09) | (0.07) |
| Age | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\*\* | -0.01\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Education | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.05\* | 0.09\*\*\* | -0.01 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Income | 0.00\*\* | 0.00 | 0.00\* | 0.00\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Ideology | 0.23\*\*\* | 0.31\*\*\* | 0.38\*\*\* | 0.17\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) |
| South | 0.01 | -0.25\*\* | -0.13 | 0.07 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.09) | (0.07) |
| GOP Win | 0.04 | 0.25 | -0.15 | 0.17 |
|  | (0.66) | (0.15) | (0.19) | (0.26) |
| Constant | 0.91\*\*\* | 0.62 | 0.10 | 1.90\*\*\* |
|  | (0.27) | (0.49) | (0.45) | (0.33) |
| Observations | 2,095 | 838 | 1,210 | 1,756 |
| R-squared | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.06 |

Source: 2010 Cooperative Congressional Election Study. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Coefficients in bold represent the variables of interest following coarsened exact matching. Only black respondents are in the above analysis.

Notes: The above analysis measures difference between different treatment groups after coaresened exact matching by the treatment district's percent of the black population and the cook's partisan voting index scores. After each matching procedure the difference in the treatment categories and control categories with regards to the size of the black population and the partisan leanings of the district is insignificant (i.e. the districts of interest and their comparisons are balances on the size of the black population and pvi variables). The results presented in SA5 demonstrate that if black individuals in districts with different types of black candidates were compared to other blacks from similar districts in terms of the size of the black population partisan leanings with non-black candidates the results presented in the text would not be dramatically different. Namely, black Democratic candidates who failed or succeeded would still be associated with blacks being more likely to identify with the Democratic Party. Also, blacks who resided in districts with successful black Republicans would be more likely to identify with the Republican Party.

Table SA6: Partisan (1=Strong Dem…7=Strong Rep) Differences between Those Who Correctly or Incorrectly Identified the Race of the Co-Racial/Ethnic Candidates in Their District

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate Type | Correct | Incorrect | Diff | Significance |
| Black Dem (W) | 1.76 (1,278) | 2.04 (33) | 0.28 | 0.19 |
| Black Dem (L) | 1.87 (48) | 1.93 (45) | 0.06 | 0.84 |
| Black Rep (W) | 3.1 (16) | 2.24 (44) | 0.86 | 0.12 |
| Black Rep (L) | 1.81 (178) | 2.27 (71) | -0.46 | 0.04 |
| Latino Dem (W) | 3.32 (290) | 3.09 (86) | 0.23 | 0.38 |
| Latino Dem (L) | 3.93 (165) | 3.48 (74) | 0.45 | 0.12 |
| Latino Rep (W) | 4.21 (215) | 3.84 (38) | 0.37 | 0.33 |
| Latino Rep (L) | 3.52 (72) | 3.38 (96) | 0.14 | 0.69 |

Only the partisanship for respondents who are black are reported for the section with black candidates. Only the partisanship for respondents who are Latino are reported for the section with Latino candidates.