Every Heart Beats True, for the Red, White, and Blue: National Identity Predicts Voter Support

Debbie S. Ma*
California State University, Northridge

Thierry Devos
San Diego State University

In two studies conducted during the 2012 U.S. presidential election, we sought to determine whether the relative ascription of the American identity to Barack Obama and Mitt Romney was distinct from attitudinal responses and from associations about racial categories. We also tested the degree to which these associations accounted for voter support. In both studies, participants completed a series of Implicit Association Tests and reported their intention to vote for and their willingness to support these candidates. In contrast to implicit associations about racial categories (Black vs. White), Obama was implicitly seen as more American and elicited a more favorable implicit evaluation than Romney (Study 1). At the same time, these effects were reduced when candidates were categorized based on their racial (rather than personal) identity (Study 2). Implicit associations about the candidates (but not racial categories) accounted for intention to vote for them and relative willingness to support them over and above the effect of political orientation (Studies 1 & 2). These findings suggest that the implicit ascription of a national identity is an important facet of presidential elections.

During the 2008 U.S. presidential election, Barack Obama's national identity received close attention. In particular, individuals collectively referred to as the "birthers" questioned Obama's citizenship by maintaining that he was not born in the United States or that he was born in Hawai'i before the state joined the Union. These claims were lobbied in an attempt to disqualify Obama from holding the nation's highest office (Article Two of the U.S. Constitution requires the President to be a natural born citizen). Well into his presidency, apprehension about the legitimacy of Obama's birth status lingered, which ultimately prompted the White House to release Obama's Long Form Birth Certificate on April 27, 2011. Still, misgivings about Obama's birth status resurfaced during his re-election campaign. For example, the elected Sheriff of Arizona's Maricopa County, Joe Arpaio, launched a private investigation of Obama's birth certificate and publicly repudiated the document as a forgery. Likewise, public figure Donald Trump expressed skepticism about the birth certificate's validity in several media appearances and released a videotaped appeal calling for additional documentation.

Although one might argue that the birther movement represents the beliefs held by a skeptical few, a poll conducted by Public Policy Polling in February 2011 revealed that 51% of Republican respondents believed that Obama was not born in the United States. This sentiment might be even more widespread. Over the last few years, researchers have documented a robust tendency to more strongly associate the concept American with White Americans than Black Americans, Asian Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Americans (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Devos, Gavin, & Quintana, 2010; Nosek, Smyth, et al., 2007). Moreover, researchers have observed the propensity to more easily ascribe Americanness to Whites than ethnic minorities even in situations where participants know at an explicit level that the White individuals in question are not American citizens (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Devos & Ma, 2008). Of course, issues about racial and ethnic exclusion are not new phenomena—historians have documented and described a culture of nativism and xenophobia in America for centuries (Higham, 1955). This cultural milieu of disenfranchising minorities has been tightly linked to political behavior by social psychologists, law scholars, and historians alike (e.g., Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, & Armstrong, 2001; Leibowicz, 1985; Sánchez, 1997).

Issues of national identity and patriotism merit significant consideration when electing an individual to represent the nation's values and shape the nation's future. By some accounts, the presidency symbolizes American values (Edelman, 1964; Lowi, 1985). For this reason, we examined the role of national identity in the 2008 U.S. presidential election. In a series of four studies (Devos & Ma, 2012), we measured the extent to which participants explicitly and implicitly associated Barack Obama and Tony Blair, Hillary Clinton, or John McCain with the concept American. Consistently, we showed that ascription of national identity depended on how participants construed the political candidates—when participants focused

on the candidates' racial identities rather than personal identities (i.e., names) they showed more of a tendency to implicitly perceive the White candidate as American relative to Obama. In addition, individual differences in the ease with which participants associated Obama with American predicted greater willingness to support his candidacy over and above the effects of explicit prejudice and political orientation. The current research sought to replicate and extend these findings within the context of the 2012 U.S. presidential election.

Although our earlier research highlighted a link between national identity and voting-related responses (see also Knowles, Lowery, & Schaumberg, 2009; Sheets, Domke, & Greenwald, 2011), it is important to acknowledge the likely relationship between ascriptions of national identity and evaluative judgments more generally. Principles of affective-cognitive consistency (Cvencek, Greenwald, & Meltzoff, 2012; Festinger, 1957; Greenwald et al., 2002; Heider, 1958) posit that individuals are motivated to maintain coherence among cognitive and affective responses, in order that they do not create psychological tension or dissonance. Research conducted by Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, and Montheith (2001) found that U.S. college students showed implicit ingroup bias favoring Americans more than individuals from other countries. Likewise, Devos and Banaji (2005) reported that American participants possessed strong pro-American implicit attitudes. If individuals have positive regard for their national identity, then others who are tightly associated with the group should also be viewed positively. In other words, among American participants, ascribing Americanness to an individual should correspond with greater liking. Consistent with this view, researchers have shown that individuals who are evaluatively positive are more likely to be associated with the American identity than individuals who are evaluatively negative, even when those individuals are members of a relatively disliked or stigmatized social group (Rydell, Hamilton, & Devos, 2010).

The probable relationship between ascriptions of American identity and positive evaluations is important to consider when isolating factors that might contribute to voting behavior. In testing this question, we sought to determine whether beliefs about national identity represent something distinct from evaluation in voters' minds. The critical question for the current research is whether national identity and evaluative associations *uniquely* account for variability in candidate support. Political scientists and social psychologists have long focused on the role that attitudes play in political behavior. Abelson, Kinder, Peters, and Fiske (1982), for example, asked participants at the start of the 1980 presidential election to provide affective and semantic knowledge about the politicians who were vying for the presidency at the time. Results indicated that both affective judgments (i.e., attitudes) and semantic associations (i.e., cognitions) related to overall preference. Moreover, attitudes were more consequential than cognitions in predicting candidate support, an idea that has since found support across a number of studies examining political behavior and candidate support (e.g., Breckler & Wiggins,

1991; Lavine, Thomsen, Zanna, & Borgida, 1998; Rahn, Aldrich, Borgida, & Sullivan, 1990). Findings such as these support the view that the likability of a candidate is a good predictor of election outcomes (but see Fiorina, Abrams, & Pope, 2000). Outside the realm of politics, others have echoed the idea that deliberative affect and cognition independently influence attitude formation and change (Edwards, 1990) and behaviors (Esses & Dovidio, 2002), but that affect is more predictive than cognition. In fact, the magnitude of this difference may be sizable. For example, a recent meta-analysis conducted by Talaska, Fiske, and Chaiken (2008) evaluated 57 studies and found that attitudes related to discriminatory behaviors compared to cognitions by a factor of two.

The trope that attitudes figure prominently in political activity has found recent headway in research examining implicit attitudes (for a review, see Devos, 2011; Nosek, Graham, & Hawkins, 2010). For example, researchers have found that implicit attitudes toward a ballot measure predicted support of that measure weeks later among individuals who initially self-reported being undecided (Arcuri, Castelli, Galdi, Zogmaister, & Amadori, 2008; Friese, Bluemke, & Wänke, 2007; Galdi, Arcuri, & Gawronski, 2008; see also Hawkins & Nosek, 2012). Within the context of the 2008 U.S. presidential election, researchers demonstrated that implicit attitudes toward Blacks relative to Whites corresponded with voting intention (Greenwald, Smith, Bar-Anan, & Nosek, 2009; Payne et al., 2010). Critically, although this research supports the idea that implicit attitudes correspond with voter support, it is unclear whether the influence of implicit attitudes relative to implicit cognitions mirrors the aforementioned findings based on self-reports. That is, do implicit attitudes and implicit cognitions independently predict behavior and what are their relative contributions? Relatively little research exists to address these questions; however, there is some evidence to suggest that the effects at the implicit level deviate from those documented at the explicit level. In particular, Rudman and Ashmore (2007) conducted two studies examining the predictive power of implicit prejudice and implicit stereotypes on discriminatory behaviors. Across both studies, implicit stereotypes and implicit prejudice correlated with discrimination, but when implicit stereotypes were accounted for, implicit prejudice had no measurable relationship with discrimination. The paucity of research examining the role of attitudes and beliefs in implicit political cognition motivated the current research. Although our earlier research (Devos & Ma, 2013) suggests that implicit and explicit beliefs about nationality both uniquely predict voters' support, the present studies focused on the relative contributions of various *implicit* associations. Relying on implicit measures might be particularly warranted to investigate socially sensitive associations, such as those related to race, because individuals may be concerned with self-presentation when self-reporting their racial attitudes or beliefs (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; Jones & Sigall, 1971). We therefore sought to address how *implicit* attitudes and *implicit* ascriptions of national identity figure into voter support.

A final issue that we explored relates to the predictive utility of associations that voters have about particular individuals and social categories. Specifically, the current studies tested the relative contributions of attitudes and beliefs about national identity held about particular candidates versus candidates' racial categories. In predicting voter support, researchers have historically focused on the candidate's features and attributes, such as how likable, competent, moral, or intelligent the candidate appears (Brody & Page, 1973; Kinder & Abelson, 1981). When considering who to support, voters may also take into account a candidate's social identities. In our examination of the 2008 election (Devos & Ma, 2013), for example, we assessed perceptions of Americanness when different aspects of the candidates' identity were highlighted (e.g., personal, race, political affiliation, or age) and used an aggregation of those perceptions to predict voting-related responses. Beliefs and evaluations about a candidate are likely to predict behavioral responses toward that candidate, as suggested by the principle of measurement compatibly (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). Measurement compatibility refers to the idea that psychological constructs will show the highest degree of correspondence when measures are assessed at the same level of specificity. In a classic demonstration of this principle, Davidson and Jaccard (1979) showed that attitudes toward birth control and daily birth control pill use correlated relatively poorly, whereas attitudes toward using oral contraception in the next two years correlated strongly with daily pill use. The critical point to take away here is that associations that voters have with candidates should strongly correlate with voter support.

At the same time, general beliefs and attitudes about particular candidates' social category memberships may also guide behavioral responses. As we described early, demonstrations by both Greenwald et al. (2009) and Payne et al. (2010) showed that attitudes toward Blacks compared to Whites corresponded with support of a particular Black person (Obama) or a particular White person (McCain). Similarly, others have also shown that generalized attitudes toward social categories can influence judgments and treatment of particular category members (Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; McConnell & Leibold, 2001). Thus, generalized attitudes can prove useful to predicting behavioral responses toward particular group members.

The following studies examined several important questions in an attempt to better understand the role that national identity may have on voter support. Within the context of the 2012 U.S. presidential election, we examined the relationship between implicit ascriptions of national identity and implicit attitudes and tested their independent effects on voter support. We hypothesized that implicit perceptions of Americanness would positively correlate with implicit attitudes—participants who have an easier time perceiving one of the candidates as American should also like this candidate more. Moreover, we predicted that these two constructs uniquely account for voter support.

Study 1

In Study 1, we measured implicit national identity and attitudes toward Obama and Romney as well as unknown Blacks and Whites and assessed voter support. Based on the measurement compatibility principle, we predicted that participants' associations with the candidates would correspond to voter support more strongly than associations with Blacks and Whites more generally.

Method

Participants

Data were collected from 342 participants. However, three participants were dropped for failing to complete significant portions of the explicit measures and four participants were excluded because they responded too quickly on 10% or more of the test trials (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). The final sample therefore included 335 (247 women, 87 men, 1 did not report[1]) undergraduates at San Diego State University (SDSU; 153) and California State University Northridge (CSUN; 182). The median age of participants was 19. The sample included 87 White/European Americans, 120 Latino/as, 59 Asian Americans, 18 Black/African Americans, 28 individuals of multiethnic backgrounds, and 23 individuals from other ethnic backgrounds. Based on two items assessing political orientation (described below), we determined that the sample was ideologically more liberal than conservative ($M = 3.08$; $SD = 1.43$; $t(334) = -11.83$; $p < .001$; $d = 0.65$) and more Democrat than Republican ($M = 3.23$; $SD = 1.41$; $t(334) = -9.93$; $p < .001$; $d = 0.54$). Data collection occurred between September 19, 2012 and October 4, 2012.[2] The beginning of data collection for Study 1 marked the point at which early voting began in some states and ended the day after the first Presidential debate.

Procedure

Participants completed four IATs (for a review, see Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2007), each composed of 260-trial critical blocks. The IAT is a widely

---

[1] Participants' gender did not systematically predict the effects reported in this article and the inclusion of participant gender in these models did not significantly alter the effects of interest. For this reason, we did not include gender as a factor in our analyses.

[2] Although it is conceivable that events that unfolded during the presidential campaign could have shifted participants' implicit associations, the likelihood that we would be able to detect those shifts within the narrow period of time in which we were collecting data is unlikely given the slow-changing nature of implicit associations (Rydell & McConnell, 2003). Of course, implicit attitudes are sensitive to context and situation (Blair, 2002); however, such changes would not account for potential differences between Study 1 and Study 2.

used measure of implicit social cognition (Nosek, Hawkins, & Frazier, 2011). It is based on the assumption that the direction and strength of associations between two pairs of concepts can be inferred based on the ease (or speed) with which they can be combined. The IAT does not require introspective access and minimizes the role of conscious control or intention. On each trial, a stimulus (picture or word) appeared at the center of the screen and participants were instructed to categorize it, as quickly and accurately as possible, according to labels that appeared on the top of the screen. The stimuli varied as a function of which IAT participants were completing. Participants made their categorization by pressing a keyboard key designated to the left or right. Response times were recorded from the stimulus onset to its correct classification. The order of the IATs (whether participants completed attitude or national identity measures first and whether participants completed personal versus category-level measures first) and the order of the critical blocks were counterbalanced across participants. Participants were also given a break after completing two IATs to avoid fatigue.

In the *Personal Identity-American IAT*, we measured the perceived Americanness versus foreignness of the candidates. One critical block used the label pairings "Barack Obama" + "American" and "Mitt Romney" + "Foreign." In another critical block, the labels were switched, such that "Mitt Romney" + "American" appeared on one side and "Barack Obama" + "Foreign" on the other side. Six close-cropped pictures of Obama and six of Romney were selected. Photos were taken in neutral backgrounds and matched for facial expression, eye gaze, and body posture. Landmarks and icons representing the concepts American (i.e., Capitol building, Statue of Liberty, Golden Gate Bridge, U.S. flag, bald eagle, and map of U.S.) and foreign (i.e., Eiffel Tower, Leaning Tower of Pisa, Sphinx, flag of Djibouti, Flemish lion, and map of Luxembourg) were borrowed from previous research (Devos, Gavin, & Quintana, 2010). Participants sorted these pictures according to the labels presented on the screen.

The *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* measured attitudes toward Obama and Romney. One critical block used the label pairings "Barack Obama" + "Good" and "Mitt Romney" + "Bad." In the other critical block the labels were "Mitt Romney" + "Good" and "Barack Obama" + "Bad." Participants sorted the same images of the candidates that were used in the *Personal Identity-American IAT* and positive (happy, wonderful, love, pleasure, peace, joy, glorious, and laughter) and negative (hurt, agony, evil, nasty, terrible, horrible, failure, and awful) words borrowed from Nosek, Smyth, et al. (2007).

The *Race Categories-American IAT* was used to measure perceptions of Americanness versus foreignness of Blacks and Whites. This IAT was identical to the *Personal Identity-American IAT* except participants categorized pictures of Black and White individuals instead of Obama and Romney. Photos were borrowed from Nosek, Smyth, et al. (2007). In one critical block, the label pairings "Black" + "American" and "White" + "Foreign" were used. In the other

critical block, the label pairings were "White" + "American" and "Black" + "Foreign."

The *Race Categories-Attitude IAT* assessed attitudes toward Blacks relative to Whites. This IAT was identical to the *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT*, except participants categorized Black or White individuals rather than the candidates. In one critical block, the label pairings "Black" + "Good" and "White" + "Bad" were opposed. In the other critical block, the label pairings "White" + "Good" and "Black" + "Bad" were contrasted.

After completing the IATs, we measured voting intention by asking participants, "If the election were today, I would vote for: (i) Barack Obama; (ii) Mitt Romney; (iii) Another Candidate." Next, we measured participants' willingness to support Obama and Romney. In particular, we asked participants whether they would be willing to (1) join a student group at school for, (2) donate money to, (3) try to convince my friends and family members to vote for, (4) put a bumper sticker on my car supporting, (5) make phone calls for, (6) go door to door canvassing for, (7) openly state support for, (8) attend a rally in support of, and (9) vote for each candidate (1 = Not at all willing, 7 = Very willing). Questions were asked once for Obama and once for Romney. The order of the items within the support scale and whether they completed items about Obama or Romney first was randomized. The composite of these items was used to index willingness to support the candidates. This measure was identical to that used in earlier work (Devos & Ma, 2013). After the support measures, participants completed several additional explicit measures that we do not report herein for the sake of brevity.

Finally, participants provided demographic information including ethnicity, nationality, gender, and age. To assess political orientation, participants answered two 7-point items rating themselves in terms of how liberal-conservative and Democrat-Republican they were (1 = Strongly liberal, 7 = Strongly conservative and 1 = Strongly Democrat, 7 = Strongly Republican, 4 = Neutral in both cases). Participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results

Implicit Associations

IAT D scores were computed for each of the IATs in accordance with the algorithm set forth by Greenwald et al. (2003). IAT D scores represent the extent to which the two targets were differentiated in terms of their association with the concepts. A positive IAT D indicates that the concepts American or Good were more strongly associated with Obama or Blacks than Romney or Whites. Conversely, a negative score would reveal that the concepts American or Good

Table 1. Correlation Matrices for IATs, Studies 1 and 2

	1	2	3
Study 1			
1. Personal Identity-American IAT	–		
2. Personal Identity-Attitude IAT	+.30*	–	
3. Race Categories-American IAT	+.07	+.06	–
4. Race Categories-Attitude IAT	−.04	+.03	+.20*
Study 2			
1. Personal Identity-American IAT	–		
2. Personal Identity-Attitude IAT	+.37*	–	
3. Race Identity-American IAT	+.35*	+.37*	–
4. Race Identity-Attitude IAT	+.27*	+.38*	+.38*

Note. *$p < .01$.

were more strongly linked with Romney or Whites than Obama or Blacks. Participants' IAT D scores on the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($\alpha = .60$) revealed that the concept American was more strongly linked to Obama than Romney, $t(334) = 10.53$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.57$ ($M = 0.19$; $SD = 0.33$). Performance on the *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($\alpha = .59$) indicated that participants liked Obama more than Romney, $t(334) = 6.09$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.33$ ($M = 0.11$; $SD = 0.34$). The two category-level IATs showed reversals of these personal-level effects. The *Race Categories-American IAT* ($\alpha = .59$) showed a significant tendency to more easily associate the concept American with Whites than Blacks, $t(334) = −9.79$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.54$ ($M = −0.18$; $SD = 0.34$) and participants' IAT D scores on the *Race Categories-Attitude IAT* ($\alpha = .57$) showed significant pro-White/anti-Black attitude, $t(334) = −20.17$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.10$ ($M = −0.35$; $SD = 0.32$). Consistent with our hypothesis, *Personal Identity-American IAT* and *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* were significantly correlated, $r = .30$, $p < .001$, suggesting that individuals who more strongly associated Obama (relative to Romney) with the concept American tended to like him more. Likewise, we observed a significant correlation between the *Race Categories-American IAT* and the *Race Categories-Attitude IAT*, $r = .20$, $p < .001$. Participants who more strongly associated the concept American with Whites (relative to Blacks) tended to show higher pro-Whites attitudes. None of the other correlations was significant (see Table 1).

Next, we explored whether participants' political leanings related to their implicit associations. We regressed each implicit association score on participants' self-reported party affiliation (1 = Strongly Democrat, 7 = Strongly Republican). Results indicated that the more Republican participants reported being, the less likely they were to see Obama (relative to Romney) as American, $\beta = −0.15$, $t(333) = −2.83$, $p = .005$ (see also Crawford & Bhatia, 2012) and the less they liked Obama (relative to Romney), $\beta = −0.22$, $t(333) = −4.17$, $p < .001$. However,

there was no evidence that party affiliation related to a general tendency to view Blacks as less American than Whites, $\beta = -0.12$, $t(333) = -0.07$, $p = .95$, or anti-Black prejudice, $t(333) = -0.22$, $p = .83$.

Predicting Voting Intention

First, we focused on participants' responses to the question of whom they would vote for if they were to vote at the time of the study. Of the 335 participants, 267 selected Obama, 44 selected Romney, and the remaining 24 indicated Other. We coded a binary outcome of voting for Obama or another candidate ($0 = $ Other, $1 = $ Obama).[3] Correlational analyses showed that the personal-level measures—*Personal Identity-American IAT* ($r = .24$; $p < .001$) and *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($r = .36$, $p < .001$) were positively associated with participants' intentions to vote for Obama. The more participants associated Obama (relative to Romney) with the concept American and liked Obama (compared to Romney), the more they indicated an intention to vote for Obama. However, neither category-level measures were related to intention to vote for Obama ($rs \leq .06$, $ps \geq .26$).

Next, we conducted a logistic hierarchical regression analysis. We regressed the intention to vote for Obama on participants' race (coded as White or non-White), the campus from which participants came,[4] political orientation, and the four implicit associations. On step 1, race ($p = .33$), campus ($p = .30$), and political orientation ($p < .001$) were entered and the fit of the model significantly improved from the null model, $\chi^2 (3) = 92.51$, $p < .001$, *Nagelkerke* $R^2 = .38$. On step 2, the addition of the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($p = .05$), *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($p < .001$), *Race Categories-American IAT* ($p = .38$), and *Race Categories-Attitude IAT* ($p = .28$) were added to the model, yielding a significantly better fit, $\chi^2 (4) = 27.86$, $p < .001$, *Nagelkerke* $R^2 = .48$ (see Table 2).

Predicting Relative Willingness to Support Candidates

Overall, participants reported significantly more support for Obama ($\alpha = .95$; $M = 3.40$; $SD = 1.80$) than Romney ($\alpha = .93$; $M = 1.41$; $SD = 0.83$), $t(334) = 16.53$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.90$. We computed a relative willingness to support index by subtracting support of Romney from support of Obama and conducted some correlational analyses to explore the relationships between this index and the

---

[3] Similar analyses were also performed using an alternative coding scheme reflecting an intention to vote for Romney vs. another candidate ($0 = $ Other, $1 = $ Romney). The results of these analyses for both Study 1 and Study 2 were extremely similar to those reported in the article.
    [4] Inclusion or exclusion of the race and campus variables did not reliably influence any of the other effects in the model.

Table 2. Intention to Vote for Obama and Relative Willingness to Support the Candidates: Logistic and Linear Regression Analyses, Study 1

Intention vote Obama	B	SE	Wald	OR	p
Political orientation	− 1.55	.25	39.63	0.21	<.001
Participant race	− 0.15	.43	0.12	0.86	.728
Campus	0.26	.37	0.47	1.29	.493
Personal Identity-American IAT	1.14	.59	3.78	3.13	.052
Personal Identity-Attitude IAT	2.47	.65	14.48	11.82	<.001
Race Categories-American IAT	− 0.47	.54	0.77	0.63	.381
Race Categories-Attitude IAT	0.65	.60	1.17	1.92	.279

Willingness support candidates	B	SE	β	t	p
Political orientation	− 1.39	.11	− .56	− 13.19	<.001
Participant race	− 0.69	.23	− .14	− 3.04	.003
Campus	0.49	.20	.11	2.48	.014
Personal Identity-American IAT	0.43	.29	.06	1.46	.147
Personal Identity-Attitude IAT	0.64	.29	.10	2.21	.028
Race Categories-American IAT	0.09	.28	.01	0.34	.737
Race Categories-Attitude IAT	− 0.02	.29	− .002	− 0.06	.955

implicit measures. Consistent with our earlier findings, only the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($r = .18$; $p = .001$) and *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($r = .27$; $p < .001$) correlated with relative willingness to support the candidates. Stronger associations between Obama (relative to Romney) with American and preferences for Obama over Romney corresponded with greater relative willingness to support Obama. However, a tendency to see Whites as more American than Blacks or greater implicit preference for Whites over Blacks did not relate to willingness to support, $rs \leq .04$, $ps \geq .43$.

To test the relative contributions of implicit perceptions of Americanness and implicit attitudes on willingness to support the candidates, we conducted a hierarchical regression analysis. More specifically, in step 1 we regressed relative willingness to support the candidates on participants' race ($p = .002$), campus ($p = .01$), and political orientation ($p < .001$). The model explained a significant amount of variance in relative willingness to support, $R^2 = .43$, $F(3, 331) = 83.85$, $p < .001$ (see Table 2). At step 2, inclusion of the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($p = .15$), *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($p = .03$), *Race Categories-American IAT* ($p = .74$), and *Race Categories-Attitude IAT* ($p = .96$) significantly improved the model fit, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F_{change}(4, 327) = 2.47$, $p = .05$. Collinearity analysis revealed suitable variance inflation factors (≤ 1.06) and tolerance levels ($\geq .96$), indicating that the estimated effects were well-established (see Table 2).

Discussion

Results from Study 1 revealed two important insights. As predicted, individual differences in perceptions of Americanness corresponded with liking, as indicated

by the significant positive correlation between the *Personal Identity-American* and *Personal Identity-Attitude IATs*. Participants who more strongly associated Obama with American also tended to have more positive implicit attitudes favoring Obama. Although this relationship was statistically reliable, it is important to point out that perceptions of Americanness and liking do appear to be distinct constructs in that the correlation was only moderate. Moreover, implicit national identity and liking had unique predictive power on voting-related responses. The second important finding worth highlighting here is the fact that personal-level associations predicted voting-related responses, whereas general associations with the candidates' racial categories did not have a reliable association with voting intention or willingness to support the candidates.

Study 2

Results from Study 1 may seem to suggest that race does not have a role in voter support. However, while it may be the case that associations with Blacks and Whites more generally do not account for voter support, there may be an effect of race as it relates to the candidates. That is, participants' associations with the candidates as members of their respective racial categories may predict voter support even though associations with the categories Black and White might not. To test this possibility, we measured implicit perceptions of Americanness and implicit attitudes toward the candidates when their personal and racial identities were made salient. In particular, we manipulated the labels used to categorize the candidates by either asking participants to categorize stimuli based on personal identity labels ("Barack Obama" and "Mitt Romney") or racial identity labels ("Black" and "White"). This manipulation has been shown to effectively focus participants' attention on specific aspects of a target's identity (Devos & Ma, 2008, 2013; Mitchell, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). In line with previous research, we predicted that the tendency to view Obama as more American than Romney and like Obama more than Romney when the focus is on the candidates' personal identities (see Study 1) would be reduced when the candidates' racial identities were made salient.[5] Finally, we predicted that associations with the candidates as both individuals and as members of racial categories would predict voter support.

---

[5] Although Obama is biracial, he self-identifies as a Black man with mixed racial heritage. Importantly, research suggests that individuals are likely to view Obama as Black (Malahy, Sedlins, Plaks, & Shoda, 2010; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008).

Method

Participants

Data were collected from 322 participants. However, 4 participants failed to complete significant portions of the explicit measures, leaving a final sample of 318 (239 women, 77 men, 2 did not report) undergraduates at SDSU (201) and CSUN (117). The median age of participants was 18. The sample included 101 White/European Americans, 109 Latino/as, 49 Asian Americans, 15 Black/African Americans, 30 individuals of multiethnic backgrounds, 10 individuals from other ethnic backgrounds, and 4 participants did not report their race. The sample was ideologically more liberal than conservative ($M = 3.23$; $SD = 1.46$; $t(317) = -9.48$; $p < .001$; $d = 0.53$) and more Democrat than Republican ($M = 3.34$; $SD = 1.34$; $t(317) = -8.83$; $p < .001$; $d = 0.50$). Data were collected between October 8, 2012 and November 1, 2012. The second and third Presidential debates and the only Vice Presidential debate occurred during this period.

Procedure

The procedure for Study 2 largely followed that of Study 1. Participants completed 4 IATs. These included the *Personal Identity-American* and the *Personal Identity-Attitude IATs*. Instead of completing the *Race Categories-American IAT* and *Race Categories-Attitude IAT*, however, we measured participants' implicit national identity and attitudes toward the candidates when the candidates' race was made salient. These measures are referred to as the *Race Identity-American IAT* and the *Race Identity-Attitude IAT*, respectively.

In the *Race Identity-American IAT*, we measured the perceived Americanness versus foreignness of the candidates when the candidates' races were salient. One critical block used the label pairings "Black" + "American" and "White" + "Foreign." In another critical block, the labels were switched, such that "White" + "American" appeared on one side and "Black" + "Foreign" on the other side. The stimuli included images of the candidates and American and foreign icons and were identical to those used in the *Personal Identity-American IAT*.

In the *Race Identity-Attitude IAT*, we measured attitudes toward the candidates when the candidates' races were salient. One critical block used the label pairings "Black" + "Good" and "White" + "Bad." In another critical block, the labels were switched, such that "White" + "Good" appeared on one side and "Black" + "Bad" on the other side. The stimuli included images of the candidates and positively- and negatively-valenced words and were identical to those used in the *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT*.

After finishing the implicit measures, participants indicated whom they would vote for if the election were today and completed the same candidate support items as in Study 1. Other explicit measures were assessed, but we do not report these for the sake of brevity. Again, demographic information was gathered at the conclusion of the study.

Results

Implicit Associations

The *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($\alpha = .62$) once again showed that the concept American was more strongly linked to Obama than Romney when participants categorized the politicians based on their personal identities, $t(317) = 6.01$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.34$ ($M = 0.11$; $SD = 0.34$). Participants' implicit attitudes toward Obama were more favorable than their attitudes toward Romney when they categorized the candidates based on their personal identities, as revealed by the *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($\alpha = .58$), $t(317) = 3.98$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.22$ ($M = 0.08$; $SD = 0.35$). Performance on the *Race Identity-American IAT* ($\alpha = .57$) revealed a null effect, $t(317) = 1.11$, $p = .27$, $d = 0.06$ ($M = 0.02$; $SD = 0.33$). When participants focused on the candidates' race, there was no evidence for a difference between how strongly Obama and Romney were associated with the concept American. The effect on the *Race Identity-Attitude IAT* ($\alpha = .69$) was significant, $t(317) = -3.63$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.20$ ($M = -0.08$; $SD = 0.39$), indicating that when race was highlighted, participants liked Obama less than Romney (see Table 1).

We also examined the extent to which participants' political leanings related to their implicit associations when the candidates' personal and racial identities were made focal. We regressed each implicit association score on participants' self-reported party affiliation (1 = Strongly Democrat, 7 = Strongly Republican). The more Republican participants reported being, the less likely they were to see Obama (relative to Romney) as American regardless of whether participants were categorizing based on the candidates' personal identities, $\beta = -0.36$, $t(316) = -6.91$, $p < .001$ or racial identities, $\beta = -0.23$, $t(316) = -4.23$, $p < .001$. Being more Republican also corresponded with liking Obama less (relative to Romney) when personal identities, $\beta = -0.33$, $t(316) = -6.15$, $p < .001$ or racial identities, $\beta = -0.31$, $t(316) = -5.80$, $p < .001$ were highlighted.

Next, we wanted to test the hypothesis that construal processes moderated perceptions of Americanness and attitudes. We first conducted a paired-samples t-test comparing IAT D scores on the *Personal Identity-American* and *Race Identity-American IATs*. Recall that on this task participants sorted the exact same stimuli, but were instructed to do so using names or racial labels. This test was statistically significant, $t(317) = 4.39$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.25$, indicating that when participants

focused on the candidates' personal identities they had an easier time associating Obama with the concept American than when race was focal. We also tested whether attitudes toward the candidates were influenced by construal processes by comparing IAT D scores on the *Personal Identity-Attitude* and *Race Identity-Attitude IATs*. This comparison was also statistically significant, $t(317) = 6.79$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.38$. Although participants liked Obama more than Romney when personal identities were salient, they liked Romney significantly more than Obama when race identities were salient.

Voting Intention

Next, we focused on participants' responses to the question of whom they would vote for if they were to vote at the time of the study. Of the 318 participants, 238 indicated Obama, 58 selected Romney, and the remaining 22 responded that they would vote for an alternative candidate. We coded a binary outcome of voting for Obama or another candidate ($0 =$ Other, $1 =$ Obama). Correlational analyses revealed significant positive correlations between the intention to vote for Obama and the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($r = .28$; $p < .001$), *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($r = .38$; $p < .001$), *Race Identity-American IAT* ($r = .34$, $p < .001$), and *Race Identity-Attitude IAT* ($r = .31$; $p < .001$). The more participants associated Obama (relative to Romney) with the concept American and liked Obama (compared to Romney), the more they were more inclined to vote for Obama. This was true when both personal and racial identities were made salient.

Next, we conducted a logistic hierarchical regression analysis following steps similar to those described for Study 1. First, we regressed the intention to vote for Obama on participants' race, campus, political orientation, and implicit associations. On step 1, race ($p < .001$), campus ($p = .17$), and political orientation ($p < .001$) were entered and the fit of the model significantly improved from the null model, $\chi^2 (3) = 113.17$, $p < .001$, *Nagelkerke $R^2 = .45$*. On step 2, the addition of the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($p = .41$), *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($p = .001$), *Race Identity-American IAT* ($p = .02$), and *Race Identity-Attitude IAT* ($p = .30$) significantly improved the model fit, $\chi^2 (4) = 29.34$, $p < .001$, *Nagelkerke $R^2 = .54$* (see Table 3).

Relative Willingness to Support Candidates

Participants reported significantly more support for Obama ($\alpha = .96$; $M = 3.24$; $SD = 1.75$) than Romney ($\alpha = .95$; $M = 1.56$; $SD = 1.11$), $t(317) = 12.09$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.68$. Correlational analyses revealed significant positive correlations between willingness to support Obama relative to Romney and *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($r = .44$; $p < .001$), *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($r = .44$; $p < .001$), *Race Identity-American IAT* ($r = .38$; $p < .001$), and *Race Identity-Attitude*

Table 3. Intention to Vote for Obama and Relative Willingness to Support the Candidates: Logistic and Linear Regression Analyses, Study 2

Intention Vote Obama	B	SE	Wald	OR	p
Political orientation	− 1.74	.29	35.85	0.18	<.001
Participant race	− 1.30	.39	10.92	0.27	.001
Campus	− 0.60	.39	2.30	0.55	.129
Personal Identity-American IAT	− 0.51	.61	0.68	0.60	.409
Personal Identity-Attitude IAT	2.11	.64	10.74	8.25	.001
Race Identity-American IAT	1.43	.62	5.28	4.17	.022
Race Identity-Attitude IAT	0.53	.52	1.07	1.70	.301

Willingness support candidates	B	SE	β	T	p
Political orientation	− 1.31	.12	− .48	− 11.08	<.001
Participant race	− 0.76	.22	− .14	− 3.49	.001
Campus	− 0.11	.21	− .02	− 0.51	.610
Personal Identity-American IAT	0.90	.32	.12	2.78	.006
Personal Identity-Attitude IAT	1.16	.32	.16	3.60	<.001
Race Identity-American IAT	0.77	.34	.10	2.27	.024
Race Identity-Attitude IAT	0.56	.28	.09	2.00	.046

IAT ($r = .39$; $p < .001$). The more participants associated Obama (relative to Romney) with the concept American and liked Obama (compared to Romney)—regardless of whether the candidates' personal or racial identities were salient—the more they were willing to support Obama relative to Romney.

To test the relative contributions of implicit associations, we conducted a hierarchical regression analysis. At step 1, we regressed relative willingness to support the candidates on participants' race ($p < .001$), campus ($p = .67$), and political orientation ($p < .001$). The model explained a significant proportion of variance in relative willingness to support, $R^2 = .44$, $F(3, 310) = 82.09$, $p < .001$ (see Table 3). At step 2, inclusion of the *Personal Identity-American IAT* ($p = .006$), *Personal Identity-Attitude IAT* ($p < .001$), *Race Identity-American IAT* ($p = .02$), and *Race Identity-Attitude IAT* ($p = .05$) significantly improved the model fit, $\Delta R^2 = .10$, $F_{change}(4, 306) = 15.99$, $p < .001$. Collinearity diagnostics showed suitable variance inflation factors (≤ 1.37) and tolerance levels ($\geq .97$), indicating that the estimated effects were well-established and the independent variables were not redundant (see Table 3).

Discussion

As in Study 1, we observed significant positive correlations between implicit national identity and liking. We also found that the way in which participants construed candidates influenced the extent to which they were perceived as being American and how much they were liked. When personal identities were made

focal, participants perceived Obama as more American and liked him more than Romney. However, this pattern significantly changed when participants construed Obama and Romney through the lenses of their respective racial identity. Although there were some differences across dependent measures in terms of how implicit measures accounted for voter support, two consistent relations should be stressed. First, and perhaps not surprisingly, how much candidates were liked when their personal identities were salient figured into both measures of voter support. Preference for Obama over Romney corresponded with greater intention to vote for Obama and more willingness to support Obama relatively to Romney. More relevant to our current aims was the observation that how American Obama was relative to Romney when racial identities were highlighted also predicted voter support across both indicators. When participants considered the race of the candidates, those who associated the American identity more strongly with Obama than with Romney were more likely to indicate that they would vote for Obama and were more willing to support Obama's campaign rather than Romney's campaign. Critically, these reliable relations were found while controlling for all of the other implicit associations as well as participants' race, campus, and political orientation.

General Discussion

The 2012 U.S. presidential election provided a unique opportunity to extend our understanding of the role of implicit associations in the political arena. The present findings make several important and novel contributions to the literature. For the first time, we simultaneously assessed the extent to which political candidates are associated to the national identity and elicited relatively positive or negative evaluations. Not surprisingly, individuals who have an easier time associating the American identity to Obama than to Romney also display a more favorable attitude toward the former than the latter. Although implicit national identity and implicit attitudes are reliably intercorrelated, the overlap between these measures is moderate, suggesting that they tap distinct, yet related, constructs (Studies 1 & 2). Similar conclusions hold when we examine associations about racial categories (Study 1): The tendency to view Whites as more American than Blacks is related to a pro-White/anti-Black attitude. Although it is likely that evaluative responses can be one criterion for inclusion in the national identity and weak associations to the national identity can be a basis for devaluation (Rydell, Hamilton, & Devos, 2010), these two levels are distinct, probably reflecting that some of their determinants are specific.

A second important contribution of this work is to systematically explore the extent to which implicit associations about political candidates who differ in terms of racial identity are related to implicit associations about the racial groups to which they belong (Study 1). Here, the results clearly point to a relative

dissociation between these two levels. Implicit associations about the two candidates who were running for office (Obama vs. Romney) do not reliably correlate with implicit associations about racial categories (Blacks vs. Whites). This dissociation emerges for assessments of both Americanness and attitude. These findings demonstrate the suitability of a technique such as the IAT to tap associations about specific targets. At a more conceptual level, these findings are consistent with a substantial body of work establishing the distinction between interpersonal and intergroup perceptions or attitudes (Brewer, Weber, & Carini, 1995; Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Cognitions and evaluations about individuals and social groups are fairly distinct and specific even when we compare individuals who belong to the social groups under consideration. At the same time, the extent to which specific individuals are construed as members of social groups has implications for the cognitive and affective responses they elicit. In line with prior research (Devos & Ma, 2008, 2013; Mitchell, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003), perceptions of Americanness and evaluative responses fluctuate depending on whether Obama and Romney are categorized based on their personal identities or their respective racial identities. When race comes to the forefront, it is relatively harder to associate the American identity with Obama and he is evaluated less favorably than when the candidates are appraised as individuals (see also Nevid & McClelland, 2010). The continued effect of the label manipulation is perhaps even more impressive considering that participants would likely have formed individuated impressions of Obama (and possibly Romney) given his visibility and high-profile status (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Research also suggests, however, that minority groups are higher in perceived entitativity (Lickel et al., 2000), which could conceivably result in chronic perceptions of Obama through a racial lens. Regardless of what the default perceptions of Obama and Romney are, the critical point to take away is that the way in which Obama and Romney are construed can reliably affect the extent to which they are associated with the American identity or elicit more or less favorable attitudes—if even momentarily.

A third important aspect of this work is to examine the predictive validity of implicit associations on the extent to which individuals vote for candidates or, at a minimum, indicate an intention to do so and express a willingness to support them. The fact that behavioral responses are linked to implicit associations (attitudes and stereotypes) has now firmly been established (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009). However, whereas prior research on implicit political cognition focused on the predictive validity of *either* implicit associations with candidates (Devos & Ma, 2013; Sheets, Domke, & Greenwald, 2011) or implicit attitudes toward racial categories (i.e., implicit prejudice; Greenwald Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009; Payne et al., 2010), Study 1 simultaneously examined both. The findings clearly suggest that implicit associations toward the political candidates (as opposed to the candidates' respective racial categories) are the most potent predictors of voting intention and willingness to support the candidates. This could

easily be explained based on a principle of measurement compatibility (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Davidson & Jaccard, 1979), but it is worth stressing that implicit associations about racial categories do not reliably predict behavioral responses, even when considered in isolation. This fails to replicate research conducted by Greenwald et al. (2009) or Payne et al. (2010). Notably, however, the present research deviates significantly from the methods employed by these researchers (e.g., those studies used larger and more diverse samples and some of these studies exclusively used online data collection techniques).

The current research examined the predictive power of implicit national identity and implicit attitudes. The predictive validity of these constructs has been established in distinct lines of research, but it has not been examined simultaneously. On this issue, the present findings reveal that both implicit national identity and implicit attitudes matter—even when we control for political orientation. Consistently, bivariate correlations show that voting intention and relative willingness to support candidates are linked to implicit national identity and implicit attitudes. Given that these two constructs overlap, it is also important to examine their predictive power when they are simultaneously considered. Based on the findings of Study 1, implicit attitude and implicit national identity each have a unique contribution to voting intentions. Not surprisingly, attitude emerges as a more robust predictor. This is consistent with the research we reviewed earlier examining the predictive utility of explicit attitudes and beliefs (Abelson Kinder, Peters, & Fiske, 1982; Breckler & Wiggins, 1991; Lavine, Thomsen, Zanna, & Borgida, 1998; Rahn, Aldrich, Borgida, & Sullivan, 1990). However, our finding contrasts with research conducted by Rudman and Ashmore (2007), who reported that implicit stereotypes predicted discrimination more strongly than implicit prejudice. We speculate that this discrepancy may be because of differences in the types of beliefs we measured compared to the types of stereotypes Rudman and Ashmore assessed. Study 2 adds another layer of complexity by showing that implicit attitudes predict voting intentions in particular when candidates are appraised based on their personal identities, whereas implicit national identity is adding to the model when candidates are construed along racial lines. This novel finding is further evidence for the value of simultaneously considering implicit attitudes and implicit national identity and examining their respective role as a function of how targets are construed.

We do, of course, acknowledge the limitations of our sample when drawing conclusions from the current studies. Chief among these limitations is the relative lack of ideological diversity in the sample. Our samples were drawn from college populations, which tend to be more liberal than the general electorate, and these colleges are both located in the state of California, a Democratic stronghold. For this reason, we conducted some exploratory analyses to determine whether implicit associations predict voter support *differentially* based on political affiliation by analyzing the data separately for left-leaning and right-leaning individuals.

Based on these exploratory analyses, it appeared that for Democrats, support was associated with how much they liked Obama as an individual, whereas for Republicans, support was associated with by how strongly they associated Obama with the concept American. The lack of representativeness in our samples therefore suggests that the results we report here probably overestimate the size of effects when their direction favors Obama, but underestimate the size of effects when their direction favors Romney compared to what we might observe in a more representative sample. Of course, the current studies were not designed to examine differences between Democrats and Republicans and therefore these analyses should be interpreted with caution.

Finally, although the purpose of this research was not to compare the patterns found in 2008 and 2012, it is worth examining the extent to which the data point to the stability or change in the role of implicit associations. Before describing these analyses, we would like to caution that differences observed between 2008 and 2012 may stem from differences in associations with McCain versus Romney as well as changes in associations with Obama. For these reasons, the comparison between these elections is not a perfect one-to-one mapping and should be interpreted with prudence. Our first exploratory analysis compared the two 2008 studies that contrasted Obama and McCain (Devos & Ma, 2013, Studies 3 and 4; $N = 344$) to the 2012 data of Study 2 collected on the same campus (SDSU, $N = 201$). In all cases, the studies contrasted the candidate representing the Democratic party to the candidate representing the Republican party. In addition, the procedure varied whether the candidates were categorized based on their personal identities or their racial identities and included the same measure of relative willingness to support the candidates. Besides the fact that the sociopolitical context has changed, there were several minor procedural differences across studies, but by and large the method and measures were highly similar. These data afford us the opportunity to answer, with caution, three simple questions. First, has there been a change in the extent to which Barack Obama is seen as more or less American than his White, Republican opponent? Yes, the difference between the 2008 and 2012, $F(1, 543) = 32.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .11$, indicates that Obama was seen as less American than McCain in 2008, but this time he was seen as more American than Romney. Second, was the impact of emphasizing racial identities similar or different across election contexts? Similar would be the answer given that the impact of the label manipulation did not vary as a function of election campaign, $F(1, 543) = 0.66, p = .42, \eta_p^2 = .00$. In both 2008 and 2012, when the candidates were construed through racial lenses, it became more difficult to associate the American identity to the Black candidate than to the White candidate, $F(1, 543) = 21.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .04$. Third, did the predictive power of implicit associations differ or remain the same across election contexts? Here also, the data suggest stability: the relative willingness to support the candidates was linked to the extent to which they were differentiated in terms of their association with the national

identity whether it was based on their personal identities ($\beta = .18$; $p < .001$) or racial identities ($\beta = .11$; $p = .01$) and these relations were not reliably moderated by election context (respectively, $\beta = -.01$; $p = .78$ and $\beta = .07$, $p = .10$). In sum, at least based on data collected among fairly liberal college students, one could say that over the last four years, there might have been a shift in the relative ease or difficulty to associate the American identity with Obama. To put it bluntly, four years as President of the United States will grant you the national identity. More puzzling is the fact that, to the extent that political candidates are appraised based on racial distinctions, a relative difficulty to associate the American identity with a Black politician continues to surface and to have implications for voter support.

In 2008, on the night Barack Obama was elected President, many pundits speculated about the implications of this historic event for the state of race relations in the United States—some even boldly proclaimed that Obama's election signaled a "post-racial America." Yet, in the years following the election, race and national identity were still focal as some continued to question his birth status. Interestingly, this scrutiny seems to be heavily tied to race—whereas Obama, a Black man, has been continually challenged about the legitimacy of his birth status, Mitt Romney's father (George Romney) faced no such opposition when he ran for the U.S. presidency in 1968 despite actually having been born in Mexico. In fact, Mitt Romney's campaign emphasized George Romney's immigrant status throughout the 2012 election as evidence for Mitt Romney's openness to immigration and immigration reform. In line with the picture emerging from the two studies reported here, behind political partisanship and electoral debates lurk deeply ingrained associations that contribute to swiftly deny or grant the national identity to individuals running for office by virtue of their membership to specific racial, ethnic, or cultural groups. The implicit ascription of national identity, along with more purely evaluative associations, is an important facet of biracial or multiracial electoral contests.

References

Abelson, R. P., Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., & Fiske, S. T. (1982). Affective and semantic components in political person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *42*, 619–630.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*, 888–918.

Arcuri, L., Castelli, L., Galdi, S., Zogmaister, C., & Amadori, A. (2008). Predicting the vote: Implicit attitudes as predictors of the future behavior of decided and undecided voters. *Political Psychology*, *29*, 369–387.

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Voils, C. I., & Monteith, M. J. (2001). Implicit associations as the seeds of intergroup bias: How easily do they take root? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 789–799.

Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6*, 242–261.

Breckler, S. J., & Wiggins, E. C. (1991). Cognitive responses in persuasion: Affective and evaluative determinants. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *27*, 180–200.

Brewer, M. B., Weber, J. G., & Carini, B. (1995). Person memory in intergroup contexts: Categorization versus individuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 29–40.

Brody, R. A., & Page, B. I. (1973). Indifference, alienation, and rational decisions. *Public Choice*, *15*, 1–17.

Crawford, J. T., & Bhatia, A., (2012). Birther nation: Political conservatism is associated with explicit and implicit beliefs that President Barack Obama is foreign. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *12*, 364–376.

Cvencek, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2012). Balance identity theory: Evidence for implicit consistency in social cognition. In B. Gawronski & F. Strack (Eds.), *Cognitive consistency: A unifying concept in social psychology* (pp. 157–177). New York: Guilford.

Davidson, A. R., & Jaccard, J. J. (1979). Variables that moderate the attitude-behavior relation: results of a longitudinal survey. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1364–13796.

Devos, T. (2011). The role of race in American politics: Lessons learned from the 2008 presidential election. In G. S. Parks & M. W. Hughey (Eds.), *The Obamas and a (post) racial America* (pp. 218–242). New York: Oxford University Press.

Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 447–466.

Devos, T., Gavin, K., & Quintana, F. J. (2010). Say "adios" to the American dream? The interplay between ethnic and national identity among Latino and Caucasian Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*, 37–49.

Devos, T., & Ma, D. S. (2008). Is Kate Winslet more American than Lucy Liu? The impact of construal processes on the implicit ascription of a national identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*, 191–215.

Devos, T., & Ma, D. S. (2013). How "American" is Barack Obama? The role of national identity in a historic bid for the White House. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *43*, 214–226.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *33*, 510–540.

Edelman, M. J. (1964). *The symbolic uses of politics*. Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois Press.

Edwards, K. (1990). The interplay of affect and cognition in attitude formation and change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 202–216.

Esses, V. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). The role of emotions in determining willingness to engage in intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 1202–1214.

Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 389–412.

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 10133–1027.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fiorina, M., Abrams, S., & Pope, J. (2000). The 2000 US presidential election: Can retrospective voting be saved? *British Journal of Political Science*, *33*, 163–187.

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 1–74). New York: Academic Press.

Friese, M., Bluemke, M., & Wänke, M. (2007). Predicting voting behavior with implicit attitude measures: The 2002 German parliamentary election. *Experimental Psychology*, *54*, 247–255.

Galdi, S., Arcuri, L., & Gawronski, B. (2008). Automatic mental associations predict future 3 choices of undecided decision-makers. *Science*, *321*, 1100–1102.

Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellot, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 3–25.

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: 1. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 197–216.

Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 17–41.

Greenwald, A. G., Smith, C. T., Sriram, N., Bar-Anan, Y., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Implicit race attitudes predicted vote in the 2008 U.S. presidential election. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *9*, 241–253.

Hawkins, C. B., & Nosek, B. A. (2012). Motivated independence? Implicit party identity predicts political judgments among self-proclaimed independents. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 1437–1452.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

Higham, J. (1955). *Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism, 1860–1925*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Jones, E. E., & Sigall, H. (1971). The bogus pipeline: A new paradigm for measuring affect and attitude. *Psychological Bulletin*, *76*, 349–364.

Kinder, D. R., & Abelson, R. P. (1981). Appraising presidential candidates: Personality and affect in the 1980 campaign. *Annual meeting of the american political science association*. New York.

Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., & Schaumberg, R. L. (2009). Anti-egalitarians for Obama? Group-dominance motivation and the Obama vote. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 965–969.

Lavine, H., Thomsen, C. J., Zanna, M. P., & Borgida, E. (1998). On the primacy of affect in the determination of attitudes and behavior: The moderating role of affective-cognitive ambivalence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*, 398–421.

Leibowicz, J. (1985). The proposed English language amendment: Shield or sword? *Yale Law & Policy Review*, *3*, 519–550.

Lickel, B., Hamilton, D. L., Wieczorkowska, G., Lewis, A., Sherman, S. J., & Uhles, A. N. (2000). Varieties of groups and the perception of group entitativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 223–246.

Lowi, T. J. (1985). *The personal President: Power invested, promise unfulfilled*. Ithaca, N: Cornell University Press.

Malahy, L. W., Sedlins, M., Plaks, J., & Shoda, Y. (2010). Black and White, or shades of gray? Racial labeling of Barack Obama predicts implicit race perception. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *10*, 207–222.

McConnell, A. R., & Leibold, J. M. (2001). Relations among the Implicit Association Test, discriminatory behavior, and explicit measures of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*, 435–442.

Mitchell, J. P., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Contextual variations in implicit evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *132*, 455–469.

Nevid, J. S., & McClelland, N. (2010). Measurement of implicit and explicit attitudes toward Barack Obama. *Psychology & Marketing*, *27*, 989–1000.

Nosek, B. A., Graham, J., & Hawkins, C. B. (2010). Implicit political cognition. In B. Gawronski & B. K. Payne (Eds.), *Handbook of implicit social cognition: Measurement, theory, and applications* (pp. 548–564). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). The Implicit Association Test at age 7: A methodological and conceptual review. In J. A. Bargh (Ed.), *Social psychology and the unconscious: The automaticity of higher mental processes* (pp. 265–292). New York: Psychology Press.

Nosek, B. A., Hawkins, C. B., & Frazier, R. S. (2011). Implicit social cognition: From measures to mechanisms. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*, 152–159.

Nosek, B. A., Smyth, F. L., Hansen, J. J., Devos, T., Lindner, N. M., Ranganath, K. A., Smith, C. T., Olson, K. R., Chugh, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *18*, 36–88.

Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1994). *Stereotyping and social reality*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Payne, B. K., Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., Lelkes, Y., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2010). Implicit and explicit prejudice in the 2008 American presidential election. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 367–374.

Peery, D., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2008). Black + White = Black: Hypodescent in reflexive categorization of racially ambiguous faces. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 973–977.

Public Policy Polling. (2011). *Huckabee tops GOP field, 51% are birthers and love Palin*. Raleigh, NC: Tom Jensen.

Rahn, W., Aldrich, J. H., Borgida, E., & Sullivan, J. L. (1990). A social-cognitive model of candidate appraisal. In J. Ferejohn & J. Kuklinski (Eds.), *Information and democratic processes*. (136–159). Champaign-Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Rudman, L. A., & Ashmore, R. D. (2007). Discrimination and the Implicit Association Test. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *103*, 359–372.

Rydell, R. J., Hamilton, D. L., & Devos, T. (2010). Now they are American, now they are not: Valence as a determinant of the inclusion of African Americans in the American identity. *Social Cognition*, *28*, 161–179.

Rydell, R. J., & McConnell, A. R. (2003). Understanding implicit and explicit attitude change: A systems of reasoning analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 995-1008.

Sánchez, G. J. (1997). Face the Nation: Race, immigration, and the rise of nativism in late twentieth century America. *International Migration Review*, *31*, 1009–1030.

Sheets, P., Domke, D. S., & Greenwald, A. G. (2011). God and country: The partisan psychology of the presidency, religion, and nation. *Political Psychology*, *32*, 459–484.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Talaska, C. A., Fiske, S. T., & Chaiken, S. (2008). Legitimating racial discrimination: Emotions, not beliefs, best predict discrimination in a meta-analysis. *Social Justice Research: Social Power in Action*, *21*, 263–296.

DEBBIE S. MA is an Assistant Professor at California State University, Northridge. She completed her doctoral studies in Experimental Social Psychology at the University of Chicago in 2011. Her research investigates the ways that social categories shape human thought and behavior from a social cognition perspective. She has specific interests in face perception and how targets' features influence judgment and racial identification. Debbie's other research interests involve how subtle contextual cues alter stereotypic judgments and automatic associations.

THIERRY DEVOS is Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology at San Diego State University. He received his Ph.D. in social sciences from the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. His research focuses on how social identities operate outside of conscious awareness and control. Specifically, he is interested in the implicit interconnections between ethnic and national identities, and in factors affecting the implicit academic self-concept of underrepresented groups. He has published more than 50 peer-reviewed articles or contributions to edited volumes. His research has been funded by the National Institute of Mental Health and the Swiss National Science Foundation.