Abstract and Keywords

As electorates around the world become increasingly diverse, addressing how electoral persuasion emerges is a major concern. Focusing on the United States, this chapter explores the campaign strategies used by candidates to persuade, mobilize, and target diverse voters. It begins by conducting an exhaustive review of the existing research. After doing so, the chapter concludes that there is still much to be done and highlights particular aspects ripe for future research. In particular, scant attention has been paid to the ways candidates, political parties, and outside groups target African Americans and the extent to which they are persuaded or mobilized by these efforts. A similar need exists with respect to the campaign strategies used to target Asian Americans. Critically, it is important to know whether the electoral tactics, long proven effective for white Americans also work in the same way for voters with distinct political experiences and socialization processes. The remainder of the chapter offers future avenues and directions for scholars wishing to better understand how electoral persuasion operates in diverse electorates.
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A vast demographic shift has taken place in the United States over the past sixty years. According to the 1960 US Census, 11.4 percent of the population identified as non-white, with over 80 percent of the non-white population identifying as African American (US Census 1963). Fast forward to the 2010 US Census, African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and other racial and ethnic groups accounted for 36.3 percent of the population. This change constitutes over a three-fold increase in just fifty years (Hixson, Hepler, and Ouk Kim 2011). Largely due to large-scale immigration from Asia and Latin America during this time period (Masuoka and Junn 2011), the United States has become increasingly diverse, with estimates pointing to a majority-minority nation by 2050 (Frey 2016). Currently Latinos are concentrated in border states, such as California, Arizona, and
Texas, with increasing voting power, but there are also populations of over a million Latinos in Florida, New York, New Jersey, and Illinois (Ennis, Ríos-Vargas, and Albert 2011).

While Asian Americans currently comprise only 5.6 percent of the US population, they represent the fastest growing racial category, growing 46 percent from 2000 to 2010. Asian Americans are heavily concentrated on the West Coast, but these patterns are also in flux, with a larger share moving to Southern states and other non-traditional Asian American localities (Rastogi et al. 2012). Finally, while the African American population has not grown as fast as other racial groups, they still comprise 13.6 percent of the population, with heavy concentrations throughout the country (Rastogi et al. 2012). Combined, these groups wield enormous power in elections across the country from border states, such as California, Arizona, and Texas, to Southern states, such as Florida and Georgia, to increasingly diverse electorates in states from Illinois to New Jersey. Racial and ethnic minorities accounted for over a quarter of all voters in the 2016 presidential election (Krogstad and Lopez 2017). And even if population growth of these groups halted, their share of the electorate will significantly increase over the coming years as a substantial share of Latinos and Asian Americans are still in the process of becoming naturalized citizens.

It is important to keep in mind immigrants come to the United States with a wide array of life experiences and backgrounds, in particular with respect to politics. Many immigrants were raised in authoritarian and non-democratic political regimes, and to most immigrants, a two-party system may be quite unfamiliar. These experiences, as the research on political socialization highlights (Wong and Tseng 2008), can have profound effects on their political attitudes and behaviors in the United States. African Americans, too, were politically socialized in a way that vastly differs from those of white Americans. Slavery, institutionalized segregation, and widespread discrimination have led to a very distinct political orientation for African Americans (Dawson 1994). Such experiences have serious implications for the ways in which racial and ethnic voters choose to vote, participate, and interact with the political system. Campaigns therefore need to develop electoral tactics that account for these differences and develop strategies in a culturally competent manner if they wish to persuade and mobilize voters of color.

Our goal for this chapter is twofold. First, we provide an overview of the existing research on campaign persuasion and campaign mobilization targeting diverse voters in the United States. After our exhaustive investigation in this area of research, we conclude that there is still much to be done, and we highlight particular aspects ripe for future research. In particular, the paucity of research on how candidates, political parties and outside groups target African Americans and whether or not they are persuaded or mobilized by these efforts cannot be emphasized enough. The same holds true for Asian Americans, whereas the majority of literature focuses on Latinos, which we have the most understanding of. Moreover, studies that employ a comparative analysis across racial/ethnic groups, including comparing to whites, are equally lacking. It is critically important to know whether the electoral tactics that have been demonstrated to succeed with white Americans also work in the same way for voters with distinct political experiences and so-
cialization processes. The second goal of this chapter is to point researchers to the numerous avenues and directions that are available to them. While our discussion focuses exclusively on the United States, the increasingly diverse electorates in Europe have also resulted in campaigns crafting in-language messaging as well as tailoring specific content toward immigrant communities. Thus, as countries around the world are becoming more diverse, addressing how electoral persuasion operates becomes more pertinent than ever.

Historical Efforts: Campaigning to a Nation of Immigrants

While demographic changes over the last six decades have been quite pronounced, the United States has always been a country of immigrants hailing from virtually all parts of the world. Candidates, interest groups, and political parties have not been blind to this fact and as a result, presidential candidates have competed for the votes of ethnic minorities since the late 1800s (Dahl 1961; Katznelson 1981). Using such methods as direct contact, leaflets, public appearances, and other forms of propaganda, these candidates campaigned on the assumption that a common ethnic or racial identity also translated into a shared political ideology and preferences.

One particular strategy that candidates rely on is advertising to immigrant groups in their native language. Given the size of the Latino population, as well as their concentration in states with large shares of the electoral vote, advertising in Spanish has become a mainstay for presidential hopefuls. The first available record documenting a Spanish-language advertisement emerged from the 1960 presidential campaign of John F. Kennedy. His campaign created television and radio advertisements that featured his wife Jacqueline Kennedy speaking Spanish, since the candidate himself could not do so (Segal 2003). The Kennedy campaign earns high marks for their political savvy—not only did these ads have a practical component to them, ensuring that Spanish-dominant Latinos would understand them, there was also a symbolic component: creating these ads signaled to Latino voters that Kennedy considered them important enough to target.

More than a decade later in Gerald Ford’s 1976 campaign, his attempt at connecting with Latino voters in San Antonio, Texas, did not go as planned: his inability, during a campaign event, to eat a tamale in the correct manner (failing to remove the corn husk) signaled to Latinos his unfamiliarity with their culture (Popkin 1994). This infamous moment on the campaign trail serves as a constant reminder to politicians that cultural awareness and competence is crucial to their success. From the 1980 presidential election onward, a regular feature of their campaigns featured the creation and development of Spanish-language ads (Abrajano 2010; Segal 2004). Sometimes these ads were identical to their English-language counterparts, though the more common strategy involved candidates creating unique Spanish-language ads. Common themes in these ads include an emphasis on the importance of family, religion, the immigrant experience, and the proverbial “American Dream” (Abrajano 2010). As a testament to the growing size and perceived importance of the Latino electorate, Republicans in the 2000 election devoted $2 million to
Spanish ads, while Democrats spent just slightly less at $1.75 million (Segal 2003). In the 2002 midterm election, $16 million went to Spanish-language commercials (Segal 2003). And in the 2004 presidential race, Democratic presidential candidates spent even more money on Spanish-language television ads than they did in 2000—at least $4 million. By the 2012 presidential election, levels of Spanish-language ad spending quickly accelerated, with Obama allocating more than $12 million, the Romney campaign $3.2 million. It is important to keep in mind, however, that this amount of spending pales in comparison to the overall levels of spending, estimated at ~$892 million (Open Secrets 2012).

**Mobilization and Persuasion Campaigns**

Research investigating the tactics that best mobilize voters to the polls has witnessed an incredible growth in the last decade (Green and Gerber 2008). Virtually every aspect of the get-out-the vote (GOTV) process has been analyzed, from the mode of contact (e.g., phone, text message, email, in-person), the content of the message relative to the electoral context, and the messenger. Yet if we are interested in understanding how these studies inform our understanding of all groups in the US electorate, the bulk of these studies offer limited guidance. Given that the overwhelming majority of these research endeavors focus exclusively on the political behavior of white Americans, we are unable to conclude whether these mobilization strategies are equally effective for voters of color (for exceptions, see Abrajano and Panagopoulos 2011; Barreto, Merolla, and DeFrancisco Soto 2011; Garcia Bedolla and Michelson 2009).

Lisa Garcia Bedolla and Melissa Michelson’s (2012) book, *Mobilizing Inclusion*, stands as the most comprehensive study, to date, on understanding which GOTV strategies are most effective for diverse electorates. In conjunction with several community organizations based in Los Angeles and Orange County, they conducted a series of GOTV field experiments targeting Latinos and Asian Americans.

Among Asian American voters, their research revealed that phone banking campaigns boosted turnout, with variation between different countries of origin (Garcia Bedolla and Michelson 2009). Yet direct mail efforts had no discernible impact on Asian American turnout. These findings are consistent with previous work by Green and Gerber (2008), who draw a similar conclusion regarding the effectiveness of phone banking and ineffectiveness of direct mail among white voters.

For Latino voters, the mode of mobilization also mattered, with phone banking and canvassing efforts leading to higher rates of turnout. Additionally, their findings stress the importance of training canvassers and phone bankers properly, especially when focusing on these communities. Future research efforts would be well-served to extend their groundbreaking work in other areas of the United States, particularly in places where the context of reception has varied, and where Mexican Americans are not the dominant Latino group.
Another effective mobilization tool is televized political ads, especially in presidential elections (Krasno and Green 2008; Ridout and Franz 2011). Yet as we mentioned earlier, candidates spend a fraction of their budgets on Spanish-language advertisements (Abrajano 2010). The empirical evidence from the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections suggest that exposure to Spanish-language television ads is positively associated with Latino turnout, in the same vein as for whites (Abrajano 2010). Additional evidence from the 2000 presidential election suggests that Spanish-language advertisements were effective in boosting voter turnout among Spanish-dominant Latinos (DeFrancesco Soto and Merolla 2006). However, their findings regarding English-dominant Latinos were inconclusive, once again reaffirming the need to further examine the relationship between language and voting behavior among Latinos.

A study by Winneg, Hardy, and Hall Jamieson (2012) also notes that pro-Obama ads, combining English and Spanish-language ads, were associated with increased support for Obama among Latino voters. Unfortunately, the authors do not compare advertising’s effect on the white community relative to the Latino community to see how the two compare. But, it does suggest that advertising, a common campaign tool, can be similarly effective on Latinos.

In a recent study leveraging an experimental design, Flores and Coppock (2018) demonstrate how candidates benefit not only from employing Spanish-language ads but by being bilingual. In line with the notion that communicating in Spanish signals a sense of cultural sensitivity, bilingual candidates benefit by demonstrating a connection with Latino voters. In an increasingly diverse electorate, being bilingual can be advantageous to candidates. Importantly, this study focused on the effects of a bilingual Republican candidate, and a potential path for Republican candidates to persuade Latinos would be to employ more Latino campaign workers. It may be that the effects of being bilingual may disappear for Democratic candidates as most Latinos vote Democrat, as we will discuss later in the chapter; future research is needed to further detail and determine this relationship.

Another study also found that Latinos preferred bilingual candidates (Lavariega Monforti, Michelson, and Franco 2013) but also highlights the cost of being a bilingual candidate with non-Latinos: among Republicans outside of Texas, white candidates suffered when they spoke both English and Spanish compared to only speaking English. This backlash effect exemplifies why campaigns focus on targeting racial and ethnic minorities only in circumstances where whites do not see the message (Nteta and Schaffner 2013). This is evidence of the challenges campaigns face when attempting to appeal to a diverse electorate. Attracting voters from racial and ethnic communities without alienating white voters requires careful crafting of the campaign message.

Unfortunately, it remains to be seen whether televised political ads also increase rates of turnout amongst African and Asian Americans; to the best of our knowledge, there has not been any research in this area.
The Message Matters

In crafting a message to voters, campaigns need to be cognizant of what issues will be more likely to resonate with them in order to have electoral success (Vavreck 2009). In the case of African American voters, scholars have hypothesized that issues such as hate crime, racial profiling, and educational opportunities are relevant and will help get them out to the polls. In an examination of both direct mail and phone banking, one study found rather small effects compared to receiving no campaign communication, with substantial variation by state (Green 2004). However, this study did not compare the effectiveness of these three appeals, either compared to each other or to a generic civic duty motivational message. The next step would be to compare if these appeals are actually more effective compared to a typical appeal used on the general population. Historically, because African Americans are captured by the Democratic party (Frymer 1999), primarily Democratic, not Republican, campaigns reach out to African American voters (Wielhouwer 2000). As a result, any persuasion or mobilizing campaign targeted at the African American community is intertwined with partisanship, and so the specific message may matter less due to already converging partisanship between the campaign and voter.

In line with the research on Spanish versus English language advertisements, a recent study found no significant effects on the different types of appeals in a GOTV campaign targeting Latinos (Matland and Murray 2012). While some research (Enos, Fowler, and Vavreck 2014) has suggested that many mobilization campaigns worsen the turnout gap, Matland and Murray find strongest effects for their GOTV message among occasional voters compared to either habitual or registered non-voters. This may potentially signal a key difference in the Latino community where mobilizing campaigns may have a larger impact on closing the turnout gap between voters and non-voters than in the general population.

Another study directly compared the effects of a message highlighting the issue of immigration on the turnout of Latinos and Asian Americans. While both Latino and Asian American communities contain large numbers of immigrants, the issue of immigration may be more important for the Latino than the Asian American community. Research partially bears this out as an experiment demonstrates that for second- or later-generation (US born) Latinos, a GOTV appeal with an immigration message resonated and boosted voter turnout, while having no effect on naturalized Latinos or Asian Americans (Michelson and Garcia Bedolla 2014). It remains unknown why the effect does not exist for naturalized Latinos, especially as immigration tends to be a more important issue for first-generation Latinos (Branton 2007). In a related experiment, other researchers found that Latinos did respond to an immigration-based appeal, while both white and Asian American voters did not (Merolla et al. 2012). While they did find some differences with different types of immigration messages, the sample size was too small to draw conclusive evidence. For at least the Latino community, immigration does represent a potential issue to highlight in order to mobilize voters to go to the polls.
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Although immigration may be effective, it is important to keep in mind that other appeals, such as economic issues, may be equally or more effective in mobilizing or persuading the Latino and Asian American communities. In the 2004 presidential election, Latinos had similar concerns as whites, especially with the focus on national security issues (Abrajano, Alvarez, and Nagler 2008), and in 2016 both Latino and Asian Americans were focused on economic issues more than immigration (Lopez et al. 2016; Ramakrishnan et al. 2016). Although immigration may be highly salient and relevant to Latinos and Asian Americans, so are economic issues. Future research should compare different types of appeals, as similar concerns exist in both the white and non-white communities.

Several studies have examined whether the effectiveness of a campaign message varies by the race or ethnicity of the voter. In particular, several studies have noted that whites and African Americans respond differently to implicit and explicit racial cues. In an experimental design, researchers presented a set of implicit or explicit racial cue to both African American and white voters to examine how support for racial and non-racial policies changes with exposure to these racial cues (White 2007). While white voters respond to implicit racial cues, African American voters respond more strongly to explicit racial cues. Whites may self-censure their reactions when exposed to explicit racial cues due to social desirability bias (Mendelberg 2001), while African Americans may respond more strongly to explicit cues as this highlights their different perspective to whites and the importance of representing African American interests. Explicit racial cues prime African Americans on their group consciousness, also known as linked fate (Dawson 1994). This idea of group consciousness and priming an individual’s group awareness or consciousness often arises as a potential avenue for campaigns to either mobilize or persuade racial and ethnic voters. The notion of linked fate varies depending on the racial or ethnic group, and so the effectiveness of this strategy also varies, with African Americans typically considered to have the strongest sense of linked fate.

Vidal’s study (2017) on Latino and Asians Americans also focuses on the role of group consciousness as a positive mobilizing force to turnout. He finds that Latinos and Asian Americans who have stronger group consciousness are more likely to turn out and vote. As an individual increases their group consciousness, they may feel more pressure, or the need to have their voices heard, and thus vote more frequently. Another study highlights this relationship, focusing on Asian Americans, and demonstrates that those with stronger group consciousness turn out in greater numbers compared to Asian Americans who lack that group awareness (Kim 2015). Priming group consciousness may be a productive campaign strategy to appeal to racial and ethnic groups, especially for targeted campaign tactics such as phone banking and canvassing. It becomes riskier with more broad-based tools, such as television advertising, as it can potentially come at a cost if white voters also view the message.

Scholars have demonstrated that explicit racial cues may also cue certain white voters to support one candidate over another (Huber and Lapinski 2006). In order to avoid this problem, campaigns can appeal to racial or ethnic voters in ways that limit the likelihood that white voters will view the message. For example, campaigns appeal to African Ameri-
can voters by advertising on Black Entertainment Television (BET) and appeal to Latinos on Spanish-language channels such as Telemundo and Univision. Nteta and Schaffner’s (2013) research supports the notion that the 2002 television political ads indeed employed this strategy.

Unfortunately, the widely utilized Campaign Media Analysis Group (CMAG) data does not include BET, and so it is difficult to assess how and to what extent campaigns reach out to African American voters through television advertising. Additionally, no major television channel focuses on Asian Americans, and so it remains unclear if or how campaigns target Asian Americans through television advertising. The Nteta and Schaffner study also highlights the risk-averse nature of campaigns. Campaigns almost exclusively directly appeals to racial and ethnic voters when whites are not watching. However, as they assimilate Latinos and Asian Americans increasingly speak English, so it may become necessary to craft messages that can appeal to both whites and non-whites alike.

**In-Language Efforts**

Another key component in crafting an appeal toward a diverse electorate, particularly one that is comprised of a large number of immigrants, is to deliver the message in-language. Approximately 40 percent of Latinos are foreign born and an even higher percentage of Asian Americans, upward of 60 percent, are born outside of the United States. While it is certainly the case that many of these individuals are bilingual and fluent in English, immigrant voters may feel more comfortable when appeals are made in their native language.

Most of the existing research has focused on Latino voters, with some work conducted on Asian Americans as well (see Garcia Bedolla and Michelson 2009). Although Latinos are a pan-ethnic group comprised of individuals hailing from more than a dozen countries, they share a common language, Spanish. This shared language makes it much easier for candidates to target them as they only have to translate their appeals into one language. In contrast, campaign efforts targeted at Asian Americans would need to be translated into several different languages (e.g., Mandarin, Vietnamese, and Tagalog, to name just a few), and in especially diverse states such as California, the range of languages is considerable. California’s Secretary of State offers voter information in nine non-English languages: Spanish, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese (“Voting in California” 2016). While some of these communities may be small, they are growing quickly, and it will be necessary for campaigns to recognize the importance of communicating in voters’ preferred language.

The ease of advertising in just one language to target Latino voters has meant that Spanish-language advertising has become a mainstay in modern presidential campaigns, as well as in subnational elections, particularly for candidates competing in areas with a sizable Latino electorate. Abrajano’s (2010) comprehensive analysis of the Spanish- and English-language ads created for the presidential, congressional, and gubernatorial elections spanning the 2000–2004 election cycles provide us with some important insights in
the way candidates advertise to Latinos, and how this compares to their advertising strategies for the English-speaking electorate. Overall, her findings indicate that Spanish-language ads contain less informationally rich policy messages that can help Latinos learn about the candidates as well as politics more generally, relative to the English-language ads (Abrajano 2010). Instead, Spanish-language ads contained a much larger proportion of non-policy content, such as symbolic and cultural messages (e.g., mentions of the “American Dream,” caring about Latinos), relative to English-language ads. The policy gap in these ads was consistent across the different election cycles, as well as across the various elections.

Treating Latinos in this way can potentially backfire and be seen as insulting by later-generation Latinos. Additionally, Latinos exposed to Spanish-language ads are unable to increase their levels of political knowledge, which is quite unfortunate given that those who are exposed to English ads do gain knowledge from them (Abrajano 2010).

In a detailed assessment of past Latino-focused advertisements, researchers found little evidence of discussion of important political issues; instead candidates focused on conveying the importance of the Latino community to Latino voters (Connaughton and Jarvis 2004b). This lack of informative policy is particularly acute in Republican outreach efforts to Latinos (Connaughton and Jarvis 2004a). If campaigns want to mobilize or persuade the Latino or other minority communities then they need to invest the resources into determining what issues matter to them and exert effort in crafting relevant political messages. Engaging in this strategy can pay off in both the short- and long-term, as increased campaign exposure has been shown to increase levels of partisanship among the foreign-born population (McCann and Chávez 2016).

To determine whether in-language efforts are indeed more effective at boosting turnout among Latinos, Abrajano and Panagopoulos (2011) conduct a randomized GOTV field experiment in which Latino voters were randomly assigned to receive a non-partisan mobilization appeal in Spanish or English. The results indicate that Spanish-language appeals were effective in boosting turnout, however only for low-propensity Latino voters. Somewhat surprisingly, the experimental results also suggested that English-language appeal increased turnout for all Latinos (Abrajano and Panagopoulos 2011).

In another GOTV experimental study, Binder et al. (2013) randomized whether Latino voters in California received direct mailers in Spanish or in English and found that English-language appeals mobilized English-dominant Latinos. However, they found no effect for Spanish-language appeals, for either English- or Spanish-dominant Latinos (Binder et al. 2013). These two studies focus on direct mail, which typically finds small to negligible effects. Direct-mail is often ineffective as it can be too easy for individuals to throw out the flyer and not pay attention to the message (Green and Gerber 2008). However, with bilingual speakers, an English message may stand out more or require more attention prior to discarding, and this may be one potential reason for this seeming English effect with direct mail.
Other research demonstrates that Spanish-language radio ads can be effective in boosting Latino voter turnout across the country (Panagopoulos and Green 2010). However, that study is limited by not comparing Latino turnout with exposure to similar English-language radio advertisements. It may be that both English- and Spanish-language advertisements are equally effective, and more research is needed to determine which language a campaign message may be more effective in. While racial cues can be harmful in the case of targeting African Americans (Huber and Lapinski 2006), that may not be the case if whites cannot understand the message. In the case of the Panagopoulos and Green (2010) study they find no effect, either harmful or beneficial, of a Spanish-language ad on non-Latino voter turnout.

**Having a Co-Ethnic/Racial on the Ballot**

If political parties or interest groups are interested in boosting voter turnout of racial and ethnic voters then a potential strategy is to recruit racial or ethnic candidates. Several studies demonstrate that having a co-ethnic on the ballot is associated with increased turnout among racial/ethnic minorities (Barreto 2010; Uhlaner and Le 2015; Whitby 2007). Similar to the mobilizing effect that a Latino candidate can have on their rates of turnout (Barreto 2010), the research by Uhlaner and Le (2015) documents the same positive relationship for Vietnamese voters in Orange County, California. A recent GOTV study by Valenzuela and Michelson (2016) suggests that certain segments of the Latino electorate may be particularly motivated to turn out when a co-ethnic is running for office. Latinos of low socio-economic status residing in low-resource communities were particularly receptive to co-ethnic GOTV appeals due to higher levels of group consciousness in these Latino communities. This may be similar to effects of female candidates increasing voter turnout among female voters (Campbell and Wolbrecht 2006).

Why this positive relationship exists can primarily be explained by the importance of descriptive representation, where having someone that looks like them in elected office can serve as a powerful mobilizing force for voters. Forward-thinking political parties and interest groups should therefore be cognizant of this positive relationship and encourage more minority candidates to run for office, particularly those who reside in majority-minority districts.

A related strain of research demonstrates that overall racial/ethnic composition of the legislature can influence minority voter turnout (Rocha et al. 2009). That is, when elected officials reflect the diversity of their constituents, rates of turnout also increase. Additionally, in a study conducted by Uhlaner and Scola (2015), race, as opposed to gender, was found to be a stronger predictor of turnout among African American women (Uhlaner and Scola 2015). One limitation to this research area pertains to the issue of selection. In most cases, political parties are strategic and recruit minority candidates in districts that are majority-minority. Thus, it can often be difficult to differentiate between the effects of a large co-ethnic population and a co-ethnic candidate on the ballot.
Abrajano, Nagler, and Alvarez (2005) attempt to avoid this issue of selection by analyzing the 2005 mayoral and district attorney elections in Los Angeles, taking advantage of a pseudo-natural experiment where a Latino candidate was running against a white candidate in both elections, while the Latino candidates differed in their ideology. The Latino mayoral candidate was more liberal than his white counterpart, yet the Latino candidate for district attorney was more conservative than his white opponent. While they observe voting patterns among both Latinos and whites that are consistent with a preference for a co-ethnic, this may be overstated due to the conflation of race and partisanship.

In another study that disentangles the effect of ideology and race, Fairdosi and Rogowski (2015) find that having an African American candidate only boosts turnout among African Americans when the candidate is a Democrat. Having a black Republican on the ballot yielded no effect on their rates of turnout (Fairdosi and Rogowski 2015). This makes sense as most African Americans are Democrats and consistently vote Democratic (Frymer 1999). While the presence of a co-ethnic candidate most likely does have an impact, although potentially small at times, recent work taking advantage of voter file data, rather than survey data, demonstrates that the size of the racial or ethnic group’s population has a larger impact than the presence of a co-ethnic candidate (Fraga 2016). All these results paint a picture whereby co-ethnic candidates most likely boost racial and ethnic voter turnout in their district, although the size of that effect may be smaller than originally thought.

Racial and ethnic voters are not defined solely by their race or ethnicity. Their decision to turn out and vote may also be determined by a number of factors, similar to the white population, including gender, socio-economic status, and immigration status. Labor unions can also help mobilize voters and increase voter turnout (Leighley and Nagler 2007), and recent evidence points to a mobilizing effect of Latinos participating in labor unions (Francia and Orr 2014). Labor unions may play an important role in incorporating Latinos into the US political system and helping them to become politically active. Since labor unions traditionally support Democratic candidates, campaigns could coordinate with unions in order to help mobilize their Latino or other racial minority members.

The Messenger Matters Too

Another strain of research suggests that GOTV efforts may be more effective when the messenger is a co-ethnic. While the bulk of these research studies have been devoted to Latinos, future research could potentially be applied to African Americans and Asian Americans. Evidence consistently shows that when a Latino voter is contacted by a fellow Latino, typically through canvassing, that type of contact yields a greater chance of mobilizing the Latino voter compared to a situation where a non-Latino canvassed that same home (Barreto and Nuno 2011; Nuno 2007; Ramirez 2016; Shaw, la Garza, and Lee 2000). Importantly, two of these studies (Barreto and Nuno 2011; Nuno 2007) demonstrate that the impact of a co-ethnic contact can go beyond turnout and also impact vote choice.
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However, shared racial identity does not necessarily trump all other identities, particularly political orientation. Barreto and Nuno’s (2011) study highlights the important intersection of the canvasser’s partisanship and ethnicity. They demonstrate that contacting Latinos by a Latino Republican was effective, while contact by a non-Latino Republican yielded no effect. This finding aligns with previous work that co-ethnic contact affects voters. However, when a Democratic canvasser contacted a Latino voter, Latino turnout increased, regardless of the canvasser’s ethnicity. But given that most Latinos identify as Democrats, with the exception of Cubans (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010), the effect of co-ethnic contact may be swamped by a co-partisan effect. Unfortunately, little research exists to test these claims on either African or Asian American voters. Although it is plausible that these findings extend to those communities, additional studies are needed to test the veracity of this hypothesis beyond the Latino community.

Electoral Context

Many factors have been discussed so far that prove to be effective strategies to mobilize and persuade racial and ethnic voters. Other factors in the election that may also influence their political participation may or may not be outside the control of a political party or candidate. A few studies have examined the impact of the electoral context on Latino voter mobilization. In particular, xenophobic candidate rhetoric can drive Latinos to the polls, especially Latinos with higher levels of group consciousness (Perez 2015). While candidates who are attempting to appeal to many racial categories may need to be careful, this factor goes beyond such broad appeals to focus on the effect of candidates who blatantly focus on mobilizing the white community. Such efforts may prove to be effective under some circumstances, as certain xenophobic rhetoric can drive white public opinion (Brader, Valentino, and Suhay 2008). This type of rhetoric may only pay off for candidates in localities with either small Latino populations or where the effect drives more white voters than Latino voters to the polls. As seen in the election of President Trump, xenophobic rhetoric can pay off despite the potential backlash.

Political candidates can only control their own message and rhetoric, and yet there are factors outside of their control that drive racial and ethnic voters. The context and conditions of both states and localities can influence Latino voter turnout. When localities choose to partner with the federal government to increase immigration enforcement, then Latino voters respond and turn out at higher rates (White 2016). Latino voters care about immigration and immigration policy, as already discussed, and they turn out in response to politicians proposing policies they oppose. In the case of a proposed radical shift in immigration law, Latinos turned out in record numbers in 2006 (Barreto et al. 2009). While such factors may not be in a candidate’s control, they may provide potential avenues to mobilize Latino voters in future elections. Campaigns could prime Latino voters on the conditions in their locality, or the policy views of their opponents, in order to gain more Latino support.
Similarly, a state with more hate crimes per capita may experience higher Latino voter turnout (Bueker 2013). These studies suggest the importance of the electoral context in mobilizing racial and ethnic voters: Latino voters responded to the situations in their states and localities by choosing to express their political power. A potential avenue for future research would be to examine how these factors intersect with an individual’s group consciousness or to prime these factors in a field experiment in order to drive more Latino voters to the polls. Additionally, little is known about how these factors influence African American or Asian American voter turnout. Given the recent events in Ferguson, Missouri, and elsewhere around the country regarding police shootings of unarmed black men, these would be potentially fruitful issues to raise with voters to boost voter turnout, even beyond the directly affected communities.

The 2016 Presidential Election and Efforts to Appeal to Diverse Electorates

The 2016 presidential election presented the democratic nominee, Hillary Clinton, the opportunity to take advantage of the growth in racial and ethnic voters and appeal directly to them. The percentage of the white vote won by the Democratic candidate has declined over several decades, and so Clinton or future Democratic candidates need racial and ethnic voters in order to have a path to the White House. In fact, even Republicans recognized the importance of Latino voters in the wake of their 2012 loss to President Obama (Walshe 2013). Additionally, the inflammatory anti-immigrant remarks by then-candidate Trump would provide further motivation to spur greater minority voter turnout, especially among the Latino community.

As we discussed earlier, little systematic knowledge exists on how candidates reach out to racial and ethnic voters. But, significant anecdotal evidence highlights the lack of outreach by the Clinton campaign. In line with the research highlighting the non-policy-focused advertising (Abrajano 2010; Connaughton and Jarvis 2004b), the Clinton campaign engaged in those types of ads, however by 2016 Latinos were fed up with it (“Just When You Thought Hillary Clinton Couldn’t Hispander Any More, She Did It Again” 2015). Anecdotal evidence suggest that Latinos are insulted by not being treated equally to white voters; many view that a sole emphasis on the Latino community, is just “Hispandering.”

As the campaign progressed, Trump continued his assault on immigrants. He constantly denigrated immigrants and depicted Mexican immigrants as criminals. At the same time, he explicitly appealed to the African American community with promises to improve inner cities (Diamond 2016). Overall, the Trump campaign invested relatively little in television advertising; in total his campaign spent about a third of the amount of the Clinton campaign (Fowler, Ridout, and Franz 2016). While his incendiary remarks on both Latinos and blacks led to low levels of support from these electorates, his rhetoric was successful in motivating white voters to the polls.
The Clinton campaign could have capitalized on Trump’s attacks on voters of color. However, evidence suggests that they instead decided to make assumptions about voters, rather than directly engage with them (Phillip and O’Keefe 2016). The Clinton campaign as well as the Democratic Party were assuming that Latino voters would turn out in response to Trump’s anti-immigrant appeals. It appears that they were making the same assumptions as historically have been made regarding the African American community (Frymer 1999). Certainly after Clinton lost, many pointed at her lack of outreach to Latino voters as a crucial reason for her loss (Pilkington 2016). While Clinton did win significant support among racial and ethnic voters who turned out to vote, it is unknown how many more may have shown up if the Clinton campaign had engaged in more phone banking, canvassing, and GOTV efforts.

The most recent presidential election highlights the growing gap between campaign outreach efforts and the importance of minority voters. Democratic campaigns, including Hillary Clinton’s, often fail to engage in meaningful outreach to voters of color. Instead, they assume that due to the rhetoric of Republicans, minority voters must vote for the Democratic candidate. While it is true that Democrats garner a significantly larger share of the minority vote, they may have more electoral success if they engaged in more GOTV efforts. Without engagement, Latino, African American, and Asian American voters may simply choose to stay home.

At the same time, Republicans need to make a decision—whether to continue engaging in xenophobic rhetoric to appeal to white voters or to make inroads with voters of color. President Bush in 2000 received significant greater support from the Latino community than recent presidential candidates. He engaged with the Latino community, whereas recent candidates have instead opted to lean more on white support. Republican candidates have the ability to attract significant support, especially among Latino and Asian Americans, but they cannot both do that and engage in their recent anti-immigrant rhetoric.

Discussion

As we have argued throughout this chapter, there is much work to be done in this area of research. Specifically, here are some issues that are ripe for future research: 1) replicating previous studies on whites with racial/ethnic minorities; 2) examining campaign efforts targeting African Americans and their responses to these appeals; 3) comparing the effectiveness of campaign strategies across and within racial/ethnic groups.

Our first recommendation is quite straightforward. Existing strategies that exclusively focus on the majority of the population, white Americans, could easily be re-analyzed to determine whether they operate in the same way for voters of color. Of course, given that racial and ethnic minorities have experienced unique political socialization processes, attempts at replication should recognize these differences. Some campaign strategies, such as ones that emphasize particular issues (e.g., criminal justice reform or immigration) need to be carefully tailored to the specific ethnic/racial group. At the same time, there may be other equally or more effective strategies to mobilize or persuade voters of color.
Not recognizing these voters’ increasing importance can be detrimental, and not appealing to these electorates, in certain parts of the United States, has already translated into electoral defeat.

Second, we encourage scholars to devote their efforts toward understanding the campaign strategies used by candidates, parties, and outside groups to target African Americans. Despite the availability of data, it remains unknown which campaigns run their television ads on BET and what the content of these ads are. Moreover, it remains an open question as to who sponsors these ads (interest groups or candidates) and how these appeals vary from the ads developed for other groups in the electorate. Both a historical and contemporary analysis of this subject matter would be incredibly insightful and help to fill a substantial gap on this subject matter.

Our final recommendation is for scholars to adopt a more comparative approach in studies that wish to understand the campaign strategies for a diverse electorate. Much of the research, thus far, has generally focused on the racial and ethnic communities in isolation, or at best comparing one another. For example, conducting field experiments on mobilizing or persuading voters can be done by blocking on racial group, which allows for the analysis to illustrate similar or differential effects across racial and ethnic communities. Additionally, this issue also includes assuming what issues most resonate with these communities instead of directly testing how an immigration message compares to an economic message. Combined, these issues illustrate the need for more research on appealing to multiple groups, not just a single type of voter, be they white, Latino, African American, or Asian American. More research needs to examine if a phenomenon exists across multiple groups, such as with comparing Latinos to Asian Americans or African Americans to Latinos. Importantly, while much of the recent research has focused on Latinos, more work needs to be done to examine similar relationships and effects in both the African American and Asian American communities.

Conclusion

Campaigns have already begun to differentially appeal to an increasingly diverse electorate, including advertising differently on different television channels, mobilizing different types of voters, and employing different messages to mobilize or persuade voters. Similarly, scholars have begun to examine how Latinos, African Americans, and Asian Americans respond differently to political campaigns compared to whites as well as other racial and ethnic voters. The literature has focused on several key strategies that mobilize or persuade minority voters, including: recruiting co-ethnic candidates, campaign contact by a co-ethnic, language of the message, relevant issues, and invoking group consciousness. In addition to these specific strategies, researchers have re-examined the GOTV literature on how canvassing, direct mail, and phone banking operate similarly to the general population.
These strategies have huge potential benefits for candidates and other campaigns to employ in order to mobilize and persuade racial and ethnic voters. While co-ethnic candidates typically arise from communities and districts with large co-ethnic populations, they still typically increase voter turnout among these communities. Additionally, campaigns can make significant gains by employing co-ethnics in mobilizing voters. This can be particularly effective when the ethnic group favors one political party but the campaign is of another, such as with Latino Republicans used to mobilize on behalf of a Republican candidate. While the language of the message can yield some benefits, it may be increasingly irrelevant as more and more Latinos and Asian Americans assimilate and learn English. The key issue, especially with television advertising, is that many of the Spanish-language messages do not discuss policy issues. Campaign messages in Spanish or other non-English languages may yield a benefit if they address voters’ concerns. Some research highlights the benefit of appealing to voters with an issue such as immigration; it has yet to determine if that truly is more effective compared to other issues that racial and ethnic voters identify in polls as important, such as the economy. Different groups and individuals hold different levels of group consciousness, and priming this can potentially be an effective strategy for a campaign. Finally, in line with previous research on the general population, tactics such as canvassing and phone banking can also be effective with racial and ethnic voters, just as they are with white voters.

The United States has become increasingly diverse, with a vastly growing population, especially of immigrant-origin groups. Thus for many of these individuals, their political socialization process occurs in a context outside of the United States. Campaigns and researchers need to be cognizant of this fact and determine how best to appeal to multiple groups without alienating others. Even though campaign messages are increasingly micro-targeted to specific groups, there will always be instances when candidates give speeches or advertise and need to appeal to a broad swath of voters. While racial and ethnic voters may particular care about certain issues, such as immigration, they also have similar concerns to white voters about the economy and other important issues. It will be important to move beyond the bland non-issue appeals that have especially characterized Spanish-language television advertising. Instead, campaigns will need to treat all voters as having similar issues; appealing with shared concerns may be a good potential avenue for appealing to a diverse electorate.
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