NES Pilot Report: The Impact of Group Attitudes on Vote Choice in Gubernatorial Contests

Abstract

This report examines the group responsiveness questions asked on the 1998 NES Pilot Study. These questions were designed to assess voter perceptions of candidate support for specific groups. We provide some descriptive information on these new measures, and estimate their performance as predictors of intended vote choice. We find that the questions do a fairly good job of distinguishing between the candidates and influencing the vote-decision, provided that the candidates actually differ ideologically. There was also some evidence that respondents mis-perceived the candidates' "true" positions, but this varied dramatically across states. We conclude by suggesting that the Board include these items on the 2000 Election Study, with some modifications.

Memo

To: NES Board of Overseers
From: Vincent L. Hutchings and Nicholas A. Valentino
Regarding: New Group Responsiveness questions on the '98 Pilot Study

Introduction

We proposed that the NES Board use the 1998 Pilot to explore the influence of group-attitudes on candidate evaluations. All aspects of our proposal were not formally accepted, but variations of some of our questions did end up on the 1998 Pilot Study. Specifically, we proposed that the Board examine whether perceptions of candidate responsiveness to interest groups affected their vote-decision. We anticipated that such attitudes would be influential especially when group-specific appeals were made salient in the campaign.

This notion, of course, has a long tradition in the field of public opinion dating back at least as far as the original Columbia studies. Empirical support for this idea has, however been somewhat mixed. For example, a recent Pilot report (Rabinowitz and Macdonald 1995) found that questions designed to link the presidential candidates with various groups "…did not perform as well as they might (pg. 10)." This report represents an effort to again address this issue and, perhaps, to improve on past attempts.

The survey questions we examine (v98p256-v98p259) are described below:

Now thinking about both candidates, do you think that CANDIDATE #1 or CANDIDATE #2 would do a better job for labor unions such as the AFL-CIO?

1.	CANDIDATE #1
2.	CANDIDATE #2
3.	DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED	

The same pattern was then repeated for "pro-life groups such as the National Right to Life Committee", "environmental protection groups such as the Sierra Club", and "conservative religious groups such as the Christian Coalition." These questions are similar to the ones proposed by Rabinowitz and Macdonald, but differ in that respondents are not asked about the candidates separately.[1] The problem with this set-up is that respondents tended to perceive each candidate as supportive of all groups' interests. We think that interest group performance is evaluated relatively, and not absolutely. Thus, the questions we proposed were framed such that

[1] For example, in the 1995 Pilot Study, respondents were asked "Based on what you may have read or heard, do you think that Bill Clinton (Bob Dole) usually supports or opposed legislation favored by big business? "

respondents had to select one of the candidates as *more responsive to an interest group, relative to the other candidate.*

In the remainder of this Pilot Report, we will provide some descriptive information on these new measures, assess their performance as predictors of intended vote choice, and conclude with our overall recommendations to the Board.

Group Responsiveness Questions

In evaluating the effectiveness of the questions, our first interest was in determining the relationship between partisan attachments and perceptions of candidate responsiveness to groups. We were particularly interested in whether respondents' perceptions were driven by their party affiliation. We reasoned that if the measures were to have any construct validity, then respondents should, regardless of party, view Democratic candidates as more responsive to "Democratic" interest groups (i.e. labor unions and environmental groups), and Republican candidates as more responsive to "Republican" groups (i.e. pro-life groups and conservative Christians). This is, of course, assuming that the candidates adopt traditional Democratic and Republican positions on the issues.

Before discussing these results, however let us first explain how we analyzed the survey data. Unlike previous NES Pilot Studies, the 1998 survey drew representative samples from only three states: California; Georgia; and Illinois. Also, instead of focusing on presidential candidates, the 1998 Pilot primarily dealt with Gubernatorial contests. This information is relevant because it has implications for the manner in which we examine the survey data. That is, instead of combining analyses across all three Gubernatorial campaigns, we present our results

broken down by state. We adopt this method because the various Democratic and Republican Gubernatorial candidates in the sample do not easily conform to their national party images.

To illustrate, the Democratic candidate from Illinois, Glenn Poshard, opposed abortions, even in the case of rape or incest.[2] Although supported by organized labor, he also opposed gun control, some gay rights initiatives, and more expansive environmental legislation. His Republican opponent, George Ryan, ran to the left of Poshard on many of these issues. He also aired a number of ads charging Poshard with being too conservative. The Georgia campaign resembled Illinois in some ways, yet also adhered more closely with the national Democratic and Republican Party images. The Democratic candidate, Roy Barnes, was endorsed by the National Rifle Association and generally opposed abortion. However, he also sought to reform health care and appealed strongly to African American voters (Barone and Ujifusa 1999). The Republican candidate, Guy Millner, accused Barnes of being soft on crime and tried to link him with the black mayor of Atlanta, Bill Campbell.

A decidedly different contest emerged in California. In this state, a moderate-to-liberal Democrat, Gray Davis, ran against a traditional conservative Republican, Dan Lungren. As one might expect given the national party images, Davis' campaign emphasized education and criticized Lungren for opposing abortion rights and being generally too conservative. Lungren, on the other hand, paid considerable attention to the issue of crime and charged Davis with being a closet liberal (Barone and Ujifusa 1999).

In short, because the Democratic candidates were not uniformly liberal and the Republican candidates were not consistently conservative, we present the data by state. Given

[2] Barone, Michael and Grant Ujifusa. 1999. *The Almanac of American Politics 2000.* National Journal: Washington DC.

the campaign descriptions provided above, our expectation was that the group perception questions would work best in California. This is because in this state, the candidates adhered more closely to national party images.

Tables 1-4 present the marginals for the candidate responsiveness questions, broken down by state and party identification. Table 1 presents the results for labor unions. Across all three states there are relatively few self-described Independents so our remarks will focus primarily on Democrats and Republicans. As anticipated, the majority (or plurality) of both parties perceived Democrats as "doing a better job" for labor unions. However, these effects differ dramatically across states. In California, clear majorities of both Democrats and Republicans view Davis as the better candidate for unions. In Georgia, however, there seems to be more confusion (or projection?) about the candidates, especially among Republicans. In Illinois, Republicans are also evenly divided in their perception of candidate responsiveness to unions. Democrats, however, are almost as certain of their candidate's allegiance as they are in California.

Table 2 presents results for environmental groups. The findings here are similar to table 1, in that the greatest agreement emerges in California. Over two-thirds of Democrats in this state, and almost 50% of Republicans, agree that Gray Davis would do a "better job" for environmental groups. By contrast, the plurality of Republicans in Illinois believe (perhaps justifiably) that their candidate would best represent environmental groups. A majority of Illinois Democrats either sees no difference between the candidates or give the edge to Republican, George Ryan. In Georgia, a plurality believes the candidate who shares their party affiliation will best represent environmental groups. Among Republicans, however, opinions are almost evenly divided.

Table 3 reports the results for perceptions about pro-life groups. Again, the greatest degree of partisan agreement can be found in California. In this state, the plurality of both Democrats and Republicans view Lungren as the best representative of pro-life groups. Still, a surprisingly large minority misperceives pro-choice candidate Gray Davis as a better representative of pro-life groups.

In Georgia and Illinois, partisans tend to see their own candidate as doing a better job for pro-life groups. This tendency results at least in part from the fact that the candidates in these states were not that far apart on the issue of abortion. Finally, the results for conservative Christians also conform to earlier patterns (see table 4). Partisan agreement is strongest in California, although the plurality of respondents view Republican candidates as better for this group in the other states.

In table 5, we present another way of examining perceptions of candidate responsiveness to groups. The group responsiveness questions have been re-coded "-1" "0" and "1". The negative value indicates that the respondent believes the Republican candidate would do a better job for the relevant group, whereas the positive value indicates that Democratic candidate is perceived as better. Respondents who perceive no difference between the candidates (i.e. "don't knows" and "refusals") are coded at "0." Table 5 reports the means and standard deviations across each state for all respondents. Additionally, results are also presented for respondents scoring in the top half of the sample on the political information scale, and those respondents who belong to the interest groups in question.[3]

[3] The political information scale consisted of questions on which branch of government decides if a law is constitutional (v98p344 and v98p348), which branch nominates judges to the federal courts (v98p345 and v98p349), which party controls the House of Representatives (v98p346 and v98p350), and which party has the most members in the US Senate (v98p347 and v98p351). The figures in column 2 of table 5 are based only on those respondents who answered at least two of these questions correctly (55%).

The purpose of these analyses is to determine if the average perceptions of all respondents differ markedly from the perceptions of respondents who are likely to provide more accurate answers. The top panel in table 5 presents the results for labor unions. In general, the more politically informed and union members agree with other respondents that the Democrat is the more responsive candidate. The differences, although more pronounced for groups presumed to be more informed on this question, are not dramatic.

Similar results emerge for perceptions of representation of environmental groups. Democrats are seen as better representatives of this group in states where this was likely to be true. In Illinois, where the Republican candidate was arguably the more liberal of the two, the mean response leans towards no difference. Interestingly, self-described members of environmental groups believe that the Democrat in Illinois is a much better representative of their interests than is the Republican. There were, however, only 20 respondents in Illinois who fit this description.[4]

Regarding pro-life groups, most respondents saw little differences between the candidates across states. Among respondents presumed to have greater knowledge on this question, the Republican candidate is seen as a much better representative of this group. This is most true for California, where the more informed, pro-life respondents, and especially religious conservatives were much more likely to identify Lungren as the better representative of the two candidates.[5]

---

[4] Eleven of the 20 indicated that Poshard was the better representative whereas 3 chose Ryan, and 6 perceived no difference.

[5] Religious conservatives are defined as self-described "fundamentalists", "evangelicals", or "charismatic or spirit-filled" Christians who also attend church generally once a week.

Finally, the Republican candidate is also seen as a doing a better job for Christian conservatives across all groups in each state. These perceptions were more pronounced among respondents with more information, but generally by only a small margin.

Perceptions of Group Responsiveness and Expected Vote Choice

We have seen from the preceding analyses that citizens do view the candidates as differentially responsive to interest groups. Moreover, as one might expect, these perceptions are at least partially contingent on the candidates actual positions vis-à-vis groups. We now turn to an examination of the relationship between these attitudes and expected vote choice.

First let us briefly describe our methods. As indicated above, our dependent variable is the respondent's *expected* vote choice. Their self-reported vote choice could not be used, of course, because the 1998 Pilot went into the field before the Gubernatorial elections. The expected vote choice captures both the direction and intensity of the respondent's candidate preference. That is, it is operationalized as their partisan preference as well as how strongly they support the candidate (v98p175 and v98p177). The variable ranges from –2 to 2, with lower values indicating a strong preference for the Republican candidate and higher values indicating a strong preference for the Democrat. Additionally, this variable excludes respondents who report that they do not intend to vote in the upcoming election.[6]

The principal independent variable is the group responsiveness question examined earlier in this report. The OLS regression model also includes controls for party identification, ideology,

[6] There were two versions of this question on the Pilot Study. Half of the sample was simply asked if they would vote "this coming November/next week." The other half was asked to rate the probability that they would vote (v98p173 and v980175). Those respondents who provided an answer other than "yes" in the first half-sample were dropped from the analysis as were those indicating that the probability was less then .50. Only about 15% of respondents indicated that they would probably not vote.

age, gender, race, education, and union membership.[7] The group responsiveness variable was transformed into two dummy variables, each coded 0-1. One dummy variable represented the belief that the Democratic candidate would do a better job for the group and the other represented the perception that the Republican candidate would best represent the group. In addition to these variables, we also included a feeling thermometer for each group corresponding with the group responsiveness question. For example, the union thermometer was used when the group responsiveness question addressed labor unions. Finally, the group thermometer was interacted with each of the dummy variables. Mathematically, the model can be described as follows:

Expected Vote Choice = a + $b1$ (GROUP THERMOMETER) + $b2$ (DEM. BEST) + $b3$ (REP. BEST) + $b4$ (THERM * DEM. BEST) + $b5$ (THERM * REP. BEST) + (CONTROLS) + e

The rationale for this set-up is that respondents who both like a particular group, and believe that one of the candidates would do a better job representing it's interest, will also be more likely to vote for that candidate. Moreover, to the extent that the candidates adhere to national party images, the *b4* coefficient should be significantly positive for "Democratic" groups and the *b5* coefficient should be significantly negative for "Republican" groups.

Table 6 presents the results for California. The results generally confirm our expectations. For example, respondents who feel warmly towards labor unions and who also believe the Democratic candidate would do a better job representing this group's interest are

---

[7] The party and ideology variables have been re-coded so that higher values indicate greater support for liberalism or the Democratic party.

much more likely to support the Democrat. The same holds true, although in mirror image, for pro-life groups. In this case, respondents who feel warmly towards the group and who view the Republican as the better representative of its interest were far more supportive of the Republican candidate.

Results for attitudes about environmental groups are less powerful, but still in the expected direction and achieve borderline significance. Only in the case of religious conservatives are the results more ambiguous. As expected, respondents who feel warmly towards Christian Fundamentalists, and who also believe the Republican candidate would do a better job for this group, are more likely to support the Republican. However, this also holds true for the Democratic candidate. Moreover, the magnitude of the effect is about twice as large for the Democrat as it is for the Republican.[8]

The results for Georgia are reported in Table 7. This campaign featured a contest between a moderate-to-conservative Democrat and a conservative Republican. This relative lack of ideological difference is reflected in the coefficients. On the two groups for whom the Democratic candidate should have a comparative advantage, we find that the interactions are not statistically significant. In fact, contrary to expectations, it is the Republican who benefits from an association with labor unions and environmental groups.

At first glance, results appear somewhat clearer for pro-life groups (column 3 in table 7) as the relevant interaction term is significant for the Republican candidate. However, the candidates were actually not that far apart on this issue, so one might have expected a null finding here (or perhaps significant effects for both interactions). In the case of attitudes about

---

[8] Of course, almost three times as many respondents believed that the Republican rather than the Democrat would do a better job for this group (N=189 vs. 68).

Christian Fundamentalists, both candidates seem to benefit. Given the conservative positions both candidates advocated, this is an understandable finding.

Table 8 presents the results for respondents in Illinois. Recall that in this campaign, the candidates were also not particularly distinct ideologically. In fact, on some issues, the Democrat ran to the right of the Republican. This is in part reflected in the negative sign on the ideology variable across all four columns of table 8. It suggests that there was some tendency for liberals to vote Republican.

The group attitude variables conform generally to expectations given the nature of the campaign. For example, the Democratic candidate does do better when the group in question is a "Democratic" group like environmentalists. However the effects are weaker and insignificant for attitudes about labor unions. In the case of two ostensibly Republican groups, pro-life organizations and Christian Fundamentalists, the Illinois Democrat does about as well as his Republican challenger. In light of his conservative stance on gay rights and abortion this seems to be a plausible finding.

Questions of Causality

Thus far, the results suggest that attitudes about groups do affect candidate evaluations even after controlling for party identification and other factors. Still, the issue of the direction of causality is somewhat unclear here. It is possible that respondents decide to support a candidate for reasons other than their group attitudes and then assume that their preferred candidate must also like the groups that they also like. There is at least some evidence for this "projection" effect in tables 1-4. It seems to us, however that most respondents tend to provide the "right"

answer regardless of their party affiliation. This is especially true when the candidates adopt distinct positions vis-à-vis interest groups.

One way to be certain that it is indeed group attitudes affecting the vote choice, and not the reverse, is to substitute the average perception of candidate responsiveness for the individual perception. In other words, we essentially repeated the analyses of tables 6-8 except that we interacted the group thermometers with the average perception of responsiveness in each state (as shown in column one of table 5). This model is described below:

Expected Vote Choice = a + $b1$ (GROUP THERMOMETER) + $b2$ (AVE. STATE PERCEPTION OF GROUP RESPONSIVENESS) + $b3$ (STATE AVE. * THERM) + (CONTROLS) + e

The expectation here is that support for the various interest groups (i.e. group thermometers) should be more closely associated with the vote choice in states where the candidates were objectively more distinct on this dimension (as defined by the mean perception). If these attitudes are capturing something more than mere projection effects, then the interaction coefficient will be positive and statistically significant. These results are presented in table 9. The results in the first two columns for labor unions and environmentalists essentially confirm our expectation. Attitudes about these groups more strongly affected the vote choice in states where one of the candidates was clearly perceived as the better group advocate.

Results for the two ostensibly Republican groups do not perform as well. The interaction for the pro-life interaction is significant, but has the wrong sign. The sign for the Christian fundamentalist interaction is in the right direction, but it falls well short of statistical

significance. After reexamining the means in table 5, we suspected that the average perceptions of the more informed half of the sample might more "accurately" reflect the actual campaign environment.[9] Table 10 presents the same analyses as table 9, except that instead of the average perception of all respondents we only use the mean of the more politically informed portion of the sample (column 2 in table 5). The results for the two "Democratic" groups are largely unchanged. The interactions for the two "Republican" groups however now also become positive and statistically significant. The effects are mild for Christian Fundamentalists, but quite robust for pro-life groups.

Conclusion

The new group responsiveness questions do a fairly good job of distinguishing between the candidates and influencing the vote-decision. There was some evidence that respondents mis-perceived the candidates' "true" positions, but this varied dramatically across states. In Georgia and Illinois, there was little partisan agreement as to which candidate best represented a given interest group. However, in California, where the candidates adhered most closely to national party images, Democrats and Republicans generally agreed on whom would best represent the interest groups. Additionally, in California these attitudes were most consistently associated with respondent's vote choice.

We believe the Board should consider including these items on the 2000 Election Study. This is because the campaign conditions present in California, rather than those in Illinois or Georgia, are most likely to be reflected in the upcoming presidential contest. That is, the likely

[9] For example, according to Barone and Ujifusa, the greatest difference among the candidates on abortion was in California. However, the means for attitudes about pro-life groups (column 1 in table 5) indicate that Illinois had the

Democratic and Republican nominees will almost surely appeal to traditional party constituencies, as was the case in the California gubernatorial race.

While we believe these questions should be included on the 2000 Election Study, we still think they can be improved upon. First, instead of simply asking whether one candidate or the other "would do a better job" for a particular group, respondents could be provided with more response options. For example, they might be given the option of indicating that one candidate would do a "much better job" or perhaps only a "somewhat better job."

Finally, the Board might also consider expanding the range of groups included in these questions. Certainly pro-life groups, labor unions, environmentalists, and Christian Fundamentalists are identified with one of the two major parties and have distinct issue priorities. However, this is also true of other groups. To name just a few, the Board might also consider racial minorities (e.g. blacks and Latinos), the National Rifle Association, small business owners, the elderly, and women.

As indicated at the beginning of this report, scholars have long believed that voters think about groups when evaluating political parties and candidates. Although the NES has included group identification questions in the past, there has been little effort to link these attitudes explicitly to candidates. The group responsiveness questions from the 98 Pilot Study would address this oversight and perhaps increase our knowledge about the ways in which voters process political information.

---

sharpest disagreement on this question. The means for the more informed segment of respondents (column 2 in table 5), however seem closer to the journalistic accounts.

Table 1. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Labor Unions by Party Identification

California

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	12%	14%	14%
Neither Candidate	31	65	28
Democratic Candidate	56	21	59
N	165	29	206

Georgia

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	32%	14%	23%
Neither Candidate	30	67	33
Democratic Candidate	37	19	44
N	164	36	201

Table 1. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Labor Unions by Party Identification

(Continued from previous page)

Illinois

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	34%	46%	26%
Neither Candidate	31	43	22
Democratic Candidate	35	11	52
N	179	35	188

Table 2. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Environment Groups by Party Identification

California

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	21%	17%	10%
Neither Candidate	31	55	22
Democratic Candidate	48	28	68
N	165	29	206

Georgia

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	31%	19%	20%
Neither Candidate	33	64	31
Democratic Candidate	36	17	48
N	164	36	201

Table 2. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Environment Groups by Party Identification
(Continued from Previous Page)

Illinois

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	42%	40%	22%
Neither Candidate	40	54	33
Democratic Candidate	18	06	45
N	179	35	188

Table 3. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Pro-Life Groups by Party Identification

California

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	45%	21%	42%
Neither Candidate	21	69	23
Democratic Candidate	34	10	35
N	165	29	206

Georgia

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	49%	17%	29%
Neither Candidate	33	69	33
Democratic Candidate	18	14	36
N	164	36	201

Table 3. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Pro-Life Groups by Party Identification

(Continued from previous page)

Illinois

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	44%	43%	31%
Neither Candidate	41	46	36
Democratic Candidate	16	11	33
N	179	35	188

Table 4. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Christian Fundamentalist Groups by Party Identification

California

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	52%	17%	48%
Neither Candidate	34	76	32
Democratic Candidate	14	07	21
N	165	29	206

Georgia

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	55%	17%	37%
Neither Candidate	27	69	32
Democratic Candidate	18	14	31
N	164	36	201

Table 4. Crosstabulations of Perceptions of Gubernatorial Candidates' Responsiveness to Christian Fundamentalist Groups by Party Identification

(Continued from previous page)

Illinois

	Republicans	**Independents**	Democrats
Republican Candidate	47%	34%	38%
Neither Candidate	42	63	33
Democratic Candidate	11	03	29
N	179	35	188

Table 5. Mean Group Responsiveness Score for each State for All Respondents, Informed Respondents, and Group Members

Labor Unions

	All Cases	**Most Informed**	Union Members
California	.42 (.71)	.50 (.67)	.54 (.67)
Illinois	.09 (.84)	.23 (.82)	.24 (.92)
Georgia	.13 (.80)	.25 (.77)	.11 (.87)

Environmental Groups

	All Cases	**Most Informed**	Environmental **Group Member**
California	.42 (.74)	.51 (.70)	.50 (.78)
Illinois	-.03 (.79)	.10 (.75)	.40 (.75)
Georgia	.16 (.79)	.23 (.77)	.14 (.91)

Pro-Life Groups

	All Cases	**Most Informed**	Pro-Life Voters	Religious Conservatives

California	-.08 (.86)	-.22 (.86)	-.22 (.87)	-.44 (.73)
Illinois	-.14 (.77)	-.14 (.78)	-.14 (.80)	-.19 (.76)
Georgia	-.09 (.79)	-.18 (.78)	-.19 (.79)	-.14 (.83)

Table 5. Mean Group Responsiveness Score for each State for All Respondents, Informed Respondents, and Group Members
(Continued from previous page)

Christian Conservatives

	All Cases	**Most Informed**	Pro-Life Voters	Religious Conservatives
California	-.30 (.74)	-.49 (.68)	-.29 (.75)	-.38 (.68)
Illinois	-.24 (.74)	-.29 (.72)	-.27 (.76)	-.35 (.76)
Georgia	-.19 (.79)	-.30 (.77)	-.27 (.77)	-.17 (.83)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. Means scored to run from –1 to 1. Positive values indicate that more respondents, on balance, view the Democratic candidate as better able to represent the interests of the group. Negative values indicate that the Republican candidate is seen as better able to represent the interests of the group. Values closer to 0 indicate that respondents see little difference between the two candidates on this issue.

Table 6. Regression Model Predicting Effects of Perceptions of Group Responsiveness and Group Feeling Thermometers on Expected Vote Choice
(California Only)

	Labor Unions	Environmental Groups	Pro-Life Groups	Christian Fundamentalists
Constant	-1.16***	-1.50***	-1.34***	-1.31***
	(.36)	(.38)	(.38)	(.39)
Party Identification	.38***	.34***	.36***	.37***
	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)
Ideology	.11**	.09*	.08*	.11**
	(.05)	(.05)	(.05)	(.05)
Group Thermometer	-.005	.003	.003	-.00
	(.005)	(.005)	(.004)	(.00)
Democrat Best Represents Group	-.64*	-.18	.01	-.20
	(.30)	(.35)	(.34)	(.39)
Republican Best Represents Group	-.15	-.34	.69**	.30
	(.45)	(.51)	(.30)	(.25)
Democrat-Group * Thermometer	.018***	.008+	.006	.015**
	(.005)	(.005)	(.006)	(.006)
Republican-Group * Thermometer	-.009	-.006	-.018***	-.008+
	(.008)	(.008)	(.005)	(.005)
Adj. R_2	.51	.51	.51	.48
Standard Error	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.11
N	347	347	347	347

Note: Models also include controls for gender, race, age, education, and union membership. + $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ for One-Tailed Test.

Table 7. Regression Model Predicting Effects of Perceptions of Group Responsiveness and Group Feeling Thermometers on Expected Vote Choice
(Georgia Only)

	Labor Unions	Environmental Groups	Pro-Life Groups	Christian Fundamentalists
Constant	-2.33***	-2.53***	-2.85***	-2.11***
	(.44)	(.47)	(.47)	(.48)
Party Identification	.33***	.32***	.34***	.32***
	(.04)	(.03)	(.04)	(.04)
Ideology	.15**	.09*	.14**	.15**
	(.05)	(.05)	(.05)	(.05)
Group Thermometer	.005	.006	.008*	.00
	(.005)	(.005)	(.004)	(.00)
Democrat Best Represents Group	-.20	.11	-.03	-.43
	(.34)	(.41)	(.40)	(.42)
Republican Best Represents Group	.32	-.16	.31	-.10
	(.43)	(.53)	(.35)	(.34)
Democrat-Group * Thermometer	.006	.005	.006	.013*
	(.006)	(.006)	(.006)	(.007)
Republican-Group * Thermometer	-.02**	-.014*	-.015**	-.01*
	(.01)	(.008)	(.005)	(.006)
Adj. R_2	.43	.51	.43	.44
Standard Error	1.18	1.10	1.18	1.18
N	335	335	335	335

Note: Models also include controls for gender, race, age, education, and union membership. + $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ for One-Tailed Test.

Table 8. Regression Model Predicting Effects of Perceptions of Group Responsiveness and Group Feeling Thermometers on Expected Vote Choice
(Illinois Only)

	Labor Unions	Environmental Groups	Pro-Life Groups	Christian Fundamentalists
Constant	-1.27**	- .76*	-1.22**	-1.83***
	(.51)	(.46)	(.50)	(.49)
Party Identification	.34***	.31***	.33***	.33***
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)
Ideology	-.09+	-.10*	-.06	-.05
	(.05)	(.05)	(.06)	(.06)
Group Thermometer	.002	-.004	.004	.005
	(.006)	(.005)	(.005)	(.005)
Democrat Best Represents Group	.13	-.31	-.06	-.77*
	(.42)	(.46)	(.40)	(.44)
Republican Best Represents Group	.02	-.21	.13	.44+
	(.47)	(.46)	(.37)	(.32)
Democrat-Group * Thermometer	.008	.014*	.01+	.02***
	(.007)	(.007)	(.007)	(.01)
Republican-Group * Thermometer	-.01	-.009	-.013*	-.01**
	(.01)	(.007)	(.006)	(.006)
Adj. R^2	.37	.40	.38	.35
Standard Error	1.24	1.21	1.24	1.26
N	334	334	334	334

Note: Models also include controls for gender, race, age, education, and union membership. + $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ for One-Tailed Test.

Table 9. Regression Models Predicting Support for the Gubernatorial Candidates by Average Perceptions of Group Responsiveness and Attitudes toward Groups

	Labor Unions	**Environmental Groups**	**Pro-Life Groups**	**Christian Fundamentalists**
Intercept	-2.14*** (.25)	-1.89*** (.24)	-.33 (.42)	-2.94*** (.50)
Party Identification	.39*** (.02)	.39*** (.02)	.39*** (.02)	.39*** (.02)
Ideology	.07* (.03)	.07** (.03)	.07** (.03)	.07** (.03)
Group Thermometer	-.002 (.003)	-.005* (.002)	-.015*** (.006)	.004 (.008)
Average Perception of Group Responsiveness	.58 (.61)	-.69 (.57)	15.60*** (3.37)	-3.84** (1.74)
Thermometer * Average Group Perception	.015+ (.01)	.03*** (.01)	-.14** (.05)	.02 (.03)
Number of Cases	1016	1016	1016	1016
Adjusted R^2	.36	.37	.36	.35
St. Error of Regression	1.26	1.25	1.26	1.27

Note: Models also include controls for gender, race, age, education, and union membership. + $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ for One-Tailed Test.

Table 10: Regression Models Predicting Support for the Gubernatorial Candidates by the Average Perceptions of Group Responsiveness Among the Politically Informed and Attitudes toward Groups

	Labor Unions	**Environmental Groups**	**Pro-Life Groups**	**Christian Fundamentalists**
Intercept	-2.23***	-1.83***	-4.29***	-3.21***
	(.32)	(.28)	(.53)	(.39)
Party Identification	.39***	.39***	.39***	.39***
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)
Ideology	.07**	.07**	.07**	.07**
	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)
Group Thermometer	-.005	-.008**	.02**	.00
	(.004)	(.003)	(.01)	(.00)
Average Perception of Group Responsiveness	.66	-.65	-12.46***	-3.25***
	(.73)	(.62)	(2.53)	(.82)
Thermometer * Average Group Perception	.02+	.03***	.11**	.005+
	(.01)	(.01)	(.04)	(.004)
Number of Cases	1016	1016	1016	1016
Adjusted R^2	.36	.37	.37	.36
St. Error of Regression	1.26	1.25	1.25	1.26

Note: Models also include controls for gender, race, age, education, and union membership. + $p \leq .10$; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ for One-Tailed Test.