Pre-Analysis Plan for White Identity and Vote Choice
In this paper we focus on data analysis that explores the relationship between voting behavior, white identity, beliefs about how a candidate will help whites, and political ideology. We utilize a survey to measure both white voters' extent of linked fate with other whites and also their perception of which presidential candidate will most benefit white voters. Together these two measures provide us with the ability to identify relationship between white linked fate, perception of the political candidates, and voting decisions.

These new measures draw from prior theoretical work on linked fate and the related theoretical framework from Weller and Junn (2018), but are not a perfect instantiation of their framework as their model involves relative weights that actors attach to the identity dimension and the ideology dimension, but we lack that data. As far as we know it, however, we are the first to directly interrogate voters' beliefs about which candidate will benefit the racial group with which a voter identifies.

Our analysis focuses on the beliefs and actions of white voters in 2016, because it is the group to which our theory is most relevant and there is a paucity of research regarding white identity.

In the 2016 CCES pre-election survey we placed a question on the survey designed to capture the idea of linked fate (Dawson 1994) that has been used many times before although not as often for white respondents (See Sanchez & Masuoka 2010; Simien 2005; Masuoka and Junn 2013; Sanchez and Vargas 2016). We added a supplemental question asking if Trump/Clinton would make things better for whites. These two questions together provide insight about whether an individual perceives shared fate with others in their racial group and whether they believe a given candidate will make things better for their group. This allows us to look at individuals based on how they fall on these two questions.

The questions we pursue in our analysis focus on the beliefs and behavior of white voters and use data from both the pre-election CCES data and the post-election CCES data. We outline the descriptive questions on which we focus and the hypotheses we interrogate using our data.

Descriptive Questions:
We focus initially on describing the data and exploring the relationships between the measures related to linked fate and perception of the candidate that will improve things for one's racial group.

1. What is the relationship between white identity and ideology?
2. What is the relationship between white identity, belief that Trump/Clinton would improve outcomes for whites, and ideology?
3. Do white voters expect either Trump or Clinton to be better for their racial group?
   a. Do voters expect it to be one candidate or the other, or do many voters think it won't matter much for whites which candidate is elected.
   b. What are the demographic/political factors that correlate with respondents' perceptions of whether a candidate will help white voters?
4. Does linked fate and the belief that GOP/Dem are better for whites correlate with other measures of racial resentment or measures of racism?

5. What are the contours of racial identity among whites? How are perceptions of white linked fate correlated with others important demographic characteristics such as gender, class, and religion?

Hypotheses:
We also focus on a number of topics for which we have prior expectations about the empirical relationships we will observe. We draw our expectations from Weller and Junn (2018), but we know that that our measures are only rough proxies for the concepts in their theoretical model. Furthermore, the inability to manipulate any of the key independent variables makes it basically impossible to meet the standard conditions for causal inference.

White Identity and Voting Behavior
H1:   Among Democratic voters, the probability of voting for Trump will be higher among those who express White identity and believe that Trump will make things better for whites than will the probability of voting for Trump among other Democrats. [and do not think Clinton will make things better for whites]

H2:   Among Republican voters, the probability of voting for Clinton will be higher among those who express high White identity and believe that Clinton will make things better for whites than will the probability of voting for Clinton among other Republicans. [and do not think Trump will make things better for whites].

For both H1 and H2 the rationale is similar. Among Republican [Democratic] voters their ideological similarity (or shared party identification) with Trump [Clinton] will explain most of the decision to vote with their own party – that is, white identity doesn't have much explanatory power for voting that is consistent with party identification. However, as explicated in Weller and Junn (2018) white identity can also affect a voter's utility and therefore we expect it to be associated with voting for a candidate from the other political party.

 H3:   For Republican [Democratic] party identifiers the relationship between white identity and voting for Trump [Clinton] will be stronger for those ideologically distant from Trump [Clinton] than those who are ideologically similar to Trump [Clinton].

As outlined in Weller and Junn (2018) voters' utility is affected by both ideology and white identity. For voters who are ideologically similar to a candidate it will be difficult to disentangle whether a voting decision is driven by ideological proximity or white identity, however, as a voter's ideology begins to differ from their perception of a candidate's ideology then the role of white identity on vote choice is easier to identify.

H4:   For voters who identify with a political party those who report high linked fate and believe that the candidate from their party will make things better for whites will evaluate that candidate more favorably than will other voters in their party, all else equal.

We expect partisanship to be the strongest determinant of vote choice, but another way to examine how white identity is related to political decisions is to examine whether white identity

affects evaluation of the candidate from the respondent's party. Among partisan identifiers, we'd expect those who express white linked fate and believe the candidate of their party is likely to advance the interests of whites, to evaluate their candidate more favorably than those who do not (measured with a thermometer scale (UCR 351 & 352)).

Data Source

The source of our data is the 2016 CCES survey that included a module added by faculty at UC-Riverside. This module includes multiple questions that assess linked fate and its importance among voters. We also use other data from the CCES common content data set.

To simplify the analyses and interpretation we recode some of the response to collapse responses to a small number of categories. For the following three questions (our key IVs) we collapse the two agreement responses together and the two disagreement responses together – giving us a trichotomous variable for this question.

UCR 314: How strongly do you agree with the following statement, "as things get better for [insert answer response from question "race"] in general, things get better for me."
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strong Disagree

UCR 315: How strongly do you agree with the following statement, if Hillary Clinton is elected U.S. President, then she will make things better for [insert answer response from question "race"]
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

UCR 316: How strongly do you agree with the following statement, if Donald Trump is elected as U.S. President, then he will make things better for [insert answer response from question "race"]?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

Analyses

Our analyses utilize both logit and linear probability models for additional robustness. We expect the results to be consistent between the two models; except for extremely low or high probability events the LPM and logit should result in similar marginal effect estimates. We plan to report the results from the LPM because they are easier to interpret. We also conduct our analyses separately for Democrats and Republicans because our hypotheses are specific to voters in each party rather than comparative across parties. Also, separating the data facilitates interpretation of the results and does not require us to assume a common error structure across the two parties.

We restrict our analyses for the general election to respondents who reported an intent to vote for either Trump or Clinton.

Hypothesis 1: Democratic PID and Voting
To investigate this hypothesis, we create a new variable coded as a 1 if a respondent BOTH reports having white linked fate and a belief that Trump will make things better for whites and we code as 0 all other combinations of Democratic respondents. We code as 1 an intended vote for Trump and 0 an intended vote for Clinton, and we exclude respondents who intend to vote for an alternative candidate. Using both logit and a LPM we estimate the following regression to investigate H1.

H1: Pr(TrumpVote|Democratic PID= α + $\beta1$*WhiteLinkedFate&TrumpHelpsWhites + controls

Key Test: B1 should be positive and statistically significant

Hypothesis 2: Republican PID and Voting
To investigate this hypothesis, we create a new variable coded as a 1 if a respondent BOTH reports having white linked fate and a belief that Clinton will make things better for whites and we code as 0 all other combinations of Republican respondents. We code as 1 an intended vote for Clinton and 0 an intended vote for Trump, and we exclude respondents who intend to vote for an alternative candidate. Using both logit and a LPM we estimate the following regression to investigate H1.

H2: Pr(ClintonVote|Republican PID= α + $\beta1$*WhiteLinkedFate&ClintonHelpsWhites + controls

Key Test: B1 should be positive and statistically significant; of note, if few Republicans are coded as a "1" on the primary independent variable then we will not find a statistically significant relationship.

Hypothesis 3: Ideological distance and support for Party's candidate
We again conduct this analysis separately for Democrats and Republicans. For each of the separate analyses we create a variable coded as 1 if a respondent reports having white linked fate and a belief that their party's candidate will make things better for whites called TrumpWhiteID or ClintonWhiteID. This variable is then interacted with a measure of the ideological distance between the candidate and the voter.

H3a: Pr(ClintonVote|DemocraticPID) = α + $\beta1$ * ClintonWhiteID * IdeologicalDistance + $\beta2$ * Clinton WhiteID + $\beta3$ * IdeologicalDistance + controls

H3b: $\Pr(\text{TrumpVote}|\text{RepublicanPID}) = \alpha + \beta1 * \text{TrumpWhiteID} * \text{IdeologicalDistance} + \beta2 * \text{TrumpWhiteID} + \beta3 * \text{IdeologicalDistance} + \text{controls}$

Key Test: In each regression the coefficient for β1 should be positive and significant; the marginal effect of the TrumpWhiteID [or ClintonWhiteID] will be increasing as ideological distance between the candidate and the voter increases. For voters who are not coded as a 1 on the TrumpWhiteID [ClintonWhiteID] variable the relationship between ideological distance and voting will be negative – greater distance is associated with a lower probability of voting for the candidiate. However, for those with TrumpWhiteID [ClintonWhiteID]=1, the relationship between ideology and voting will be weaker, which will manifest itself in a positive coefficient on B1. Another way to think about our expectation is that the negative relationship between ideological distance and probability of voting for party's candidate will have a flatter slope for respondents coded as a 1 on the TrumpWhiteID or ClintonWhiteID variable.

> **Note**: Measurement of ideological distance will be computed from CC16_340 that asks respondents to rate a variety of political figures on a 7-point ideological scale and the ideo5 variable (labeled: ideology) which asks respondents to place themselves on a 5-point ideological scale.

Hypothesis 4: Party Identification and Candidate Evaluation
This hypothesis focuses on candidate evaluations by those who identify with a given political party. The important test is whether, within a political party, those who care about White ID and believe their party's candidate will make things better also evaluate their candidate better than other party identifiers.

H4a: $E(\text{ClintonEvaluation}|\text{DemocraticPID}) = \alpha + \beta1 * \text{ClintonWhiteID} + \text{controls}$

H4b: $E(\text{TrumpEvaluation}|\text{RepublicanPID}) = \alpha + \beta1 * \text{TrumpWhiteID} + \text{controls}$

Key Test: In both regressions β1 should be significant and positive, meaning that voters in a given political party evaluate a candidate higher if they share linked fate with other whites and believe that their party's candidate will help white voters.

Controls: We envision using the same basic suite of covariates in our models to adjust for confounding and the variables are drawn from prior work on voting choices. These variables include at least the following: Ideology; Gender; Age; Education; Income; Political Interest; Region; Perceptions of the Economy; Married; Evangelical; Class anxiety; racial resentment;