

A CONTENT ANALYSIS STUDY ON POLITICAL
COMMERCIAL BETWEEN INCUMBENT
AND CHALLENGER IN THE 1992
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

BY

JUI-YEN LO

Bachelor of Arts

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1992

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1994

A CONTENT ANALYSIS STUDY ON POLITICAL
COMMERCIAL BETWEEN INCUMBENT
AND CHALLENGER IN THE 1992
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Thesis Approved:

Charles Fleming

Thesis Adviser

Maureen J. Nemcek

Edward Welch

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Charles A. Fleming, my academic and thesis adviser. Dr. Fleming's advice, constructive guidance and encouragement have helped me throughout my graduate program. I am also thankful to Dr. Maureen Nemecek and Dr. Edward Welch for being in my graduate committee. Their suggestions and support were very helpful for this study. I like to thank the Department of Communication in the University of Oklahoma, for their assistance in sampling and coding the data. Thanks also go to my parents and friends who cared.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Objectives	5
Methodology	6
Significance of the Study	6
Limitations	7
Organization of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Overview	11
From Broadside to Television	11
Television and Election Process	16
The Importance of Political Commercial	19
The Advantage of Incumbency	31
The Campaign Strategy of Incumbent and Challenger	37
Conclusion	41
III. METHODOLOGY	56
General	56
Research Questions and Null Hypothesis	56
Definition of Terms	57
Selection of Subjects	62
Unite of Analysis	63
Category of Analysis	63
Coding	63
Statistical Analysis	65
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	67
Introduction	67
The Overall Content and Strategy of the 1992 Presidential Commercials.....	67

Chapter	Page
Content and Strategy Difference in Political Ads of Incumbent and Challengers	73
Content and Strategy Difference of Political Ads of Candidates	81
Summary	86
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	87
Summary.....	87
Conclusion	91
Recommendations for Future Study	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96
APPENDIXES	103
APPENDIX A--CODING SHEET	104
APPENDIX B--CODE BOOK	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Number of Ads Per Candidate	66
II. Length of Political Commercials.....	67
III. Types of Speakers in the Political Ads	67
IV. Types of Ad Content	68
V. Appeals Appearing in the Political Commercials	69
VI. Types of Political Ads	70
VII. Strategies Appearing in the Negative Political Commercials	70
VIII. Strategies of Political Commercials	71
IX. Speakers in the Political Commercials of Incumbent and Challengers	72
X. Types of Ad Content Appearing in the Political Ads of Incumbent and Challengers	74
XI. Types of Political Ads of Incumbent and Challengers	75
XII. Appeals of Political Commercials of Incumbent and Challengers	75
XIII. Strategies of Negative Ads of Incumbent and Challengers	77
XIV. Strategies of the Political Ads of Incumbent and Challengers	78
XV. Types of Ads of Political Commercials of Candidates	80
XVI. Strategies of Political Commercials of Candidates	81
XVII. Issues Appearing in the Political Commercials	83

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Since 1952 when the first political commercial appeared in the presidential election, political advertising on television has grown rapidly. It has become an indispensable campaign component for political candidates in the United States.¹ Today it is no longer possible for candidates to run for major public office without spending a significant portion of their campaign budget on television advertisement.² In the 1988 presidential campaign, the two major party candidates, George Bush and Michael Dukakis, spent \$65 million on television advertisements.³ However, the importance of political advertising is not just reflected by the amount of campaign funds spent on it. Many studies have shown that political advertising substantially affects the attitudes, thinking and behavior of voters.⁴ Aware of the importance of political advertising in today's electoral politics, political analysts, communication scholars, and political candidates have done many studies to determine the content and impact of political advertising. However, little is known about the actual differences in content of political commercials between incumbents and challengers.

Background of the Problem

Today, 99 percent of all American households have at least one television set and more than half have two or more.⁵ Mass penetration of television has made it the most important communication medium. According to a Roper Organization poll in the mid 1960s, television surpassed newspapers and became the most credible source for world

news. Roper polls have shown that people in the United States get more information on a political level about candidates from television than from any other medium.⁶

With the growth of television, candidates can now go directly to voters without having to rely on political organizations or other points of contact. Television serves as the primary means for candidates to reach voters in national elections.⁷ As Lynda Lee Kaid noted in the United States the electoral process is dependent on the successful use of television. Candidates must master television press conferences, debates, news interviews and the creation of political advertising.⁸ On the national campaign level where voters have little contact with presidential candidates, television is especially important to provide campaign information to voters. Alexander explained that “television has bred a feeling of intimacy between voter and public official, an intimacy which has led voters to trust their own impressions about candidates rather than rely on the impressions of outside commentators.”⁹ Television provides voters an opportunity to view the candidates in action, to hear the candidates' positions on issues and to make their own choices by judging candidates' performance on television. The decline of the political party has also attribute the importance of television in providing campaign information.

Candidates can communicate with voters through television in various ways. However, only the paid political advertisement can give candidates direct control of messages to the electorates. News coverage of campaigns can transfer campaign information, but it may suffer from some distortion and modification inherent in the selective process of news reporting.¹⁰ Therefore, political advertising is a more important means of communication because candidates can control what they want voters to know. Besides forming the most controllable means to communicate with voters, political advertising also serves other functions and purposes in the political campaign. Political ads can make an unknown candidate a better known candidate by increasing the candidate's visibility, and his/her name identification.¹¹ These ads can also be very effective in persuading low involved or late deciding voters. Kaid concluded that

“political advertising is more effective when the level of voter involvement is low.”¹² Ads can also help to define or redefine a candidate's image and develop the campaign issues. Political ads can help candidates target particular demographic groups by showing their association with the groups. Ads can be used to reinforce supporters and partisans, and to raise money for the candidates. Political ads can also be used to attack the opposition.¹³

The importance of political advertising on television can be demonstrated by the amount of money that candidates and political parties have been willing to devote to it. In fact, an estimated 50 to 75 percent of the budget in major campaigns goes to finance the political advertising.¹⁴ In 1980, Carter and Reagan each spent close to two thirds of their \$29.4 million budgets on advertising. Approximately \$13 million of that was spent on TV.¹⁵ Political candidates aren't the only ones who spend huge portions of campaign budgets on political spots. Both major political parties have used advertisements to promote themselves and their candidates.¹⁶ The sharp increase in the number of political campaign consultants with expertise in advertising shows that political advertising has been and will always be an important campaign method in the United States.¹⁷

The impact of political advertising in the electoral process is indisputable. Many studies have shown that political advertising increases knowledge about candidates and issues and directly influences voting behavior.¹⁸ According to a poll conducted by the New York Times and CBS, one-fourth of all voters in the 1988 presidential campaign admitted that political advertisements were helpful in making decisions.¹⁹ However, many critics say that television ads fail to provide the voters meaningful information, and degrade the electoral process by selling candidates as if they were merchandise. Many people feel television emphasizes image making while ignoring political issues.²⁰

In the past three decades, much research has been done in the field of political advertising. Most of these studies focus on the effect of televised ads, the content of ads, whether issue or image, and possible contributions and dangers to the political system.²¹ However, only a few studies have been done to determine the content difference of

televised political ads according to a candidate's position as incumbent or challenger. In a study conducted by Payne and Bakus who examined 101 senatorial ads from the 1984 election, researchers found that in an "argument" spot, incumbents used more attack tactics than did challengers. The researchers also concluded that challengers in the North region of the United States were more issue-oriented in their attack, while incumbents more often attacked a challenger's personal character.²²

Another study, conducted by Kaid and Davidson, analyzed the different videostyles used by incumbents and challengers. Kaid and Davidson studied fifty-five commercials from three Senate races in 1982 and found incumbents and challengers differed in style and strategies in their commercials. Incumbent was represented by longer commercials, more testimonials, more candidate-positive focused ads, and more formal dress. On the other hand, the challenger's videostyle included more "candidate head-on" style, and more casual dress.²³ In a subsequent study, Kaid, Wadsworth and Foote analyzed political ads used during the 1968, 1972, 1976 and 1980 presidential campaigns in an attempt to understand the different strategies used by incumbents and challengers. The results of the studies showed that incumbents often used "symbolic trapping," and stressed the "legitimacy" of the president. Also incumbents were more likely to be seen working with world leaders and emphasizing their accomplishments. Challengers, on the other hand, often called for changes and took the offensive position on issues.²⁴

Earlier studies have indicated that there are some differences in political ads between incumbents and challengers. However, little is known about incumbent-challenger differences in political ads in the 1992 presidential election. Therefore, research is needed to understand the 1992 presidential commercials and the difference in television ad content between incumbent George Bush, and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the apparent impact of television on the political process, and despite all the studies that have been done in the field of political advertising. There is little information available about the content of political advertising in the 1992 presidential election. In particular, little is known about the difference in advertising content between incumbent George Bush and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot. The 1992 presidential election was the first time in many years that the third party candidate occupied an important role in the race. Also it was the first time a Democrat candidate was elected since Jimmy Carter in 1978. Both challengers, Bill Clinton and Ross Perot, used many televised political spots to communicate to the electorate. Facing two very competent challengers, the incumbent, George Bush, also used the electronic media heavily to convince voters to reelect him. Therefore, it will be interesting to learn how these candidates communicated with voters through their paid political spots, what were strategies they used, and what the differences were in ads between incumbents and challengers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand and obtain information on the content of 1992 presidential commercials with a focus on differences between incumbent and challenger advertising.

Research Objectives.

There are several research objectives in this thesis: (1) This study examines whether or not the dominant speaker in political advertising is different between the incumbent and challengers. (2) This study is seeking information about the different types of content: issue, image or both, used in the 1992 presidential commercials. The researchers will identify the difference in type of content in political advertising between incumbent and challenger. (3) This study will obtain information about the different appeals used in the

Statement of the Problem

Despite the apparent impact of television on the political process, and despite all the studies that have been done in the field of political advertising. There is little information available about the content of political advertising in the 1992 presidential election. In particular, little is known about the difference in advertising content between incumbent George Bush and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot. The 1992 presidential election was the first time in many years that the third party candidate occupied an important role in the race. Also it was the first time a Democrat candidate was elected since Jimmy Carter in 1978. Both challengers, Bill Clinton and Ross Perot, used many televised political spots to communicate to the electorate. Facing two very competent challengers, the incumbent, George Bush, also used the electronic media heavily to convince voters to reelect him. Therefore, it will be interesting to learn how these candidates communicated with voters through their paid political spots, what were strategies they used, and what the differences were in ads between incumbents and challengers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand and obtain information on the content of 1992 presidential commercials with a focus on differences between incumbent and challenger advertising.

Research Objectives.

There are several research objectives in this thesis: (1) This study examines whether or not the dominant speaker in political advertising is different between the incumbent and challengers. (2) This study is seeking information about the different types of content: issue, image or both, used in the 1992 presidential commercials. The researchers will identify the difference in type of content in political advertising between incumbent and challenger. (3) This study will obtain information about the different appeals used in the

commercials: partisanship appeal, issue-related appeal with vague policy position, issue-related appeal with specific policy position, issue-related appeal without mentioning the candidate's policy position, personal character of candidate, group reference, and criticism against opponent. The researchers will identify the different use of appeal between incumbent and challenger. (4) The researchers will identify positive and negative political advertising, and different strategy of negative political advertising with focus on the difference between incumbent and challenger. (5) The researcher will acquire information of different strategies presented in the political commercials and identify the difference between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election. (6) The study will also reveal the issues that appeared in the sample political commercials in the 1992 presidential election.

Methodology

This study used content analysis to examine 70 different political commercials from incumbent President George Bush, and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot in the 1992 general election campaign. These political spots were obtained from the Political Commercial Archive in the Department of Communication at the University of Oklahoma. Political Commercial Archive obtains the largest and most complete set of presidential ads in the world.²⁶ Thus the advertising collection examined in this study was assumed to be relatively complete and representative of all incumbent and challenger political commercials during the 1992 presidential election. The units of analysis in this study are the political commercials themselves. The researchers will exam each commercial spot to identify the type of speaker, content, direction, appeals, strategy of negative advertising, and strategy of ads. With the information obtained, the researchers will also make a comparison between incumbent and challenger.

Significance of the Study

In the past four decades, the paid political advertising of each presidential election have been carefully studied and analyzed. Studies have shown that incumbent and challenger do differ in style and strategy used in their political commercials. This study will provide updated information on the content of 1992 presidential political commercials with emphasis on the difference between incumbent and challenger advertising. The result of this study will provide valuable information for political candidates, campaign consultants, political analysts, political teachers, students and scholars. The general public themselves will also benefit from a better understanding of the political process and the use of television to influence voters. The result of this study can be used as a reference for campaign consultants and political candidates to prepare for the next political election.

Limitations

Because of the continuing development and changes of television, this study is limited to the stated time period. The result of this analysis may not apply to later political advertising and campaigns. The personality of candidates and the different campaign situations can affect the content of political commercials too. Since this study analyzes only the 1992 presidential political commercials, the results may not apply to candidates and campaigns in different situations or lower level elections.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II, the literature review, briefly describes the development of political advertising before the use of television as a political campaign medium. This chapter discusses the importance of television in today's electoral politics, discusses previous studies that have been done in the field of political advertising, and discusses and identifies congressional studies which are related to incumbents and challengers.

Chapter III explains the research methodology of the study.

Chapter IV reports the findings and the results of statistical analysis.

Chapter V is the summary of the study. Conclusions are presented and recommendations for further studies are suggested.

ENDNOTES

1. Donald T. Cundy, "Political Commercials and Candidate Image." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 210.
2. Lynda L. Kaid, Dan. Nimmo, and Keith. R. Sanders, New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), xi.
3. Patrick L. Devlin, "Contrasts in presidential campaign commercials of 1988." American Behavioral Scientist 32 (March 1989): 389-414.
4. Lynda L. Kaid, Chris M. Leland, and Susan Whitney, "The impact of televised political ads: Evoking viewer responses in the 1988 presidential campaign" The Southern Communication Journal. 57 (Summer 1992): 285-295.
5. L. Sabato, The rise of political consultants (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 117.
6. Cundy, 220.
7. Sabato, 111-114.
8. Kaid, Leland, and Whitney, 285.
9. H. E. Alexander, "Communications and politics: The media and the message." In R. Agranoff (ED.). The new style in election campaigns. (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972), 365-392.
10. Anne J. Wadsworth, Incumbent and Challenger Strategies in Presidential Communication: A Content Analysis of Television Campaign Ads from 1952 to 1984. (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1987), 3.
11. Devlin, 22.
12. Lynda L. Kaid "Political advertising" In D.D. Nimmo and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), Handbook of political communication. (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981), 265 .
13. Devlin, 23.
14. Lynda L. Kaid, and Dorthy K. Davidson, "Elements of Videostyle" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 185.
15. Patrick L. Devlin, "Reagan's and Carter's ad men review the 1980 television campaigns. Communication Quarterly 30 (Winter 1981): 3-12.

16. Barry Kolar, "Fighting back: American political parties take to the airwaves" In L.L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds), New perspectives on political advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 55-81.
17. Richard Joslyn, "The content of political spot ads." Journalism Quarterly. 57 (Spring 1980): 92-98.
18. Kaid, 265.
19. M. Oreskes, "Tv's role in '88: The medium is the election." New York Times, (30 October, 1988): 1, 19.
20. Robert D. McClure, and Thomas E. Patterson, "Television news and political advertising: The impact on voter beliefs." Communication Research. 1 (January 1974): 3-31.
21. Dan Nimmo, and Arthur J. Felsberg, "Hidden myths in televised political advertising" In L.L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders. New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 248.
22. J. G. Payne, and R. A. Baukus, "Trend analysis of the 1984 GOP senatorial spot." Paper presented at the McElroy Symposia: Current Trends in Broadcast Advertising, University of Northern Iowa. 1985.
23. Kaid, and Davidson, 199.
24. Wadsworth, 64.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter contains five sections. The first section describes varied advertising and campaign methods that were used by political candidates before television became the major campaign medium. The second section explains the influence of television on today's electoral politics and its impact on political campaign. The third section examines the importance of televised political advertising in terms of money spent on political spots, the content, and the effect of political commercials. The fourth section describes the political implication of candidates' running positions in terms of advantages and resources available to incumbents and challengers. The final section focuses on the different campaign strategies which are used by incumbents and challengers.

From Broadside to Television

As a candidate for the House of Burgesses in Virginia, George Washington attracted the attention of voters by offering them wine, punch, cider and beer. According to Jamieson, the food, drink and torch light parades were among the earliest form of political advertising.¹ These "treats" lured voters with the promise of food and drink, and torch light parades attracted them with the promise of entertainment. From the inception of the Republic to the early twentieth century, political parades continued to be a major

campaign method in presidential elections.² A reporter for Leslie's weekly estimated that "in the presidential campaign of 1904 several million dollars were spent for flags, banners, uniforms, torches, buttons, canvas, muslin and paint..."³

Political advertising is no doubt as old as political communication. Jamieson stated that from the nation's first contested election in 1796, the Federalists used handbills to attack Jefferson as an atheist and an enemy of the constitution. On the other hand, the Republican handbill praised Jefferson as a Republican and denounced Adams as a monarchist. By the election of 1828, newspapers and handbills were the primary means of associating specific electors with a specific candidate.⁴ According to Wm. David Sloan that as the party system emerged, the press was viewed as a spokesperson of the party, and a major instrument in influencing public opinion to gain political dominance.⁵ Today, politicians purchase space in newspapers for their political advertisements, but during the nineteenth century, the partisan press acted as a political propaganda tool for the party and for the party supported presidential candidates.⁶

Cartoons were also used by politicians in the 19th century as an advertising instrument. Today, most people associate cartoons with newspapers and magazines, but before the 1870s, cartoons could actually be purchased at a publisher's counter or in the streets. Cartoons that attacked the opposition were widely distributed.⁷

Champaign songs and chants were another famous form of political advertising. Jamieson stated that political songs and chants often fleshed out the skeletal claims of the banners and flags.⁸ Like the modern political spots, campaign songs helped build recognition of candidates, personalized the candidates, and carried messages of support

and attack.⁹ According to Jamieson, one major advantage of campaign songs over banners and handbills was that songs could reach the illiterate voters.¹⁰

Perhaps the most famous negative political chant was the one used against Democratic candidate Governor Cleveland in 1884. Cleveland admitted that he may have fathered an illegitimate child, and his opponents took up the chant "Ma, Ma, where's my Pa? Gone to the White House, Ha Ha Ha."¹¹

Flag banners were also a popular political advertising method as early as 1840 and prevailed until 1905 when Congress prohibited the use of compromising portraits or marks on a flag. Candidates' portraits were inserted into the flag banner and the slogans or symbols were painted on the bars. The banners seldom noted either the candidate's party or the year of the election. Instead, a portrait or a symbol identified the candidate.¹²

Throughout most of the nineteenth century, political advertising was printed on bandannas, handkerchiefs, tablecloths and coverlets. Supporters often showed their loyalties to candidates by waving and carrying the kerchiefs and bandannas with them in public and in private.¹³

According to Jamieson, around the mid-nineteenth century, patriotic envelopes bearing pictures of American flags, the American eagle, or the symbol of unity appeared.¹⁴ Jamieson wrote that when candidates' symbols were popularized and printed on these envelopes, political direct mail was born.¹⁵ Today candidates use direct mail to raise funds and to send messages to voters.

The political speech has always been a popular political campaign method, especially during the nineteenth century.¹⁶ Politicians traveled thousand of miles to meet and speak to voters. The political speech gives candidates a chance to talk to voters directly and

make personal contact with voters. Speaking in the town hall and facing voters directly is no doubt the most popular and favorite campaign method during the 19th century.

Then radio entered the political scene in 1920. By 1924, America had three million radio receivers, and in 1935 ten times that number existed.¹⁷ With the development of radio, politicians no longer had to travel thousands of miles to the local town hall to speak to voters. Instead candidates could speak to an audience of millions at the same time through radio. People do not gather in town hall or town squares, but instead, listen to speeches in their own living rooms or cars.¹⁸ Over the course of 100 days during the campaign of 1896, William Jennings Bryan made 600 speeches in 27 states and traveled over 18,000 miles to reach 5,000,000 people. On the other hand, Franklin Delano Roosevelt reached twelve times that number by delivering a single "fireside chat" via radio.¹⁹ Radio has also changed the way politicians deliver political speeches. Presidential candidates speak in the radio with a soft and friendly manner as if they were talking to voters personally.²⁰

In the early days of radio, the simple fact of candidates speaking on the radio held people's attention. However, with improved programming on more channels, people were attracted by entertainment programs rather than political speeches. Therefore hour-long speeches gave way to the half hour speech and half hour speeches often used political songs and skits to attract the audiences.²¹ Politicians' preference for shorter political speeches was also caused by the increased cost of radio time.²²

In the 1924 presidential election, Republicans spent \$120,000 on radio, while Democrats spent \$40,000. The Republican candidate Coolidge won. Four years later in

1928, the first political spot appeared when the GOP organized a 6,000 "Minute Man" all over the country to promote the Republican presidential candidates.²³

Any medium that can transmit messages to a mass audience can be used for political advertising. Therefore, newsreels and films were created by talented Hollywood producers to advertise the political candidates.²⁴ In the 1934 California gubernatorial election, newsreels attacking candidate Sinclair were distributed to every movie house in the state. In the newsreels, actors playing ordinary citizens expressed concern and outrage at the prospect of Sinclair's election.²⁵ In the 1948 presidential election, documentary films created for Truman and Dewey were similar to documentary commercials. This documentary film was so successful that the director of public relations for the Democratic National Committee claimed, "It was probably the most important and most successful publicity break in the entire campaign."²⁶

World War II delayed the development of television. However, television grew rapidly after the war. In 1952 there were nineteen million television sets in America, and almost forty percent of households could receive television signals.²⁷ 1952 was an important year in the study of political advertising because in this year, the first presidential political spot appeared on television. Since then televised political advertising has played an important role in presidential campaigns.

In the 1952 election, the Republican candidate was the popular General Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Adlai Stevenson, governor of Illinois, was running for the Democrats. Stevenson needed the help of television because a poll showed only a third of the voters knew who he was. According to the same poll, Eisenhower was the most admired living American.²⁸ Democrats spent \$1.5 million to broadcast 18.5 hour speeches by Stevenson

and other famous Democrats. However, the drawback of this type of advertising plan was that the speeches attracted only an average of 3.8 million people, and these audiences were probably already favoring Stevenson.²⁹ On the other hand, Republicans hired famous ad man Rosser Reeves to produce ads for Eisenhower. Through the magic of Madison Avenue, the biography of General Eisenhower appeared. Short commercials used Walt Disney cartoons and music to emphasize the theme "I like Ike." Then there was the famous "Eisenhower Answering America" series.³⁰ While the spots were the major innovation in the 1952 election, the Republicans also tried various paid programs and political speeches to advertise their candidates. In fact, Nixon's "checkers speech" was considered to be one of the most effective political advertisements of our time.³¹

As Diamond and Bates noted the television campaign of 1952 may not have been the determining factor in the Eisenhower-Nixon victory, but television did initiate a major change in political campaigns. The Truman style of whistle-stop tours were about to become history and the radio age was ending.³²

Television and Election Process

As political campaigning entered the age of television, politicians quickly adopted the new medium. Theodore H. White wrote in America in Search of Itself: The Making of President, "American politics and television are now so completely locked together that it is impossible to tell the story of one without the other."³³ Television not only influences viewers' perception of politics, but it also significantly alters the campaign process and the electoral politics themselves.³⁴

One of the changes that occurred due to television's domination of the election process was the decline of the party's influence on voter turnout.³⁵ With the help of mass media, candidates can appeal directly to their voters. Through television news coverage, political spots and debates, voters can receive information about the character of candidates, candidates' stands on issues, and their qualification for office.³⁶ According to Kraus the decline of the party's influence on voting decision coincides with an increase in exposure to politics on television.³⁷ Most voters rely on television for political information, and the voters' perception about the candidates received through television often helps them make the voting decision.³⁸

The influence of television on today's presidential campaigns has also changed the selection of candidates and issues significantly.³⁹ Television has pre-empted the party's role in the presidential selection process. During the primary, candidates can use television to gain enormous exposure and support long before conventions take place.⁴⁰ Television can make unknown candidates fairly well known. Senator Estes Kefauver, for example, was made a national figure overnight by television coverage of his crime committee's investigations.⁴¹ According to Langs that "the increasing exposure to politics on television has made voters concern themselves more about issues addressed by political advertising, news coverage and television debates."⁴² The personality of candidates and issues have become two major cues for voters to make their decision.

The most important effect of television probably is its ability to present an image of candidates and to provide voters a sense of the reality of political events. Kurt and Gladys stated that watching something on television makes people think "that they see for themselves; they are directly involved in history; television takes them to the scene...; that

they have a clearer picture of what is going on than people right there."⁴³ Television has created a sense of reality and a feeling of intimacy between voters and political officials. The visual component of television allows voters to have a closer look at candidates, watch candidates in action, and hear candidates address them directly.⁴⁴

Many researchers still argue over whether television changes or merely reinforces opinions. But they generally agree that it can promote familiarity with an image, whether real or manufactured, with considerable success.⁴⁵ Politicians have long believed that face to face contact with voters is the most effective way to campaign.⁴⁶

However, appearing on the living room's box only a few feet away from the constituents is surely next best.⁴⁷

Panney stated that with television's emphasis on image, the medium has influenced the electoral politics in the ways campaigns are conducted and in the kinds of candidates to be elected.⁴⁸ Often a presidential campaign is coordinated with media schedule. In the campaign headquarters, voters' demographic maps are replaced by the media marketing map.⁴⁹ According to Robert Agranoff, the impact of television on elections is that "the campaign must be planned and organized around the media schedule. The event to be covered must meet the news deadline of the radio and TV stations."⁵⁰ In fact, Kellner said that "many presidential candidates fly from airport to airport, holding press conferences and doing interviews with media personalities, rather than actually speaking or meeting with live voters."⁵¹

In addition, the ability to perform on television has become one very important criteria in assessing potentially successful candidates.⁵² Minow stated that a political candidate is likely to rise faster and further if he "comes across" well on television.⁵³ Minow wrote in

Presidential Television, "Citizens in the television age expect their leader to be reasonably pleasing to the eye and to be capable of a confidence inspiring television presentation."⁵⁴

Roger Ailes, one of Nixon's media advisers in the 1968 election stated, "This is the beginning of a whole new concept. This is it. This is the way they'll be elected forevermore. The next guys will have to be performers"⁵⁵ However, many critics have blamed television for shifting the emphasis from issues to images in political campaigns.⁵⁶ Often political advertising is accused of the destruction of the political system by its emphasis of personalities and image over issues.⁵⁷

The Importance of Political Commercials

There is no doubt that television greatly impacts today's electoral politics. And one form of television communication which has become a dominant campaign method and most favored by political candidates is the political commercial. Since Eisenhower's initial use of political spots in the 1952 presidential election, politicians have quickly exploited paid television advertising as a favorite means of campaign communication.⁵⁸ The use of political commercials has grown at such a rapid rate that today it is impossible for politicians to run for major offices without spending huge amounts of their campaign budget on political spots.⁵⁹ Also, there are increasing numbers of political consultants with advertising and media experience. Politicians and political consultants are not the only ones who believe the effect of political advertising. Many studies have shown that political commercials do affect voters' attitudes and behavior.⁶⁰

The importance of political commercials can be shown through the increasing amount of money that political candidates and parties spend on political spots. In 1964, political

candidates spent \$24.6 million on radio and television ads. By 1968, \$44.8 million was charged for spot announcements. In four years, political candidates spent about twice as much on political advertising as candidates in 1964.⁶¹ In 1972 candidates for all levels of office spent a total of \$59.6 million for television ads.⁶² Then in the 1980 campaign, Ronald Reagan spent \$13 million, about 70 percent of his advertising money, on television ads. In fact, an estimated 50 to 75 percent of the budget in major campaigns goes to electronic advertising.⁶³ Political parties have also recognized the importance of political advertising and increased their investments on political spots to promote the party and its candidates.⁶⁴ In the 1980 campaign, the Republican party spent \$10 million to produce and air institutional ads. Both the Republican and Democrat parties have full staff production facilities to produce ads for the party and its candidates.⁶⁵

Why have political candidates spent so much money on producing and airing political commercials? According to Delvin, political commercials have many different functions and purposes. Political ads can be used to make an unknown candidate better known. For example, McGovern, Carter, and Bush all used television extensively to become better known in their primary campaigns.⁶⁶ Political ads can target late-deciding or low interest voters. For low interest and late-deciding voters, political commercials are likely to be their main campaign information source.⁶⁷ Linda Kaid concluded in her research that "political advertising is more effective when the level of voter involvement is low."⁶⁸ Political ads reinforce supporters and attack opponents, and candidates also use ads to develop and explain issues.⁶⁹ Patterson and McClure concluded in their analysis of the 1972 presidential commercials that ads were primarily oriented toward communicating substantive candidate issue positions.⁷⁰ Ads are used to target particular demographic

groups by showing candidates associated with certain groups. Political ads also can redefine and improve the candidates' images, and can be used to raise money.⁷¹

McGovern, in 1972, used ads to appeal for campaign contributions. Voters did, in fact, send in money, and McGovern paid for his television commercials mainly through the appeal at the end of his ads.⁷²

According to Diamond, political commercials serve different functions at various stages in a campaign.⁷³ In the first phase of campaign, the "identification spots" are used to establish name recognition. As campaigns proceed, ads are used to stress the candidate's issues, standards and the virtue of his or her personal characteristics. Once the candidate's name, personality and ideas are known by voters, the campaign enters the third stage, negative advertising. Negative ads often attack the image, record and policy of the opponents. In the final stage of the campaign, candidates use ads to tell voters what their candidacy has represented, and appeal for voter support.⁷⁴

According to Richard Joslyn, the content of political commercials also reveal the nature of the American electoral process. The researcher believed that one can learn about the nature of electoral choices by studying the appeals made in commercials.⁷⁵ Joslyn said that ads containing prospective policy gave voters a chance to evaluate the candidates' policy positions.⁷⁶ Ads containing retrospective policy appeal allowed voters to reevaluate an incumbent's job performance. Political ads sometimes de-emphasized policy significance and stressed the leadership qualities of the various candidates to voters (benevolent leader appeal). Finally, ads using the ritual appeal showed that elections may serve to legitimate prevailing political values and beliefs.⁷⁷

Based on a sample of 506 televised political ads, Joslyn found fifty-seven percent of ads contained benevolent leader appeals which had an explicit reference to the personal characteristic of candidates. Sixty percent of ads contained retrospective policy appeals in which ads attempted to claim credit, place blame, and raise issues about performance in office. Election as ritual appeal ranked third in all 506 ads and the prospective policy choice approach appeared least. According to the results, Joslyn concluded that election outcomes more likely indicated the type of person preferred by American voters for public offices.⁷⁸ He said that "the world of televised campaign commercials is much more likely to delimit citizen understanding to perceptions of candidate personality and the recognition of cultural icon and values than to an appreciation of policy alternatives."⁷⁹

Another explanation of the increasing magnitude of political advertising in presidential elections is that ads affect viewers.⁸⁰ Many studies have shown that political advertising substantially affects the cognition, attitudes, and behavior of voters.⁸¹ A study conducted by Charles Atkin and Gary Heald showed that political commercials increase voter knowledge about the candidates and issues, set issue agenda for the campaign, stimulate the electorate's political interest, produce more positive affect toward the candidate's image, and intensify polarization of evaluations of the candidates.⁸²

Many researchers and political observers believed that voters would gain political knowledge from repeated political commercials.⁸³ Kaid stated that political commercials contain substantial issue information, that ads can overcome selective exposure and that it probably has their greatest effect in increasing knowledge about candidates and issues. She argued that political advertising is most influential when the voter's involvement in the election is low.⁸⁴ In a study of two gubernatorial campaigns, Atkin, Bowen, Nayman and

Sheinkopf found that voters felt they learned substantive information about candidates' qualifications and issue positions from TV ads.⁸⁵

McClure and Patterson stated in their study that the political ad has the advantage to reach voters who normally would give little attention to political messages. On the other hand, television news reaches a smaller and a more informed and interested audience. McClure and Patterson found that political ads in the 1972 presidential campaign contained more issue information than did television news. The researchers concluded that political ads rather than news were the primary source of information about election issues for U.S. voters. Seventy-five percent of the voters who could recall seeing a political ad during the 1972 presidential election campaign could correctly identify the ad's message. However McClure and Patterson discovered that political advertising had its strongest impact on issue awareness for voters who had a low exposure to newspapers and television news. The researchers also found that exposure to political advertising was consistently related to voter belief change.⁸⁶

The viewers' growth in political knowledge is also related to their motivation in watching the ads. The message and receiver conditions facilitating political knowledge acquisition have been identified in several advertising studies.⁸⁷ In their study of the uses and effects of political advertising, Atkin et al. found that voters who have information-seeking motivation learn more about each candidate than captive audiences.⁸⁸ In 1983, Garamone found that audiences could be "primed" for the type of information they should "get out of" the ads.⁸⁹

The potential of political commercials for setting agenda and transmitting issue information to the electorate is documented by many researchers. In many of the content

analysis studies, researchers have found the issue content of political commercials to be quite high.⁹⁰ Patterson and McClure reported that 42% of the 1972 election commercials were primarily issue communications, while another 28% contained substantial issue material.⁹¹ Hofstetter and Zukin found that 85% of the political commercials contained some information about issues.⁹² Bowers found strong relationships between the content of political ads and voters' perceptions of which campaign issues were most important.⁹³

In the content analysis of the 1980 presidential primary campaigns, Shyles found that political commercials did indeed reflect the issue concerns of the candidates and of the country during the presidential campaign.⁹⁴ Shyles defined issues as "current topics linked to the national interest."⁹⁵ In the 1980 presidential election, the hot issues during the campaign were: national well-being, economy, energy, foreign policy and relations, domestic and national security, and government management.

The researchers also discovered that there are different presentation styles for image and issue ads. The study showed that issue spots tend to use relatively straightforward formats featuring formally dressed candidates talking directly to the camera. By contrast, image spots tend to use a more slickly-packaged approach featuring still pictures of candidates with announcer voice-over, or visual and voice of citizens and stirring music.⁹⁶

Using the content of 156 televised commercials from presidential, gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional campaigns, Joslyn categorized ads into four groups: partisanship, issue content, candidate qualities and group reference.⁹⁷ The study showed that 77% of ads are issue-related, although much of those commercials revealed either nothing at all about the candidate's position on the issue or revealed only a vague issue position.⁹⁸ The second and third most prevailing type of ad content is the candidate's

personal qualities, and group references. The partisan information is the least prevalent ad content. In recent years, ads have become less partisan, contain less information on issues and contain more group related appeals.⁹⁹

It is not unusual that many commercials contain issue information but few present specific policy position because media consultants claim that issues are important only as a means of selling image.¹⁰⁰ Bennett noted that candidates must address policy issues, but only in very general terms and primarily for symbolic reasons. Bennett believed that issues are used to build up images, and the candidates' specific issue stand on policy and issues is counterproductive.¹⁰¹ Nimmo argued that "messages which present only vague issue positions allow voters to project their own needs and desires into those messages, while too much specificity precludes that possibility and is likely to alienate certain special interest groups."¹⁰² The intention of using issue to build up image was found in the 1982 Idaho gubernatorial campaign. The Republican candidate Phil Batt's political ads focused on specific policy issues in an attempt to build a positive public image.¹⁰³

However, some empirical studies have shown that presidential candidates are willing to reveal specific policy proposals, and policy preferences.¹⁰⁴ A major study of U.S. public opinion showed that candidates had an increased willingness to present voters a distinct position on issues.¹⁰⁵

Like Beneet, Nimmo and Rudd, some scholars are suspicious about the spots' function in agenda setting and conveying issue information to the electorates. These scholars seem to agree that televised political spots are preoccupied with images at the expense of issues.¹⁰⁶ New York Times columnist James Reston wrote, "Instead of the old-fashioned emphasis on what a candidate thinks, or what he says, the emphasis now seems to be on

how he looks, especially on television, and on what kind of personality he has"¹⁰⁷

Television's unique ability to create a sense of intimacy and its emphasis on image has resulted in many criticisms of political spots. Political commercials are often accused of selling candidates like soap, creating the image of a candidate with little relation to reality and the destruction of the political system by emphasizing personalities over issues.¹⁰⁸

The impact of political commercials on a candidate's image has also been studied by several researchers. Cundy reported in his study that political advertising can make a significant impact on a voter's perception of the candidate's image. Cundy concluded that political advertising will be most effective early in the campaign when the voters have little prior knowledge about the candidate, and in lower level races where the candidates are not heavily covered by the media.¹⁰⁹ Therefore if the candidate is able to create a positive image early on in the campaign, the political ads could function as a buffer to any attack from the opposition.¹¹⁰

The effect of political commercials is a major trend of studies in the field of political communication. Except for a few studies mentioned earlier, many researchers have used candidate evaluation, recall of commercial content and likelihood of voting for the candidate to evaluate the effect of political spots.¹¹¹ In 1978 Kaid and Sanders found that subjects could recall more of the content of the ads in image ads, and issue ads resulted in a higher evaluation of the candidates. The authors also compared the effect of commercials between five minutes and sixty seconds in length. Kaid and Sanders found no significant difference in recall of content between the two type of commercials. However, the candidates received higher evaluations in the five minute commercials compared with the shorter ones.¹¹²

In another study comparing the different types and lengths of commercials on name recall of the candidate, Kaid found that image commercials resulted in higher name recognition of the candidates than did issue commercials.¹¹³ They found no significant difference in name identification between five minute and sixty-second commercials.¹¹⁴

In recent years, negative advertising has received increasing attention from political consultants and researchers. Many scholars have studied the effect and content of the negative political commercials. According to Sabato, one third of all spot commercials in recent political campaigns were negative ads and there is a trend of increasing negative advertising.¹¹⁵ Joslyn's study of 506 political ads showed that 23 percent of those ads had blame-placing focus.¹¹⁶ In the 1988 presidential campaign, negative advertising was so prevalent that hosts of researchers and political observers considered 1988 as the year of the negative ad. It was estimated that 60-70% of all political ads in the 1988 presidential campaign contained mudslinging messages.¹¹⁷

Many reasons have been suggested for the increased use of negative advertising during presidential elections. The most obvious reason is that negative ads appear to be effective.¹¹⁸ Many political consultants believe that negative ads can inform the public, and people tend to remember negative ads more than other types of ads.¹¹⁹ Kern suggested in her book, 30-second Politics, that negative advertising is effective because it evoked voters' fear and anxiety.¹²⁰

The use of negative ads has become a controversial topic among political communication researchers. Some researchers believed that negative advertising resulted in voters' backlash,¹²¹ but some said political advertising is the hallmark of American media politics.¹²² Several studies have shown that negative advertising may have a

backlash effect on the sponsor of the negative ad. In a 1982 Michigan telephone survey, Garramone discovered that 75% of the voters had negative feelings toward the sponsoring candidate and were more positive toward the targeted candidate.¹²³ Merritt found that negative commercials in a 1982 California state election resulted in the voters' negative response toward the sponsor rather than toward the targeted candidate.¹²⁴ Voters highly involved in a political campaign, and with higher education and higher socioeconomic status perceived the negative ads as unethical and less truthful. Partisanship and the voter's predisposition toward the candidate also affect the voter's perception toward the negative advertising.¹²⁵ In an experiment exploring the roles of sponsorship and rebuttal in negative political advertising, Garramone noted that independent sponsorship was more effective than candidate sponsorship. Independent sponsorship can increase the effect against the targeted candidate and reduce backlash effect against the supported candidate. Rebuttal ads by the targeted candidate can increase backlash against the opponent, but fail to influence perceptions of the target.¹²⁶ Several studies have shown that negative ads are more successful when they attack an issue rather than an image.¹²⁷ One study done during the 1988 senatorial elections showed that attacks were effective with voters. However, negative ads were more effective when launched against stands on issues than on the character of the politicians.¹²⁸

In a study of 1988 presidential commercials, Kaid and Johnston compared the difference in ad content between positive and negative commercials. The researchers found that both positive and negative ads rely heavily on emotional appeal and negative ads more likely to use fear appeal. Negative ads contain more issue information than do positive ads, and both negative and positive ads contain the same amount of information

about the candidate's image. According to the result, the most popular strategy used in negative ads is humor or ridicule. In the 1988 presidential campaign, most strategies used in the negative ads linked the opponent with undesirable images or issues.¹²⁹

A candidate's running position also affects the content of his/her political commercials. In a study of newspaper political advertising in a state election, Latimer found that challengers who won used many policy oriented ads and winning incumbents emphasized their personal character more than did the losing incumbent.¹³⁰ Payne and Baukus examined 101 ads from a 1984 senatorial election and found different patterns and strategies were used between incumbents and challengers. The study showed that both incumbents and challengers used many argument spots while the attack strategy was more popular with the incumbents. Payne and Baukus noted that challengers in the Northern part of the country take a more offensive position on issues and incumbents use more personal attacks on the challengers in their negative ads.¹³¹

Video style of the political commercial also varies by different position of candidates. Kaid and Davidson analyzed fifty-five commercials from three Senate races in 1982 showing that challengers used more short, twenty and thirty second commercials than incumbents. Further, incumbent ads had ninety percent positive focus and challenger ads were almost evenly split between positive and negative ads. Both challengers and incumbents have distinct differences in their video style. According to the study, incumbents "use longer commercials; use more testimonials, use more candidate-positive focus; use more slides with print; dress more formally; were represented by an announcer or other voice; verbally and visually stresses competence." On the other hand, challengers "use more opposition-negative focus in ads; use cinema verite style; use ads where

candidate appears 'head-on'; use more frequent eye contact with camera and audience; dress more casually; speak for self more frequently--are not represented by a surrogate."¹³²

In another study of ads used by Carter and Nixon during the 1968, 1972, 1976 and 1980 campaigns, Kaid, Wadsworth, and Foote found different campaign strategies can be identified with incumbents and challengers.¹³³ The researchers found that incumbents often used the trappings of the office, emphasizing legitimacy of the office, often appearing with world leaders in their ads, and emphasizing their accomplishments in the administration. Furthermore, incumbents relied more on documentaries, introspection and issue dramatization ads. On the other hand, challengers often called for changes and took an offensive position on issues. Challengers used more introspection and opposition-focused ads.¹³⁴

Examining presidential political ads from 1952 to 1984, Anne Johnston Wadsworth found that in general, presidential ads were designed to evoke voters' emotional appeal. Presidential ads were designed to make voters feel about an issue rather than to learn something about an issue. The researcher found that incumbents and challengers' video style, format, rhetorical styles and strategies in the ads were reflected by their running positions. Incumbents focused on their legitimacy for the presidency and stressed their competence and accomplishment in their ads. On the other hand, presidential challengers tended to talk to voters directly in their ads. Unlike incumbents, challengers focused on the issues and attempted to show voters the shortcomings of the administration's policies. The result showed that incumbents used more testimonials and the opposition focused on formats; incumbents used an emotional appeal more than challengers; focus on personality characteristics more; used more cinema verite; and often used anonymous announcers. On

the other hand, challengers used more introspection and question-and-answer formats; made more use of logical appeals than incumbents; focused on issue concerns and used more candidate head on technique.¹³⁵

The Advantage of Incumbency

A famous Chinese war strategy says the key to the victory is to understand yourself and your enemy well. In a political election, a candidate needs to know the political implication of his or her running position in order to launch a successful political campaign. Traditionally, the incumbent's position possesses more advantages in a campaign than that of the challenger. Some of the advantages which congressional incumbents enjoy over challengers have been described. Incumbents find it is easier to acquire campaign resources such as party support, issue information, groups endorsements, money, and campaign workers. Incumbents also benefit from congressional privilege such as the postage frank and the use of subsidized television and radio recording facilities. Such privileges give incumbents greater resources to carry out a successful campaign.¹³⁶

In the past fifteen years, many researchers have studied incumbency advantages. Although many of these studies come from congressional elections and not from presidential campaigns, they provide insight into why incumbents and challengers campaign differently.¹³⁷

The incumbency advantage has been increasing in the past two decades while the number of competitive House seats has been decreasing.¹³⁸ In recent elections it has not been unusual for more than ninety percent of the incumbent congressmen to seek reelection and win.¹³⁹ Many researches have been done to explain the phenomenon. One

explanation for the increasing advantage of the incumbent is the decline of partisanship. Nelson suggested that voters have become increasingly less partisan and hence are more responsive to other cues such as incumbency.¹⁴⁰ Albert D. Cover's study with the data drawn from Survey Research Center showed that the decline of partisanship has in fact created new patterns of electoral behavior favoring incumbents.¹⁴¹ Linking the decline of party identification to the advantage of incumbency, Mayhew said, "incumbents have been profiting...from changes in voter attitudes. A logic suggests itself. Voters dissatisfied with party cues could be reaching for any other cues that are available in deciding how to vote. The incumbency cue is readily at hand."¹⁴²

Another suggestion offered to explain the incumbent's advantage is that district lines have been redrawn and when they have been redrawn they have usually benefited the incumbent.¹⁴³ However, some other researches have found that redistricting is not a good explanation for the incumbency advantage.¹⁴⁴ Another study conducted by Ferejohn in comparing the proportion of marginal seats in redrawn and un-redrawn districts found no support for the redistricting hypothesis.¹⁴⁵

Some researchers suggest that name familiarity is a reason for an incumbent's advantage in an election. Stokes and Miller used a questionnaire to probe voters' knowledge and attitudes concerning congressional candidates. Stokes and Miller stated that name familiarity was critically important to congressional candidates in attracting support from voters of the opposing party.¹⁴⁶ In the low-information representative election, when the challenger is not so easily recognized, the incumbent's visibility can be a deciding electoral advantage.¹⁴⁷ Because of incumbents' positions in political office, they are highly visible in the eyes of media and their constituents. In a study conducted by Hinckley, ninety-two

percent of voters recognized their house incumbents and only forty-four percent of voters recognized the House challengers.¹⁴⁸

Contact with an incumbent may also increase voters' awareness and liking of the incumbent over the challenger.¹⁴⁹ Jacobson found that incumbents are better known than challengers and have increased contact with voters.¹⁵⁰ Personal contact with voters is known as the most effective campaign methods for politicians. Incumbents often have more resources to "advertise" themselves and their work to constituents. Parker argued that congressional members have a greater ability to disseminate favorable information about themselves.¹⁵¹ Parker suggested that incumbents are able to convince voters that they are doing a good job by sending information about all of the projects they are involved with which will help their district.¹⁵²

Incumbent's popularity and challenger's invisibility may also caused the incumbency advantage. According to Fiorina, incumbents' constituent case work, voting records, style in the district, and use of perquisites have helped incumbents in building up their popularity and in continued victory.¹⁵³ However, others have seen the result as a consequence of the inability of house challengers to be considered as credible candidates. Ragsdale believed that challengers often face defeat because they are unknown, unable to raise money and unlikely to mobilize sufficient party support.¹⁵⁴ However, in a study of an interrelation model of congressional voting, Ragsdale said that

"Neither challenger invisibility nor incumbent popularity can be seen solely responsible for incumbent victory. Rather, their influences should be treated concurrently...incumbent popularity and success depend to some extent on the information they are able to convey to voters, who in turn act upon it in their decision-making efforts."¹⁵⁵

He continued by saying that voters need information on both candidates in order to compare both candidates. However, if voters do not have information about challengers, they are likely to vote for incumbents, whom they already like and may have already voted for.¹⁵⁶

The increasing legislative budget for congressmen is another explanation for the increasing incumbent advantage. Cox and Morgenster investigated the impact of the size of the legislative budget per legislator on the incumbency advantage in smaller states. The researcher suggested that budget growth and growth in the incumbency advantage have gone hand in hand.¹⁵⁷ Cox and Morgenster believed that substantial increases in real legislative operating budgets have enabled incumbents to do case work and other activities that they support that are probably also electorally valuable.¹⁵⁸ The growth of the federal bureaucracy which gives incumbents numerous resources to assure their re-election has also been suggested as a reason for the incumbency advantage.¹⁵⁹ With the larger federal bureaucracy, incumbents have greater opportunities to get federal programs for their districts.¹⁶⁰ Fiorina argued that districts have begun to look at their representative as "ombudsmen" who are willing to help them deal with bureaucracy.¹⁶¹

Some researchers also suggest that the incumbents' advantage is due to the members' ability to position themselves ideologically in line with their constituents' opinion.¹⁶² Johannes and Mcadams found that the ability of incumbents to match the issue positions of their constituents was an important explanation of incumbency advantage. Therefore, constituents may have the perception that their representative was active in representing their interests and voting for their issues in Washington.¹⁶³ When the district election becomes more competitive, candidates try to appear closer to the constituents' issue

position. Sullivan and Uslander find that even though a challenger's issue position is closer to the voters, the incumbency is still a greater predictor for winning reelection. However, researches also argue that challengers are as likely to win the election as the incumbent if three of the following conditions are met: "The district is marginal, the challenger has issue stands closer to the constituency's than the incumbent, and the incumbent has less than six years of experience in the House."¹⁶⁴

To explain the incumbency advantage, most researchers emphasize the inherent benefits in occupying a political office. An incumbent can use his or her political power and resources to get media attention, promote his image, contact constituents through personal mail, serve constituents through case work and serve as an "ombudsman" for the voters, and in general make their names and faces familiar to voters. However, some researchers believed that incumbency advantage is also affected by the incumbent's reputations and popularity. Researchers argue that incumbents' stay in office is not because they are the incumbent but because they're aggressive, active and politically ambitious. These incumbents generally have good reputation in their job performance and are destined to stay in office as long as they wish because of their voter appeal.¹⁶⁵

The various explanations of incumbency advantages have focused on the House incumbency because studies have shown that House incumbency has a stronger influence on voting behavior than Senate incumbency.¹⁶⁶ In 1978 incumbents won 95 percent and Senate incumbents 68 percent. Incumbent position in the Senate is not as secure as that of the House incumbents. According to Hinckley's study, House incumbents enjoy much greater visibility and name recognition than their House challengers. However, Senate challengers and incumbents receive almost the same amount of recognition and visibility.

Hinckley's study showed that 78 percent of participants can recognize the Senate challengers and only 44 percent of participants can recognize the House challengers. House incumbents were also rated higher in candidate evaluation than House challengers, while in the Senate, challengers were rated fairly high though not as high as incumbents.¹⁶⁷ The incumbency advantage, according to Ragsdale, is the joint result of incumbent popularity and challenger invisibility.¹⁶⁸

In presidential elections, the high visibility of challengers and the amount of resource that challengers or the opposition party is able to raise have reduced the advantage of incumbency. However, when an incumbent president seeks reelection, he or she still enjoys many special advantages by virtue of the office.¹⁶⁹ In the election race, an incumbent president begins by being much better known than any challenger can hope to be. Everything the president does attracts media attention, and the issues that concern the president are likely to become national issues. Therefore, it is easier for the incumbent president to set the agenda for the campaign than the challengers.¹⁷⁰ Also, the incumbent president has the advantage of a ready made campaign staff who have experience in a presidential campaign. It is also much easier for an incumbent president to obtain campaign resources and to attract volunteer groups because of his/her status.¹⁷¹ However, other studies have shown that incumbency does not have strong influence on voting choices in the presidential election. Voters tend to rely on their general attitude about particular issues, the perception toward the candidates' personal characters, and feelings toward the political party when they are deciding how to vote.¹⁷²

Several factors have been suggested in explaining the incumbency advantage in presidential elections. One is the president's popularity and voters' approval of the

president's job performance.¹⁷³ Sigelman found that since the 1940s, there is a positive relationship between presidential popularity and election outcomes. Sigelman said that presidential popularity can be a good predictor for the re-election outcome.¹⁷⁴

An incumbent president's image as "symbol of the nation" is one element that makes incumbency a powerful force in the presidential election.¹⁷⁵ Stovall believed that whatever the incumbent president does during the election is seen as things that presidents must do, while challengers do things to help them win election.¹⁷⁶ Polsby and Wildavsky noted that in a crisis situation, an incumbent president can travel and make "nonpolitical" speeches to advance his candidacy subtly while his opponent is open to charges of "blind partisanship".¹⁷⁷ Another element according to Stovall, is that an incumbent president is able to control events and call for citizens' support of their government. Finally, Stovall said incumbents have the power to get more attention from the mass media than do challengers.¹⁷⁸

The Campaign Strategy of Incumbent and Challenger

Incumbents seem to have more advantage in an election than do challengers. However, both incumbent and challenger need to fully understand the political implication of their running position and apply particular campaign strategies which will help them to win the election. In the following paragraph, the researcher reviews some historical findings of campaign strategies that apply to incumbent and challenger.

One strategy that has been applied by several presidential incumbents is the "rose garden" strategy. This strategy restrains the president from political campaigning, confrontation with opponents and partisan issue taking. With the silent rose garden

strategy, the incumbent can act presidential, secure media cooperation, achieve mythic identification and gain electorate consensus. Rose garden strategy enables the incumbent to create an "above the trenches" posture, avoid political confrontations, and run an "issueless" campaign. Gaulle said, "Nothing so heightens authority as silence." However, rose garden strategy requires a crisis situation. Without a crisis it is difficult for an incumbent to justify the silent campaign strategy. A poorly managed rose garden strategy could make a politically silent incumbent risk bungling the crisis, be accused of opportunism and perhaps be saddled to a "cause" that may linger indefinitely.¹⁷⁹ During the 1980 elections when the Iran hostage crisis began, President Carter used the rose garden strategy to suspend active campaigning, and he used his crisis responsibilities as a reason to refuse to meet his rivals in debate. Unfortunately, the crisis dragged on too long, and President Carter's popularity ultimately suffered a serious decline.¹⁸⁰

Trent and Friedenbergr suggested that campaign strategies used by incumbent and challengers are typically different. The researchers give a very comprehensive description of the incumbent's campaign strategy. Trent and Friedenbergr noted that incumbents typically use the symbolic trapping of the presidency, emphasize competency and accomplishments of the office, emphasize the legitimacy and charisma of the presidency, and create pseudo events to attract and control media attention. An incumbent president often appears to work with world leaders, to use endorsements by party and other important leaders, depends on surrogates to campaign for him and maintains an "above the trenches" posture. Incumbents also use their power and position to appoint jobs and committees, appoint task forces to investigate public concerns, and appropriate federal funds.¹⁸¹

Incumbent presidents have all heavily applied the campaign strategies mentioned above. For example, in the 1972 election, Nixon's campaign consultants tried to connect Nixon with the trappings of the presidency to emphasize his accomplishments, and to show the hoopla and fanfare that surround the presidency. And in the 1992 election, Bush's political commercials showed symbols of the oval office to emphasize the legitimacy of the presidency.¹⁸¹

Incumbents can use their accomplishments and the legitimacy of office for the campaign; however, they are also in a position to defend their records. Usually, challengers can attack the current administration freely without offering viable solutions.¹⁸² Often when things goes wrong, the president is the one who gets blamed. In 1982, candidate Reagan was able to blame the bad economy, high inflation and unemployment on President Carter. Four years later, when Reagan ran for re-election, he faced the same difficult defensive position as his predecessor. President Reagan was popular but when the Iran-Contra affair broke, he still had difficulty escaping the blame. The incumbent is naturally cast as the defender of his administration and the challenger as the attacker who promises better things to come.¹⁸⁴

Attack strategy is often applied by challengers in elections. According to Kitchens and Stiteler's "in man-out man" strategy, the challengers must attack the incumbent for two reasons. First, past researches have proven that the image of a winning candidate becomes more positive following an election. Thus, an attack strategy would be necessary to shift these attitudes back to the pre-election evaluation of the incumbent. Secondly, attacking the incumbent is necessary to demonstrate to the voters that a difference exists between voters' attitude and incumbent's action. However, when challengers attack the incumbent,

he or she is also under the risk of the backlash effect. Voters may consider the challenger as a mudslinger.¹⁸⁵

Another important element of the "in man-out man" strategy is that the challengers need to be perceived as a viable alternative and the voters must be inoculated against counterattacks from the incumbent. According to research on voting behavior, voters prefer candidates whose attitudes are similar to theirs. Thus it is essential for a challenger to be seen as a viable alternative. In addition, challengers also need to inoculate voters from the incumbent's counterattacks, because inoculation can stabilize voters' attitude toward the challengers. Kitchens and Stiteler stated that "If inoculation is properly executed, the incumbent's counterattacks should produce a rejection of the messages and an increase of support for the challenger."¹⁸⁶ Examples of attack and inoculation strategies used by challengers can be found in many presidential elections.

Challengers are also said to have some traditional campaign rhetoric. According to Trent and Trent, George Stanley McGovern did not become an effective challenger because McGovern failed to use some traditional strategies best suited for challengers.¹⁸⁷ Unlike more successful challengers, McGovern proposed specific solution to problems, and did not respect the middle ground belief of the Democratic party.¹⁸⁸ McGovern was accused of extreme liberalism in the Democrat party. In fact in 1972 many Nixon ad campaigns emphasized the theme of "Democrats for Nixon" to attack conservative Democrats.¹⁸⁹ McGovern also tried to change, rather than reflect the voter's attitude. He did not emphasize optimism in his speaking and he did not delegate others to make personal attacks against Nixon.¹⁹⁰ Most of McGovern's strategy emphasized attacking Nixon rather than building up his own image.¹⁹¹ However, in the 1980 campaign,

proposing specific solutions to problems worked well for challenger Reagan. In Reagan's political commercials, he proposed specific solutions to the problems facing the nation.¹⁹²

According to Trent and Friedenber, challengers should attack the record of the opponents, take an offensive position on issues and call for changes. Challengers should speak about traditional values, emphasize optimism in political rhetoric, represent the center value of his/her party and let others make personal attacks on the opponents.¹⁹³

In an open race election, assumed incumbency is another strategy that is often used by candidates. This strategy allows candidates to enjoy the incumbency advantage without actually being one. Powell and Shelby described the three stages of the assumed incumbency strategy: legitimacy, identification, and reinforcement. In the legitimacy stage, candidates should let the opinion leader and media know the existence of the candidate. The goal of the legitimacy stage is to generate expectations of the candidate as the front-runner. Then in the identification stage, the candidates should seek to increase visibility and wider recognition. Finally in the reinforcement step, the candidate has become better known and is perceived as a front-runner. In this stage, the candidates should continue to reinforce the candidate's legitimacy.¹⁹⁴

Conclusion

Before the development of broadcasting media, the treats and torch light parades lured voters to political speeches; handbill and partisan newspapers infiltrated voters' homes; political songs and chants expressed political messages; flag banners and billboards brought political messages into the public forum; buttons, kerchiefs and bandannas

transformed the supporters into advertisements; and political letters and postcards to sent messages to the electorates.¹⁹⁵

Then when political campaigns entered the age of broadcasting media, radio changed the format and content of political campaigns. Today, television has become the major campaign tool for presidential candidates. In fact television has significantly altered the process of political campaigning and electoral politics. The decline of partisanship has made television a major political informant and campaign medium. Television changes the selection of candidates and campaign issues; creates a sense of familiarity between candidates and voters. Eventually television has changed the way political candidates conducted their campaigns and the types of candidates to be elected. In today's election, television is the campaign!

One form of televised campaign method that has become indispensable for presidential candidates is political advertising. Candidates and political parties have spent a huge proportion of their campaign budgets on producing and airing political spots. According to many researchers and political consultants, political spots are effective in making unknown candidates better known, reaching low interest voters, reinforcing supporters, attacking opponents, targeting particular demographic voters, creating images of candidates and explaining issues of the campaign.¹⁹⁶ Political commercials are also known to be effective in increasing voters' knowledge about candidates and issues, increasing voting interest and liking for the candidates. Most importantly, many scholars believe that political commercials can affect the cognitive attitudes and behaviors of voters.

Although every candidate has a unique personal style in his or her political commercials, researchers have shown that the style is also mediated by the running

position of the candidates.¹⁹⁷ As incumbents, the candidates have inherent advantages by being in office and having access to the media. On the other hand, challengers can question and challenge the incumbent's policies and performance on the job without offering solutions to the problems.

There are also some campaign strategies that are suited for the different running positions of candidates. Incumbents often use symbolic trappings, emphasize the legitimacy of incumbency and stress the competence required of the office. On the other hand, challengers should attack the record of the incumbent, take offensive positions on issues and call for changes. To understand the development of political advertising, the importance of television on today's election process, the significance of political advertising, the advantage and resources available for incumbents/challengers, and the different campaign strategies used by incumbent and challengers, is important to fully understand the content and use of political commercials between incumbent and challengers.

ENDNOTES

1. Lynda, L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and Keith R. Sanders, New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), xii-xiii.
2. Kathleen H. Jamieson, "The evolution of political advertising in America" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sander (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 12.
3. Ibid, 3.
4. Kathleen H. Jamieson, Packaging the Presidency (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 5.
5. Wm D. Sloan, James G. Stovall, and James D. Startt, The Media in America (Worthington: Publishing Horizons, 1989), 65.
6. Kathleen H. Jamieson, "The evolution of political advertising in America" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sander (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 8.
7. Ibid, 9.
8. Ibid, 6.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Karen S. Johnson-Cartee, and Gary A. Copeland, Negative Political Advertising: Coming of Age (NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1991), p6.
12. Kathleen H. Jamieson, "The evolution of political advertising in America" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sander (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 6.
13. Ibid, 11.
14. Ibid, 12.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.

16. Yun. Perng, Political Advertising and Election (Taipei: Cheng Chung Publish, 1992), 3.
17. Kathleen H. Jamieson, Packaging the Presidency (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 19.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid, 20.
20. Ibid, 21.
21. Kathleen H. Jamieson, "The evolution of political advertising in America" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sander (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 13.
22. Ibid.
23. Edwin Diamond, and Stephen Bates, The Spot: the rise of political advertising on television (Massachusetts: Cambridge, 1984), 36.
24. Kathleen H. Jamieson, Packaging the Presidency (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 20.
25. Ibid, 30.
26. Ibid, 32.
27. Perng, 5.
28. Diamond, 46.
29. Ibid, 47.
30. Perng, 6.
31. Diamond, 66.
32. Ibid.
33. Theodore H. White, America in search of itself: the making of president (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), 165.
34. Sidney Kraus, Televised Presidential Debates and Public Policy (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988), 7.

35. F. C. Arterton, Media Politics: The news strategies of presidential campaigns (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1972), 5.
36. Lynda L. Kaid & Dorothy K. Davidson, "Elements of Videostyle: Candidate presentation through television advertising." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sander (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 185.
37. Kraus, 11.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid, 9.
41. Ibid, 13.
41. Ibid, 11.
42. Kurt Lang, and Gladys Lang, Politics and Television (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968), 301-302.
43. H. E. Alexander, "Communications and politics: The media and the message." In R. Agranoff (Ed.), The new style in election campaigns (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972), 365-392.
44. Newton N. Minow, John B. Martin, and Lee M. Mitchell, Presidential Television (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 6.
45. Autstin Banney, Channels of Power: The impact of television on American politics (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 90.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid, 89-90.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. R. Agranoff, The new style in election campaigns (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972), 269.
51. Douglas Kellner, Television and the Crisis of Democracy (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990), 149.

52. Kraus, 13.
53. Minow, 6.
54. Ibid.
55. Kellner, 137.
56. Leonard Shyles, "The Relationships of images, issues and presentational methods in televised spot advertisements for 1980's American presidential primaries." Journal of Broadcasting 28 (Fall 1984), 406.
57. Lynda L. Kaid, "Political Advertising." In D. D. Nimmo and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), Handbook of political communication (Bervely Hills: Sage Publications, 1981), 249.
58. Donald T. Cundy, "Political Commercials and Candidate Image" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sadnders, (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 210-233.
59. Lynda L. Kaid, Dan Nimmo, and Keith R. Sanders, New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).
60. Richard Joslyn, "The Impact of campaign spot advertising on voting defections." Human Communication Research 7, 1981, 347-360.
61. N. N. Minow, D. Bruch, T. T. Corcoran, A. Heard, and R. Price, Voter's time: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Cost in the Electronic Era (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1969), 16.
62. L. Sabato, The rise of political consultants (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 111-114.
63. Thomas E. Patterson, "Television and election strategy" Communications revolution in politics, proceedings of the Academy of political science, 1982, 34.
64. Barry Kolar, "Fighting back: American political parties take to the airwaves." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 55-81.
65. Ibid.
66. Patrick L. Devlin, "An analysis of presidential television commercials, 1952-1984." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 22.
67. Ibid.

68. Kaid, 249.
69. Devlin, 23.
70. Thomas E. Patterson, and Robert D. McClure, The Unseeing Eye (New York: Putnam, 1976).
71. Devlin, 23.
72. Ibid.
73. Diamond, 302-345.
74. Ibid.
75. Joslyn, 139-182.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid.
79. Ibid, 182.
80. Lynda L. Kaid, Chris M. Leland, and Susan Whitney, "The impact of Televised Political Ads: Evoking Viewer Responses in the 1988 Presidential Campaign." Southern Communication Journal. 57 (Summer 1992): 285-295
81. Ibid.
82. Charles Atkin, and Gary Heald, "Effects of Political Advertising." Public Opinion Quarterly 40 (Spring 1976): 216.
83. Ibid, 217.
84. Anne J. Wadsworth Incumbent and Challenger Strategies in Presidential Communication: A content analysis of television campaign ads from 1952 to 1984. (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1987).
85. C. K. Atkin, L. Bowen, O.B. Nayman, and K.G. Sheinkopf, "Quality versus quantity in televised political ads." Public Opinion Quarterly 37 (Summer 1973): 209-224.
86. Patterson, and McClure, 16.
87. Atkin, and Heald, 216.

88. Atkin, Bowen, Nayman, and Sheinkopf, 209-224.
89. Anne Johnston, "Recent political communication research." *New Directions in Political Communication* (California: Sage Publications, 1990), 332-336.
90. Atkin, and Heald, 216.
91. Patterson, and McClure, 1976.
92. C. R. Hofsteter, and C. Zukin, "TV network news and advertising in the Nixon and McGovern campaigns." *Journalism Quarterly* 56 (Spring 1979): 106-115, 152.
93. Thomas Bowers, "Newspaper Political Advertising and the Agenda-Setting Function." *Journalism Quarterly* 50 (Autuman 1973): 552-56.
94. Leonard Shyles, "The Televised Political Spot Advertisement." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), *New perspectives on political advertising*. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 107-137.
95. Ibid, 117.
96. Ibid, 107-137.
97. Richard A. Joslyn, "The content of political spot ads." *Journalism Quarterly* 57 (Spring 1980): 92-98.
98. Robert Rudd, "Issues as image in political campaign commercials" *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (winter 1986), 103.
99. Joslyn, 96.
100. Kaid and Davidson, 185.
101. W. L. Bennett, "The ritualistic and pragmatic bases of political campaign discourse." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63 (October 1977), 223
102. Rudd, 111.
103. Ibid, 101.
- 104 Joslyn, 144.
105. N. N. Nie, S. Verba, and J. R. Petrocik, *The changing American voter* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976).
106. Shyles, 111.

107. B. Rubin, Political Television. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967), 32.
108. Kaid, 249.
109. Cundy, 233.
110. Ibid, 234.
111. Wadsworth, 1987.
112. Lynda L. Kaid, and K. R. Sanders, "Political television commercials: An experimental study of type and length." Communication Research 5 (1978): 57-70.
113. Lynda L Kaid, "Paid television advertising and candidate name identification" Campaigns & Elections 3 (1982): 34-36
114. Ibid.
115. Sabato, 1981.
116. Richard Joslyn, "Political advertising and the Meaning of Elections." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 159.
117. Lynda L. Kaid, and Anne Johnston, "Negative versus positive television advertising in U.S. presidential campaigns, 1968-1988." Journal of Communication, 41, 1991, 53-54.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid.
120. Montague Kern, 30-second Politics: Political Advertising in the Eighties (New York: Praeger, 1989).
121. Perng, 14.
122. Johnson-Cartee, and Copeland, 3
123. Gina Garrmone, "Voter responses to negative political ads." Journalism Quarterly 61 (Spring 1984): 250-259.
124. S. Merritt, "Negative political advertising: Some empirical findings." Journal of Advertising, 13 (1984): 27-38.
125. Gina Garrmone, "Voter responses to negative political ads." Journalism Quarterly 61 (Spring 1984): 250-259

126. Gina M. Garramone, "Effect of Negative Political Advertising: The Roles of Sponsor and Rebuttal" Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media 29 (Spring 1985), 147.
127. Ibid.
128. M. Pfau, and M. Burgoon, "The efficacy of issue and character attack message strategies in political campaign communication." Communication Reports, 2 (1989): 53-61.
129. Lynda L. Kaid, and Anne Johnston, "Negative versus positive television advertising in U.S. presidential campaigns, 1968-1988" Journal of Communication 41 (Summer 1991): 53-64.
130. Margaret K. Latimer, "Policy Issues and Personal Images in Political Advertising in a State Election" Journalism Quarterly 61 (Autumn 1984): 776-784, 852.
131. J. G. Payne, and R. A. Baukus, "Trend analysis of the 1984 GOP senatorial spot." Paper presented at the McElroy Symposia: Current Trends in Broadcast Advertising, University of Northern Iowa.
132. Kaid and Davidson, 184-209.
133. Lynda, L. Kaid, Anne J. Wadsworth, and J. Foote, "Incumbent and challenger styles in presidential television advertising" Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Honolulu. (May 1985).
134. Ibid.
135. Wadsworth, 1987.
136. Alan I. Abramowitz, "Name Familiarity, Reputation, and the Incumbency Effect in A Congressional Election." Western Political Quarterly 128 (1975), 668.
137. Wadsworth, 21.
138. Abramowitz, 668.
139. Ibid.
140. Michael Krashinsky, and William J. Milne, "The effects of incumbency in U.S. congressional elections, 1950-1988." Legislative Studies Quarterly xviii, 3, (August 1993): 321.
141. Albert D. Cover, "One good term deserves another: The advantage of incumbency in congressional elections." American Journal of Political Science xxi, 3, (August 1977): 523-540.

142. David, R. Mayhew, "Congressional representation: The case of the vanishing marginal" Polity 6 (1974), 313.
143. Ibid, 295-317.
144. Cover, 523.
145. Ibid.
146. Donald E. Stokes, and Warren E. Miller, "Party government and the Saliency of Congress," In A. Campbell, P. E. Converse, W. E. Miller and D. E. Stokes (Ed.), Elections and the Political Order (New York: Wiley, 1966).
147. Barbara Hinckley, "House re-elections and Senate defeats: The role of the challenger." British Journal of Political Science 10 (October 1980), 441.
148. Ibid, 446.
149. G. R. Parker, "Interpreting candidate awareness in U.S. congressional elections." Legislative Studies Quarterly 6 (May 1981): 219-233.
150. G. C. Jacobson, "Incumbents' advantage in the 1978 U.S. congressional elections." Legislative Studies Quarterly 6 (May 1981): 183-200.
151. Parker, 219-233.
152. Ibid.
153. Morris Fiorina, "The case of the vanishing marginal: The bureaucracy did it," American Political Science Review 71 (March 1977): 177-181.
154. Lyn Ragsdale, "Incumbent popularity, challenger invisibility, and congressional voters" Legislative Studies Quarterly 2 (May 1981): 201.
155. Ibid, 214.
156. Ibid.
157. Cary W. Cox, and Scott Morgenstern, "The increasing advantage of incumbency in the U.S. States." Legislative Studies Quarterly xviii, 4 (November 1993): 405-510.
158. Ibid.

159. Wadsworth, 25.
160. Ibid.
161. Ibid.
162. Ibid, 24
163. J. R. Johannes, and J. C. McAdams, "The congressional incumbency effect: is it casework, policy compatibility, or something else? An examination of the 1978 election." American Journal of Political Science 75 (June 1981): 512-542.
164. Wadsworth, 24.
165. Ibid, 31.
166. Hinckley, 142.
167. Ibid, 458.
168. Ragsdale, 201.
169. Nelson W. Polsby, and Aaron Wildavsky, Presidential Election: Contemporary Strategies of American Electoral Politics (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1988), 78.
170. Ibid.
171. Wadsworth, 34.
172. Ibid, 31.
173. Ibid, 31.
174. Lee Sigelman, "Presidential popularity and presidential elections" Public Opinion Quarterly 47 (Winter 1979): 532-534.
175. Wadsworth, 31.
176. J. G. Stovall, "Incumbency and news coverage of the 1980 presidential election campaign." Western Political Quarterly 37 (1984): 621-631.
177. Polsby, and Wildavsky, 79.
178. Stovall, 621-631.

179. Keith V. Erickson and Wallace V. Schmidt, "Presidential political silence: Rhetoric and the rose garden strategy" The Southern Speech Communication Journal 47 (Summer 1982): 402-421.

180. Polsby, and Wildavsky, 79.

181. J. S. Trent, and R. V. Friedenberg, Political campaign communication: Principles and practices. (New York: Praeger, 1983).

182. Ibid.

183. Polsby, and Wildavsky, 79.

184. Ibid, 80.

185. James T. Kitchens, and Betsey Stiteler, "Challenge to the 'rule of minimum effect': A case study of the in man-out man strategy." The Southern Speech Communication Journal 44 (Winter 1979): 176-190.

186. Ibid.

187. Judith S. Trent, and Jimmie D. Trent, "The rhetoric of the challenger: George Stanley McGovern" Central States Speech Journal 25 (Spring 1974), 11.

188. Ibid.

189. Perng, 20.

190. Trent, and Trent, 11.

191. Wadsworth, 38.

192. Patrick L. Devlin, "An analysis of presidential television commercials, 1952-1984." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).

193. Trent and Trent, 11.

194. Larry Powell, and Annette Shelby, "A strategy of Assumed Incumbency: A case study" The Southern Speech Communication Journal 46 (Winter 1981): 105-123.

195. Kathleen H. Jamieson, "The evolution of political advertising in America" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sander (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 12.

196. L. P. Devlin, "An analysis of presidential television commercials, 1952-1984." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 22-24.

197. Wadsworth, 61.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

General

To understand the different styles and strategies used in political commercials between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election, a content analysis was performed. According to Bernard Berelson's definition, content analysis is "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication."¹ Generally, content analysis has been used to determine the characteristics, forms or styles of message content.² The issues contained in political commercials or the themes used in dramatic programs are examples of content analysis that study manifest messages. Content analysis was said to be one of the most widely used research techniques for understanding and evaluating broadcast messages.³

Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

This study examined the different strategies and styles presented in the televised political advertising of incumbent and challengers during the 1992 presidential election.

The research questions were:

- a. Is there a difference in the dominant speaker between political commercials of the incumbent and challengers?
- b. Are there differences in type of content between incumbent and challenger political commercials in the 1992 presidential election?

- c. How do the appeals of political advertising differ between incumbent and challengers?
- d. What issues appear in televised political advertising in the 1992 presidential election?
- e. Did incumbent and challengers differ in use of positive and negative political commercials?
- f. What are the strategies used in the negative political advertising by incumbent and challengers?
- g. What are the strategies used in the political commercials of incumbent and challengers?

Null Hypotheses:

- a. There are no differences in the dominant speaker in political advertising between incumbent and challengers.
- b. There is no difference in type of content used in the political commercials between incumbent and challengers.
- c. There is no difference in appeals used in the political commercials between incumbent and challengers.
- d. Incumbent and challengers do not differ in extent of use of positive and negative political commercials.
- e. There is no difference in strategy used in negative political advertising between incumbent and challengers.
- f. There is no difference in strategy used in political advertising between incumbent and challengers.

Definition of Terms

The coding design and definition of terms basically came from Wadsworth's study on

political commercials between incumbent and challenger.⁴ Other political advertising studies also were considered in designing this study. Kaid and Davidson's study on video style, Kaid and Wadsworth's study on negative and positive political advertising, Joslyn's study on appeals of political commercials, Shyles' study on issues in the political advertising, Johnson and Copeland's study on negative political advertising and Trent and Friedenbergs' study on strategy used in political commercials were all used to structure and define the variables.⁵

Independent Variables

1. Status, with two levels:
 - a. Incumbent
 - b. Challenger

Dependent variables

1. Dominant speaker: the main speaker in the commercials. Levels:
 - a. Anonymous announcer: the announcer who speaks behind the scene and does not show his/her face and identity.
 - b. Candidate: candidates talk directly in the ads.
 - c. Surrogate speaker: people who speak about in the behave of the candidate (public figure, private citizenship, spouse or family members).
 - d. Candidate and surrogate speaker: candidate and surrogate speakers are equally vocal in the political commercials.
 - e. Opponent candidate and anonymous announcer: the opponent candidates and the

anonymous announcer are equally vocal in the commercials.

f. Anonymous announcer and surrogate speaker: anonymous announcer and surrogate speakers are equally vocal in the political ads.

2. Type of ad content: the rhetorical content of the political commercials. Levels:

a. Image ads: ads that stress the candidate's characteristics, personality, human qualities, etc. Ads proclaim a candidate's honesty, integrity, competence and caring.

b. Issue ads: ads that emphasize specific policy positions or express the candidate's concerns about particular matters of public concern.

c. Both image and issue: political commercials that contain both image and issue information.

d. Cannot determine: ads that emphasize neither candidate's image nor issue concerned.

3. Appeal of the ads: things said or mentioned in the political commercials to persuade and influence voters.

a. Partisanship appeal: ads that identify the candidate's party, mention other members of the same party.

b. Issue-related appeal with vague policy position: candidate expresses the issue concern but vaguely expresses his/her policy preference.

c. Issue-related appeal with specific policy position: candidate specifically expresses his/her policy preference, or specific policy proposal. The candidate may suggest precise legislation or action that will take.

d. Issue-related appeal without mentioning the candidate's policy position at all.

- e. **Candidate's character appeal:** ads that emphasize the good quality and characteristics of the candidate.
 - f. **Group reference appeal:** ads that attempt to link the candidate with certain demographic groups.
 - g. **Criticism against opponent appeal:** ads that emphasize the negative aspect of opponent.
4. **Issues:** current topics linked to the national interest, for example: economic, foreign policy and health care.
5. **Type of the ad:** the direction of ads with three levels:
- a. **Candidate-positive focused ads:** ads that emphasize candidate's virtue, accomplishments, and good quality.
 - b. **Opponent-negative focused ads:** ads that emphasize opponent's negative quality, attack the opponent's character, faults, policy and issue position.
 - c. **Both negative and positive:** Ads that focus both the positive aspect of the candidate and negative aspect of the opponent.
 - d. **Cannot determine:** ads that emphasize neither positive side of the candidates or negative aspect of the opponent.
6. **Strategies of negative political advertising:** Strategies typically used in negative advertising.
- a. **Attack on personal characteristics of opponent:** ads that attack the personality of the opponent; use negative words to denounce the character of opponent.
 - b. **Attack on issue stands, policy, record, and consistency of opponent**

- c. Attack on candidate's group affiliations: ads that attack the opponent's ties to certain groups which have undesirable characteristics, members, and philosophies.
 - d. The people against you: surrogate speakers in the ads speak out against the opposition candidates.
 - e. Disparaging humor: ads that ridicule the opponent's intelligence, honesty, and political record.
7. Strategies used in the ads: Strategies used in political commercials to persuade and influence voters.
- a. Use of symbolic trappings to transmit importance of office: ads show candidate surrounded by bodyguards, use of title to address the candidate, showing of the image that somehow signifies the candidate's official government position.
 - b. Presidency stands for legitimacy: ads emphasize the office of the presidency, its legitimacy, and the support and respect to the presidency.
 - c. Competency and the office: ads show an image of a candidate as a competent world leader and one capable of managing the highest office.
 - d. Charisma of the candidate: ads show the excitement and hoopla that the candidate receive from the people.
 - e. Traditional values: ads reinforce majority value, the American dream, and family values.
 - f. Appearing to represent the philosophical center of the party: ads show a candidate has the support of his political party and represents the party's policies and platforms.
 - g. Endorsements by party and other important leaders: party leaders speak on behalf of candidate; link candidate with established, highly respected leaders.

- h. Emphasizing accomplishments: ads stress the achievements of the candidate.
- i. Creating and maintaining “above the trenches” posture: candidate remains removed from politics, aloof from political battle, rarely acknowledges existence of any opponent, refrains from confrontation with opponents.
- j. Depending on surrogates to speak: candidate use others to speak for him or her in the ads.
- k. Taking the offensive position on issues: ads probe, question a candidate’s issue position.
- l. Attack the record of the opponent: ads attack the policy and record of the opponent.
- m. Attack on the personality of opponents: ads attack the character of opponents.

Selection of Subjects

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences in political commercial content between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election. Therefore, the data studied here are contained in political commercials used by incumbent George Bush, and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot during the 1992 general election. The researcher decided to exclude political spots from the primary campaign, because during the primary a challenger would need to campaign against other challengers as well as the incumbent. Thus the strategies and styles used by challengers in the primary might be different from those used against incumbent president during the general election.

This study examined 70 different political commercials from the 1992 general election campaign. Bush had 21 ads; Clinton had 31 ads and another 18 ads were from Perot's campaign. The sample was obtained from the Political Commercial Archive in the

Department of Communication at the University of Oklahoma. According to Wadsworth who also used the collection of the Archive for her study, the "Political Commercial Archive obtains the largest and most complete set of presidential ads in the world."⁴ Thus the advertising collection of examined in this study was assumed to be relatively complete and representative of all incumbent/challenger political commercials during the 1992 election.

Unit of Analysis

The units of analysis in this study are the political commercials themselves.

Categories of Analysis

The categories of the analysis are:

1. Dominant speakers in the political advertising.
2. Type of ad content (image, issue, both).
3. Appeals presented in the political ads.
4. Issues presented in the political ads.
5. Type of ads (negative, positive, both).
6. Strategies used in the negative ads.
7. Strategies used in the ads.

Coding

A coding sheet and code book were developed for this study (see appendix-for copies). The format of the coding sheet and code book is derived primarily from Wadsworth's study on political commercials between incumbent and challenger.⁶ Also the design of the coding sheet and the definition in the code book merged several other studies in the field

of political advertising.

A pretest was conducted before the actual content analysis took place. Three coders were involved in the coding: author, one undergraduate and one graduate student in Department of Mass Communication at Oklahoma State University. All coders saw all political commercials. Differences in coding were resolved by discussion and voting.

The coders were asked to code the dominant speaker in the political ads, because studies have shown that there are different types of speakers in the political commercials between incumbent and challengers. In the study of video style by Kaid and Davidson, the researchers discovered that incumbents' ads were often represented by an announcer or other voice, and challengers often speak for themselves in the ads⁷.

Coders also coded the type of ad content (image or issue). According to Wadsworth's study, the incumbent often focuses on personality characteristics and challengers focus on issues.⁸ Joslyn's study on content of political commercials showed that there were different appeals used in the political ads.⁹ Therefore coders were asked to identify the appeals present in the commercials.

Because Shyles stated that issues emphasized in the political ads reflect the climate and issue concerns of the campaign, coders were asked to describe the issues of the ads in an open end question.¹⁰

Many researchers have investigated the difference in positive and negative political ads, and the strategy used in negative political advertising. Thus the researcher intended to assess the direction of ads (negative, positive), and strategies used in the sample ads.

Finally, coders coded the strategy used in the political ads based on strategies identified by Trent and Friedenber as appropriate for incumbent and challenger.¹¹ The content

analysis took place at the Department of Communication at University of Oklahoma.

Statistical Analysis

The frequency count of terms in each category is nominal data; therefore, the researcher used complex Chi-square analysis to examine differences in political commercials between incumbent George Bush, and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot. The 95 percent level of confidence was used to determine which differences were statistically significant.

ENDNOTES

1. Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication Research (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952), 18.
2. O. R. Holsti, "Content Analysis" In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds). Handbook of Social psychology (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1968), 596-692.
3. Joseph R. Dominick, and James E. Fletcher, Broadcasting research methods (Newton, Massachusetts: Allyn nd Bacon, Inc., 1985), 7.
4. Anne J. Wadsworth, Incumbent and Challenger Strategies in Presidential Communication: A Content Analysis of Television Campaign Ads from 1952 to 1984. (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1987).
5. Lynda L. Kaid, and Dorthy K. Davidson, "Elements of Videostyle" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sadnders (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).
 Lynda L. Kaid, and Anne Johnston, "Negative versus positive television advertising in U.S. presidential campaigns, 1968-1988" Journal of Communication, 41 (Summer 1991): 53-64.
 Richard A. Joslyn, "The content of political spot ads." Journalism Quarterly 57 (Spring 1980): 92-98.
 Karen S. Johnson-Cartee, and Gary A. Copeland, Negative Political Advertising: Coming of Age (NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1991).
 Judith S. Trent, and Jimmie D. Trent, "The rhetoric of the challenger: George Stanley McGovern." Central States Speech Journal 25 (Spring 1974): 11-18.
6. Wadsworth.
7. Kaid, and Davidson.
8. Wadsworth.
9. Joslyn.
10. Leonard Shyles, "The televised political spot advertisement." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 107-137.
11. Trent, and Trent.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter describes and interprets the research findings of this thesis. First, the author describes overall content and strategies used in political commercials during the 1992 presidential election. Secondly, data are analyzed to determine the differences between political ads of the incumbent and the challengers. Thirdly, data are analyzed to understand the differences between political ads of all presidential candidates.

The Overall Content and Strategy of the 1992 Presidential Political Commercials

Table I shows the number of political ads for each candidate.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF ADS PER CANDIDATE

	George Bush	Bill Clinton	Ross Perot	Total
Number Of Ads	21	31	18	70
Proportion	30%	44%	26%	100%

The author examined a total of 70 different ads used during the 1992 presidential election. The incumbent, President George Bush, had 21 different ads. Challenger Bill Clinton had 31 ads, and Ross Perot had 18.

Table II shows the different lengths of commercials used in the 1992 presidential campaign.

TABLE II
LENGTH OF POLITICAL COMMERCIALS

	15 seconds	30 seconds	60 seconds	2 minutes	4:20 minutes	Total
N	1	46	21	1	1	70
%	1.4%	65.8%	30%	1.4%	1.4%	100.0%

Table II shows that most ads in the sample were 30-second commercials (66%), and 30% were 60-seconds in length.

Table III shows the different types of speakers in the political commercials

TABLE III
TYPES OF SPEAKERS IN THE POLITICAL ADS

Speaker	Number	Percentage
Anonymous announcer	37	53%
Candidate	22	32%
Surrogate speaker	8	11%

TABLE V
APPEALS APPEARING IN THE POLITICAL COMMERCIALS

Appeals	Number	Percentage
Partisanship appeal	3	3%
Issue appeal w/ vague policy position	7	7%
Issue appeal w/ specific policy position	1	1%
Issue appeal without mentioned policy position	29	29%
Personal character of candidate appeal	19	19%
Criticism against opponent	41	40%
Others	1	1%
Total	70	100%

Table V shows that 40% of ads used an appeal that criticized the opponent, and 29% of ads used on an issue-related appeal without mentioning of the candidate's policy position. About 19% of ads used an appeal based on the personal character of the candidate. Only one percent used an issue-related appeal that mentioned a specific policy position.

Table VI shows the different types of political commercials

TABLE VI
TYPES OF POLITICAL ADS

Types of ads	Number	Percentage
Candidate-positive focused	35	50%
Opponent-negative focused	28	40%
Both negative & positive	4	6%
Cannot determine	3	4%
Total	70	100%

The table shows that 50% of ads were "candidate positive" focused and 40% were "opponent negative" focused. Candidate positive ads emphasized the candidate's own good qualities and accomplishments, while opponent negative ads attacked the opponent's character or stand on issues.

Table VII shows the different strategies appearing in the political commercials

TABLE VII
STRATEGIES APPEARING IN THE NEGATIVE POLITICAL COMMERCIALS

Strategy	Number	Percentage
Attack on personal character of opponent	12	23%
Attack on issue policy and record of opponent	26	49%

The people against you	8	15%
Disparagement humor	4	7%
Attack opponent's ads	1	2%
Anti-establishment	2	4%
<hr/>		
Total	70	100%

According to Table VII, the most used strategy in negative ads attacked the opponents stand on issues, his policies and record (49%). Twenty-three percent of the negative ads used a strategy that attacked the opponent's personality. Fifteen percent used "the people are against you" strategy. This strategy utilized surrogate speakers to attack the opponent. Seven percent used disparaging humor. This strategy made fun of the opponent's intelligence, honesty or political record. Only Clinton ads used this strategy. Clinton used this strategy to ridicule Bush's tax record.

Table VIII shows the different strategies of political commercials.

TABLE VIII
STRATEGIES OF POLITICAL COMMERCIALS

Strategy	Number	Percentage
Using symbolic trapping	5	3%
Presidency stand for legitimacy	3	2%
Competency and the office	6	4%
Charisma of the candidate	5	3%
Speaking traditional value	26	18%

Representing the ideology of the party	1	1%
Using endorsements by party and other important leaders	2	1%
Emphasizing accomplishment	22	15%
Maintaining "above the trenches posture" posture	17	12%
Depending on surrogates to speak	10	7%
Taking offensive position on issues	13	9%
Attacking the record of the opponent	27	19%
Attacking the personality of opponent	9	6%
<hr/>		
Total	70	100%

Nineteen percent of ads used the strategy that attacked the record of the opponent, and 18 percent of the ads stressed traditional values. Also, 12 percent used the "above the trench" strategy. This strategy was used by candidates who tried to maintain an image of being remote from politics and refraining from confrontation with opponents. Ross Perot applied this strategy in many of his ads.

Content and Strategy Difference in Political Ads of Incumbent and Challengers

Table IX shows the different types of speakers of the political commercials of incumbent and challenger.

TABLE IX
SPEAKERS IN THE POLITICAL COMMERCIALS OF INCUMBENT AND
CHALLENGERS

Speaker	Incumbent	Challenger
Anonymous announcer	7 (33%)	30 (61%)
Candidate	8 (38%)	14 (29%)
Surrogate speaker	6 (29%)	2 (4%)
Announcer & opponent candidate	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Announcer & surrogate speaker	0 (0%)	2(4%)
Total	21 (100%)	49 (100%)

A calculated complex chi-square value show that there was a significant relationship between speakers in the political commercials and the position of the candidates. Table IX shows that the dominant speaker appearing most in incumbent ads was Bush himself. Bush talked for himself in 38% of his ads. On the other hand, challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot used anonymous announcers more than any other speakers. About 61% of challengers' ads were represented by anonymous announcers.

Bush also used more surrogate speakers in his ads than did the challengers. Surrogate speakers appeared in 29% of Bush ads, but in only 4% of challengers' ads. Therefore the null hypothesis, "There are no differences in the dominant speaker in political advertising between incumbent and challengers," is rejected. However the strength of the relationship between types of speakers and the candidates' running positions is weak.

Table X shows the different types of ad contents of incumbent and challengers.

TABLE X
TYPES OF AD CONTENTS APPEARING IN THE POLITICAL ADS OF
INCUMBENT AND CHALLENGERS

	Incumbent	Challenger
Image ad	8 (38%)	5 (10%)
Issue ad	8 (38%)	20 (41%)
Image & issue	5 (24%)	22 (45%)
Cannot determine	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Total	21 (100%)	49 (100%)

Complex Chi-square calculated a value that shows a significant relationship between types of ad content and the running position of candidates. The strength of relationship is small. Incumbent George Bush used equal proportions (38%) of image ads and issue ads. On the other hand, Bill Clinton and Ross Perot used ads that contained both image and issue information more than any other types of content. About 65% of challengers' ads were image and issue ads. The incumbent also used more image ads (38%) than did the challengers (10%). Many of Bush's ads tried to create an image of an experienced world leader who was trustworthy and competent. His ads also attacked Clinton as being untrustworthy, and not competent enough to be the nation's leader. The null hypothesis, "There is no difference in types of content used in the political commercials between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election," is rejected.

Table XI shows the different types of ads of the political commercials of incumbent and challengers.

TABLE XI
TYPES OF POLITICAL ADS OF INCUMBENT AND CHALLENGERS

	Incumbent	Challenger
Candidate-positive focused	10 (48%)	25 (51%)
Opponent-negative focused	11 (52%)	17 (35%)
Both negative & positive	0 (0%)	4 (8%)
Cannot determine	0 (0%)	3 (6%)
Total	21 (100%)	49 (100%)

A calculated complex chi-square value show that there were no significant differences in types of ads between incumbent and challenger in the 1992 presidential election.

Therefore the null hypothesis D, "Incumbent and challengers do not differ in extent of uses of positive and negative political commercials," is supported.

Table XII shows the different appeals of political commercials of incumbent and challengers.

TABLE XII
APPEALS OF POLITICAL COMMERCIALS OF INCUMBENT AND
CHALLENGERS

Appeal	Incumbent	Challenger
partisanship appeal	0 (0%)	3 (6%)
Issue appeal w/ vague policy position	3 (14%)	4 (8%)
Issue appeal w/ specific policy position	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Issue appeal without showing candidate's policy position	3 (14%)	26 (53%)
Personal character appeal	4 (19%)	15 (31%)
Criticism against opponent	12 (57%)	29 (59%)
Total	23 (109%)	77 (157%)

The coders were instructed to count all the appeals within an ad; therefore, the total percentage of appeals for incumbent and challengers is more than 100. According to the calculated complex chi-square value, there was a significant difference between incumbent and challenger in the use of issue-related appeals that did not mention a candidate's policy position. The strength of the relationship is small.

Table XII shows that challengers used more issue-related appeals without mentioning policy positions than did the incumbent. The null hypothesis, "There is no difference in appeals used in the political commercials between incumbent and challengers," is rejected. Both incumbent and challengers used more of the "criticism against opponent" appeal than did any other appeals. However, the results do not show any significant differences among the use of partisanship appeals, issue-related appeals with vague position, issue-

related appeals with specific policy position, personal character of candidate appeals, and criticism against opponent appeals.

Table XIII shows the different strategies of the negative political ads of incumbent and challenger.

TABLE XIII
STRATEGY OF NEGATIVE ADS OF INCUMBENT AND CHALLENGERS

Negative strategy	Incumbent	Challenger
Attack on personal character of opponent	8 (73%)	4 (17%)
Attack on issue, record of opponent	7 (64%)	19 (83%)
The people against you	5 (45%)	3 (13%)
Disparagement humor	0 (0%)	4 (17%)
Attack opponent's ads	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
Anti-establishment	0 (0%)	2 (9%)
Total	20 (182%)	33 (143%)

The coders were asked to count every strategy that appeared in a negative ad, therefore, the total percentage of appeals was more than 100. According to Table XIII, in the negative ads, the incumbent used a strategy that attacked the personal character of opponents more than any other strategies. On the other hand, Clinton and Perot used a strategy that attacked the stand on issues and the record of their opponent more than any other strategies in the negative ads. A complex chi-square value shows that incumbent and challengers differed significantly in the use of strategies that attacked the personal

character of the opponent and his stand on issue, record, and consistency. The data show that incumbent George Bush's ads attacked his opponent's character than did the challengers' ads. On the other hand, Clinton and Perot attacked the incumbent's policy stand and the performance of his administration. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There is no difference in strategy used in negative political advertising between incumbent and challengers," is rejected. However, there were no significant differences in the use of the surrogate speaker strategy, disparaging humor strategy, attacking opponent's ad strategy, and anti-establishment strategy between incumbent and challengers.

TABLE XIV shows the different strategies of the political commercials of incumbent and challengers.

TABLE XIV
STRATEGIES OF THE POLITICAL ADS OF INCUMBENT AND
CHALLENGERS

Strategy	Incumbent	Challenger
Using symbolic trapping	5 (24%)	0 (0%)
Presidency stand for legitimacy	3 (14%)	0 (0%)
Competency and the office	5 (24%)	1 (2%)
Charisma of the candidate	0 (0%)	5 (10%)
Traditional values	8 (38%)	18 (37%)
Representing the ideology of the party	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Using endorsements by party and other important leaders	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Emphasizing accomplishment	2 (10%)	20 (41%)

Maintaining "above the trenches posture" posture	0 (0%)	17 (35%)
Depending on surrogates to speak	6 (29%)	4 (8%)
Taking offensive position on issues	4 (19%)	9 (18%)
Attacking the record of the opponent	6 (29%)	21 (43%)
Attacking the personality of opponent	7 (33%)	2 (4%)
Total	6 (220%)	100 (204%)

The coders were asked to count every strategy that appeared in a political ad; therefore, one negative ad could have several strategies. Table XIV shows that "speaking to traditional values" was the number one strategy used by incumbent George Bush. "Attacking the personality of opponent" ranked second, and both "Depending on surrogates to speak," and "Attacking the record of the opponent" ranked third. Challengers Clinton and Perot applied the "attack on the record of the opponent" strategy most. Emphasizing the accomplishment of the candidate was second, and speaking about traditional values was third. A calculated complex chi-square value showed that there were significant differences in use of the strategies of using symbolic trappings to transmit the importance of the office, presidency stands for legitimacy and competency between incumbent and challengers. Basically, these strategies are commonly used by an incumbent. In Bush's ads, he often appeared in the oval office. Ads addressed Bush by his title and stressed his legitimacy and competence of the office.

On the other hand, Clinton and Perot seldom used these strategies. In some ads, Clinton stressed his competency during his governorship of Arkansas, but the use of this strategy was far less than that of incumbent George Bush.

Incumbent and challengers also differed significantly in emphasizing accomplishments, creating and maintaining an "above the trenches" posture, and depending on surrogates to speak. Both Clinton and Perot emphasized their accomplishments more than did the incumbent president. Clinton stressed his achievements in Arkansas, and Perot emphasized his business success.

One important strategy that Perot used was the "above the trenches" strategy. Perot promoted the image of an outsider, not part of the dirty politics of Washington, and a hard-working businessman who knew how to create jobs and cut the national deficit. Clinton and Bush did not use an "above the trenches" strategy at all.

Incumbent George Bush also used more surrogate speakers in the ads than challengers Clinton and Ross Perot. Bush often applied surrogate speakers to attack Clinton. On the other hand, Clinton and Perot had few ads with surrogate speakers. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There is no difference in strategy used in political advertising between incumbent and challengers, " is rejected.

Content and Strategy Difference of Political Ads of Candidates

Table XV shows the different types of ads appeared in the political commercials of the candidates

TABLE XV
TYPES OF ADS OF POLITICAL COMMERCIALS OF CANDIDATES

	Bush	Clinton	Perot
Candidate-positive focused	10 (48%)	11 (35%)	14 (78%)
Opponent-negative focused	11 (52%)	16 (52%)	1 (5%)
Both negative & positive	0 (0%)	4 (13%)	0 (0%)
Cannot determine	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (17%)
Total	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	18 (100%)

Although there was no significant difference between incumbent and challengers' uses of positive and negative ads, the statistical results show that there was a significant difference in types of ads used among the candidates. The strength of the relationship between candidate and ad types was moderate. Table XV shows that 78 percent of Ross Perot's ads were positive ads. On the other hand, Clinton used negative ads more than positive ads. Bush had half negative and half positive ads.

Table XVI shows the different strategies of political commercials of candidates.

TABLE XVI
STRATEGIES OF POLITICAL COMMERCIALS OF CANDIDATES

Strategy	Bush	Clinton	Perot
Using symbolic trapping	5 (24%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Presidency stand for legitimacy	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Competency and the office	5 (24%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Charisma of the candidate	0 (0%)	5 (16%)	0 (0%)
Traditional values	8 (38%)	9 (29%)	9 (50%)
Representing the ideology of the party	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Endorsement by party and other important leaders	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
Emphasizing accomplishment	2 (10%)	8 (26%)	12 (67%)
Maintaining "above the trenches" posture	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17 (94%)
Depending on surrogate to speak	6 (29%)	3 (10%)	1 (6%)
Taking offensive position on issue	4 (19%)	5 (16%)	4 (22%)
Attack on the record of the opponent	6 (29%)	20 (65%)	1 (6%)
Attack on the personality of opponent	7 (33%)	2 (6.45%)	0 (0%)
Total	46 (220%)	56 (116.14%)	44 (244.45%)

Bush used the "speaking traditional value" strategy most, "attacking the personality of opponent" second, and "attacking the record of the opponent," third. Clinton used the "attacking the record of the opponent" most, "speaking traditional value" strategy second, and the "emphasizing accomplishment" strategy third.

Perot utilized the "maintaining above the trenches posture" strategy most, "emphasizing accomplishment" second, and the "speaking traditional value" third. A chi-square value shows that there were significant differences in the strategies for using symbolic trappings, presidential legitimacy, competency and the office, charisma of the candidate, emphasizing accomplishment, creating and maintaining "above the trenches" posture, attacking the record of the opponent and attacking the personality of opponent among candidates. As mentioned above, symbolic trappings, presidential legitimacy, and competency of the office were main strategies used by incumbent George Bush. However, Clinton's ads often showed cheering crowds waving signs to support himself and Al Gore. Bush and Perot did not use "hoopla" in their ads during the general election campaign. But rather, Perot's ads stressed his own accomplishments more than did the other two candidates. Challenger Bill Clinton used the strategy of attacking the record and policies of the opponent more than did the other two candidates. Bush's ads attacked Bill Clinton's character. Perot did not attack either Clinton or Bush, but he took more offensive positions on issues and asked voter for support.

Table XVII shows the issues appeared in the political commercials

TABLE XVII
ISSUES IN THE POLITICAL COMMERCIALS

	Number	Percentage
Family Values	1	1%
Crime	2	2%
Government Management	3	3%
Deficit	4	5%
Welfare Reform	3	3%
Health care	12	14%
Foreign policy/Defense	2	2%%
Education	10	14%
Taxes	12	33%
Economy	29	10%
Jobs	9	1%
Environment	1	

Based on the coders' observations, nine issues were mentioned in the sample ads. They were: family values, crime, government management, foreign policy/defense, deficit, taxes, the economy, jobs, the environment, education, health reform and welfare reform.

According to the results, the economy was the number one issue in the 1992 presidential election. Health care and taxes ranked second, education ranked third, and unemployment ranked fourth.

Summary

The following describes the differences of political commercials of incumbent and challengers.

Incumbent President George Bush:

- Candidate spoke for himself in the ads
- Used more image or issue ads
- Attacked the personality of opponents in the negative ads.
- Used more symbolic trappings to transmit importance of office
- Stressed more the president's legitimacy
- Stressed more the competence of the office
- Used more surrogate speakers

Challengers: Bill Clinton and Ross Perot

- Used more anonymous announcers
- Used more image and issue ads
- Used more issue-related appeal without mentioning the candidate's policy position
- Attacked issue stand, record, and consistency of incumbent in the negative ads
- Emphasized accomplishments
- Created and maintained "above the trenches" posture

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study focused on determining the content and strategy differences in political commercials of incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election. The researcher conducted a content analysis study and examined a total of 70 different television political commercials from candidates George Bush, Bill Clinton and Ross Perot.

The research questions to be answered in this study were:

- a. Is there a difference between political commercials of the incumbent and challengers in regard to the dominant speakers?
- b. Are there differences in types of content between incumbent and challenger political commercials in the 1992 presidential election?
- c. How do the appeals of political advertising differ between incumbent and challengers?
- d. What issues appeared in televised political advertising in the 1992 presidential election?
- e. Did incumbent and challengers differ in use of positive and negative political commercials?
- f. What are the strategies used in the negative political advertising by incumbent and challengers?
- g. What are the strategies used in the political commercials of incumbent and challengers?

The results indicated that there was a significant relationship between speakers in the political commercials and the candidate's running position. Most incumbent's ads were represented by the candidate himself, and most challengers' ads were voiced by anonymous announcers. Incumbent George Bush used more surrogate speakers in his ads than did challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot.

A significant relationship was found between types of ad content and the position of the candidates. The results showed that incumbent George Bush used image or issue ads to convey his campaign messages. On the other hand, most of challengers' ads contained both image and issue information.

No significant differences were found in the use of negative and positive ads between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election.

Incumbent and challengers also differed in use of issue appeals that did not mention the policy position of the candidates. The results showed that Clinton and Perot used more issue related appeals without mentioning the candidate's policy position than did the incumbent.

The researcher examined the different strategies used in the negative commercials of incumbent and challengers. The evidence showed that in the negative commercials, Bush focused on attacking the character of his opponents, and challengers Clinton and Perot used a strategy that attacked the issue stand, record and consistency of their opponent. Bush attacked Clinton's character but none of Bush's ads attacked Ross Perot. Several Bush ads showed ordinary people on the street, or in parks and coffee shops saying they did not trust Bill Clinton. Clinton's negative ads emphasized George Bush's economic policies, tax record and the economic performance of the administration. Ross Perot also

focused negative ads on the economy and the national deficit. Perot's ads often took an offensive position on issues and promoted his own image.

The findings of this study showed that Bush used more "symbolic trapping," "presidency stands for legitimacy," and "competency and the office" strategies than did his challengers. Incumbent George Bush was also found to use more surrogate speakers in the ads than his opponents.

On the other hand, challengers Clinton and Perot used more "above the trench," and "emphasize the accomplishments" strategies than did the incumbent. Clinton stressed his achievement in Arkansas and Perot emphasized his business success. The independent candidate Ross Perot liked to create an image of non traditional politicians. One of the slogans that often appeared in Perot's ads was "There is no time to waste our vote on traditional politics as usual."

The issues that appeared in the political commercials of the 1992 presidential election were issues related to the economy, unemployment, taxes, health care, education, the national deficit, welfare reform, government management, Crime, family values, foreign policy, and environmental issues. According to the results economy was the number one issue in the 1992 presidential election. Health care and taxes ranked second, education ranked third, and unemployment ranked fourth.

The researcher also analyzed the overall content and strategy of the political commercials in the 1992 presidential election. Political spots in the 1992 presidential election were presented in short segments. About ninety-nine percent of ads were 30 or 60 second spots. Most of the ads were presented by anonymous announcers, and Issue ads were prevalent in the campaign. Positive ads were the dominant type of ads in the

election, but negative ads were 40 percent of the total. Attacking or criticizing the opponent was a very popular appeal used by candidates. In negative advertising, candidates liked to attack the record and issue stand of the opponent. Stressing the traditional values, the American dream, and the accomplishments of the candidates also were strategies frequently used.

Because the study included the Independent candidate, Ross Perot, the researcher decided to analyze the content differences among the three candidates.

Bush:

- Spoke for himself in the ads and used more surrogate speakers.
- Equal use of image or issue ads.
- Attacked the personality of opponent.
- Used more symbolic trappings to convey importance of the office.
- Stressed more the president's legitimacy.
- Stressed more the competence of the office.

Clinton:

- Used more anonymous announcers.
- Used more issue ads.
- Used more criticism against opponent appeal than did Bush and Perot.
- Used more opponent-negative focused ads than Bush and Perot.
- Attacked the issue stand and record of the opponent.
- The only candidate who used the charisma of the candidate strategy.

Perot:

- Liked to speak for himself in the ads.
- Most ads were candidate positive focused.
- Used more issue-related appeal without showing candidate's policy position more than Clinton and Bush.
- The only candidate who used the anti-establishment strategy in negative ads.
- The only candidate who used "above the trench" posture.
- Emphasized accomplishments more than Bush and Clinton.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to empirically examine the content difference in political commercials between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election. The results support the argument that the political positions of the candidates do affect the content and strategies of political spots adopted by candidates.

The study showed that incumbent George Bush liked to speak for himself in the political ads, and challengers Bill Clinton and Ross Perot used more anonymous announcers. This is a surprising finding, because Bush was said to be stiff and uncomfortable in front of the camera. On the other hand, Clinton was said to be "so good on camera that it reinforced his whole 'Slick Willie' problems."¹ Perot was also known to work well with the camera and the television media. This finding did not match previous study findings. Kaid and Davidson, and Wadsworth found that the incumbent's ads were often presented by anonymous announcers or surrogate speakers. On the other hand, challengers tended to speak for themselves in the ads and were less dependent upon

surrogate speakers.² However, the results did show Bush used more surrogate speakers than did Clinton and Perot.

The study also showed that Bush tended to use either image or issue ads, but challengers used ads that mostly contained both image and issue information. According to Kaid and Davidson, and Wadsworth, the incumbent tended to use image ads and challengers focused on issue ads.³ The results indicated that in the 1992 presidential election, the challengers Clinton and Perot not only emphasized issues but they also tried to use political ads to create a favorable image.

No significant differences were found in the use of negative and positive ads between incumbent and challengers in the 1992 presidential election. However, the results did show that challengers used more positive ads (51%) than negative ads (35%). Previous studies have shown that challengers used more attack strategy and negative ads.⁴ In this study, the Independent candidate, Ross Perot, used a large number of positive ads in his campaign. Therefore, the author believed that Perot's ads influenced the statistical outcome of the challenger's use of positive and negative ads.

The study also found that challengers used more issue-related appeals that did not mention the policy position of the candidates. Evidence from this study supports Joslyn's finding concerning the content of political spot ads. Joslyn found that issue-related appeal dominated the content of political commercials, but much of the issue content did not mention the candidate's specific policy position.⁵ Challengers Clinton and Perot fully utilized their advantage as challengers to attack the policies of the administration and mentioned issues concerning the nation without offering any solutions for the problems. "Criticism against opponent" appeals dominated the content of both incumbent and

challengers' ads. This indicated that attacking opponents and using negative ads were important themes in the 1992 presidential election.

In the negative advertising, Bush focused on attacking the character of his opponent, and Clinton and Perot stressed the negative aspect of Bush's record and his stand on issues and policies. Previous research did show that challengers often took an offensive position on issues, called for change and attacked the record of the incumbent.⁶ However, earlier research did not show that attacking the character of the opponents was an effective strategy. Roddy and Garramone found that negative ads attacked political records, and issue stands of opponents were considered by voters as fairer than an attack on the opponent's personality.⁷

The study also found that Bush tended to use "symbolic trapping," "presidency stands for legitimacy," and "competence of the office" strategies in his political commercials. Bush also used more surrogate speakers in the political ads to convey his political messages. On the other hand, Clinton and Perot applied strategy that created an "above the trench" posture and emphasized their achievements.

The findings of this study are supported by earlier studies that showed incumbent presidents often used symbolic trappings to transmit the importance of the office, reinforced voter's images of them as tied to the office of the president and their competence to be the nation's leader.⁸

The personal style of the candidate, the circumstances, and the philosophy of the political consultants and ad creative teams all have contributed to form the style and strategy used in the political commercials. In the 1992 presidential election, the study found that incumbent George Bush liked to talk for himself in the ads, and depend on

surrogate speakers more than his challengers, used either image or issue ads to convey his political messages, attacked the character of his opponents, used more symbolic trapping and stressed his competence for the office strategies. On the other hand, Clinton and Perot used more anonymous announcers in the ads, tended to use ads that mostly combined both image and issue information, talked about issues but did not mention any solutions for the problems, attacked the record, stands on issues, and policy of the incumbent, tried to create an "above the trench posture", and emphasized their achievements.

Recommendations for Future Study

This study only looked at the rhetorical aspect of the commercials. Therefore, a future study can investigate the production and video style of commercials between incumbent and challenger. The role of commercials in the process of elections is another area that needs to be investigated. According to Diamond and Bate political ads serve a different function during the process of election.⁹ Therefore, it would be interesting to know if there is a certain time period during the election for certain types of political spots. Future study should also consider the influence of media consultants and the advertising creative teams on the styles and strategies of political commercials. This study is limited to the 1992 presidential campaign. Thus, future studies may consider analyzing political ads from more than one presidential election or analyzing political ads from other levels of elections. This study used televised political spots to examine the difference in content of political commercials between incumbent and challengers. Therefore, future

studies could examine other channels of political advertising such as print and radio to see if the findings of this study still hold true.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowitz, A. I. "Name Familiarity, Reputation, and the Incumbency Effect in A Congressional Election." Western Political Quarterly 128 (1975): 668-684.
- Agranoff (ED.). The new style in election campaigns. (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972).
- Agranoff, R. The new style in election campaigns (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972).
- Alexander, H. E. "Communications and politics: The media and the message." In R. Arterton, F. C. Media Politics: The news strategies of presidential campaigns (Lesington, MA: Lexington Books, 1972).
- Atkin, C. K., and Heald, G. "Effects of Political Advertising." Public Opinion Quarterly 40 (Spring 1976): 216-228.
- Atkin, C. K., Bowen, L., Nayman, O. B., and Sheinkopf, K. G. "Quality versus quantity in televised political ads." Public Opinion Quarterly 37 (Summer 1973): 209-224.
- Bajai, M., Haley, G., and Rust R. T. "Efficient and inefficient media for political campaign advertising." Journal of Advertising 13 (1984): 45-51.
- Bennett, W. L. "The ritualistic and pragmatic bases of political campaign discourse." Quarterly Journal of Speech 63 (October 1977), 223
- Bowers, T. "Newspaper Political Advertising and the Agenda-Setting Function." Journalism Quarterly 50 (Autuman 1973): 552-56.
- Cundy, D. T. "Political Commercials and Candidate Image." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sadnders (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).
- Cover, A. D. "One good term deserves another: The advantage of incumbency in congressional elections." American Journal of Political Science xxi, 3, (August 1977): 523-540.
- Cox, C. W., and Morgenstern, S. "The increasing advantage of incumbency in the U.S. States." Legislative Studies Quarterly xviii, 4 (November 1993): 405-510.
- Devlin, L. P. "Contrasts in presidential campaign commercials of 1988." American Behavioral Scientist 32 (March 1989): 389-414.

- Devlin, L. P. "An analysis of presidential television commercials, 1952-1984." In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).
- Devlin, L. P. "Contrasts in presidential campaign commercials of 1980," Political Communication Review 7 (1982): 1-38.
- Devlin, L. P. "Reagan's and Carter's ad men review the 1980 television campaigns." Communication Quarterly 30 (Winter 1981): 3-12.
- Diamond, E., and Bates, S. The Spot: the rise of political advertising on television (Massachusetts: Cambridge, 1984).
- Erickson, K. V., and Schmidt, W. V. "Presidential political silence: Rhetoric and the rose garden strategy." The Southern Speech Communication Journal 47 (Summer 1982): 402-421.
- Faber, R. J., and Storey, M.C. "Recall of information from political advertising." Journal of Advertising 13 (May 1984): 39-43.
- Fiorina, M. "The case of the vanishing marginal: The bureaucracy did it," American Political Science Review 71 (March 1977): 177-181.
- Fox, S. The mirror makers: a hisotry of American advertising and its creators. (New York: Vintage Books, 1985).
- Garramone, G. M. "Effect of Negative Political Advertising: The Roles of Sponsor and Rebuttal." Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media 29 (Spring 1985): 147-159.
- Garrmone, G. M. "Voter responses to negative political ads." Journalism Quarterly 61 (Spring 1984): 250-259.
- Garramone, G. M. "Issue versus image orientation and effects of political advertising." Communication Research 1 (Jan 1983): 59-76.
- Gronbeck, B. E. "Negative narratives in 1988 presidential campaign ads." Quarterly Journal of Speech. 78 (1992): 333-346.
- Hill, D. B. "Political campaigns and madison avenue: a wavering partnership." Journal of Advertising 3 (May 1984): 21-25.
- Hinckley, B. "House re-elections and Senate defeats: The role of the challenger" British Journal of Political Science 10 (October 1980), 441-460.
- Hofsteter, C. R., Zukin, C. "TV network news and advertising in the Nixon and McGovern campaigns." Journalism Quarterly 56 (Spring 1979): 106-115, 152.

Jacobson, G. C. "Incumbents' advantage in the 1978 U.S. congressional elections." Legislative Studies Quarterly 6 (May 1981): 183-200.

Jamieson, K. H. "The evolution of political advertising in America" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New Perspectives On Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).

Jamieson, K. H. Packaging the Presidency (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Johannes, J. R., and McAdams, J. C. "The congressional incumbency effect: is it casework, policy compatibility, or something else? An examination of the 1978 election" American Journal of Political Science 75 (June 1981): 512-542.

Johnson-Cartee, K. S., and Copeland, G. A. Negative Political Advertising: Coming of Age (NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1991), p6.

Joslyn, R. "The Impact of campaign spot advertising on voting defections." Human Communication Research 7, (1981): 347-360.

Joslyn, R. "The content of Political Spot Ads." Journalism Quarterly. 57 (Spring 1980): 92-98.

Joslyn, R. "Political advertising and the meaning of elections" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).

Kaid, L. L., and Boydston, J. "An experimental study of the effectiveness of negative political advertisements." Communication Quarterly 35 (Spring 1987): 193-201.

Kaid, L. L. "Political advertising" In D.D. Nimmo and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), Handbook of political communication. (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981).

Kaid, L. L. and Davidson, D. K. "Elements of Videostyle" In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, and K. R. Sanders (Eds.), New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).

Kaid, L. L., Nimmo, D., and Sanders, K. R. New Perspectives on Political Advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).

Kaid, L. L., and Wadsworth, A. J., and Foote, J. "Incumbent and challenger styles in presidential television advertising" Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Honolulu. (May 1985).

Kaid, L. L. "Paid television advertising and candidate name identification." Campaigns & Elections 3 (1982): 34-36

- Kaid, L. L., and Sanders, K. R. "Political television commercials: An experimental study of type and length." Communication Research 5 (1978): 57-70.
- Kaid, L. L., and Johnston, A. "Negative versus positive television advertising in U.S. presidential campaigns, 1968-1988." Journal of Communication, 41 (Summer 1991): 53-63.
- Kaid, L. L., Leland, C. M., and Whitney, S. "The impact of televised political ads: Evoking viewer responses in the 1988 presidential campaign." The Southern Communication Journal. 57 (Summer 1992): 285-295.
- Kern, M. 30-second Politics: Political Advertising in the Eighties (New York: Praeger, 1989).
- Kellner, D. Television and the Crisis of Democracy (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990).
- Kinsey, D., and Perloff, R. M. "Political advertising as seen by consultants and journalists." Journal of Advertising Research (May/June 1992): 53-60.
- Kitchens, J. T., and Stiteler, B. "Challenge to the 'rule of minimum effect': A case study of the in man-out man strategy." The Southern Speech Communication Journal 44 (Winter 1979): 176-190.
- Kolar, B. "Fighting back: American political parties take to the airwaves" In L.L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds), New perspectives on political advertising (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).
- Krashinsky, M., and Milne, W. J. "The effects of incumbency in U.S. congressional elections, 1950-1988." Legislative Studies Quarterly xviii, 3, (August 1993): 321-341.
- Kraus, S. Televised Presidential Debates and Public Policy (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988).
- Lang, K., and Lang, G. Politics and Television (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968).
- Latimer, M. K. "Policy Issues and Personal Images in Political Advertising in a State Election" Journalism Quarterly 61 (Autumn 1984): 776-784, 852.
- Mayhew, D. R. "Congressional representation: The case of the vanishing margin" Polity 6 (1974), 313.
- McClure, R. D., and Patterson, T. E. "Television news and political advertising: The impact on voter beliefs." Communication Research. 1 (January 1974): 3-31.
- McClure, R. D., and Patterson, T. E. The Unseeing Eye (New York: Putnam, 1976).

- Merritt, S. "Negative political advertising: Some empirical findings." Journal of Advertising, 13 (1984): 27-38.
- Minow, N. N., Martin, J. B., and Mitchell, L. M. Presidential Television (New York: Basic Books, 1973).
- Minow, N. N., Bruch, D., Corcoran, T. T., Heard, A., and Price, R. (Voter's time: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Cost in the Electronic Era New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1969).
- Morgan, R. "Party out party on," Adweek. 42 (Nov 9, 1992): 7-9, 30-34.
- Nie, N. N., Verba, S., and Petrocik, J. R. The changing American voter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976).
- Nimmon, D., and Felsberg, A. J. "Hidden myths in televised political advertising" In L.L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders. New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).
- Oreskes, M. "Tv's role in '88: The medium is the election." New York Times, (30 October, 1988): 1, 19.
- Panney, A. Channels of Power: The impact of television on American politics (New York: Basic Books, 1983).
- Parker, G. R. "Interpreting candidate awareness in U.S. congressional elections." Legislative Studies Quarterly 6 (May 1981): 219-233.
- Payne, J. G., and Baukus, R. A. "Trend analysis of the 1984 GOP senatorial spot." Paper presented at the McElroy Symposia: Current Trends in Broadcast Advertising, University of Northern Iowa. 1985.
- Patterson, T. E. "Television and election strategy" Communications revolution in politics, proceedings of the Academy of political science, 1982, 34.
- Perng, Y. Political Advertising and Election (Taipei: Cheng Chung Publish, 1992).
- Pfau, M., and Burgoon, M. "The efficacy of issue and character attack message strategies in political campaign communication." Communication Reports, 2 (1989): 53-61.
- Polsby, N. W., and Wildavsky, A. Presidential Election: Contemporary Strategies of American Electoral Politics (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1988), 78.
- Powell, L., and Shelby, A. "A strategy of Assumed Incumbency: A case study." The Southern Speech Communication Journal 46 (Winter 1981): 105-123.

Ragsdale, L. "Incumbent popularity, challenger invisibility, and congressional voters." Legislative Studies Quarterly 2 (May 1981): 201-218.

Rubin, B. Political Television. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967).

Rudd, R. "Issues as image in political campaign commercials." The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50 (winter 1986), 103.

Sabato, L. The rise of political consultants (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

Shyles, L. "The Relationships of images, issues and presentational methods in televised spot advertisements for 1980's American presidential primaries." Journal of Broadcasting 28 (Fall 1984): 405-421.

Shyles, L. C. "Defining the issues of a presidential election from televised political spot advertisements." Journal of Broadcasting 27 (Fall 1983): 333-343.

Shyles, L. "The televised political spot advertisement." In L.L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders. New perspectives on political advertising. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986).

Sigelman, L. "Presidential popularity and presidential elections" Public Opinion Quarterly 47 (Winter 1979): 532-534.

Sloan, W. D., Stovall, J. G., and Startt, J. D. The Media in America (Worthington: Publishing Horizons, 1989).

Stovall, J. G. "Incumbency and news coverage of the 1980 presidential election campaign." Western Political Quarterly 37 (1984): 621-631.

Stokes, D. E., and Miller, W. E. "Party government and the Saliency of Congress," In A. Campbell, P. E. Converse, W. E. Miller and D. E. Stokes (Ed.), Elections and the Political Order (New York: Wiley, 1966).

Trent, J. S., and Friedenber, R. V. Political campaign communication: Principles and practices. (New York: Praeger, 1983).

Trent, J. S., and Trent, J. D. "The rhetoric of the challenger: George Stanley McGovern." Central States Speech Journal 25 (Spring 1974): 11-18.

Wadsworth, A. J. Incumbent and Challenger Strategies in Presidential Communication: A Content Analysis of Television Campaign Ads from 1952 to 1984. (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1987).

Wadsworth, A. J. "Recent political communication research." New Directions in Political Communication (California: Sage Publications, 1990), 332-336.

White, T. H. America in search of itself: the making of president (New York: Harper & Row, 1982).

Whitersponn, J. "Campaign Commericals & The Media Blitz" Campaigns & Election (Summer 1984): 6-20.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
CODING SHEET

CODING SHEET

1. Coder Name: _____
2. Commercial ID: _____
3. Candidate name: _____
 - (1) George Bush
 - (2) Bill Clinton
 - (3) Ross Perot
4. Length of the commercial: _____
5. Who sponsored the ad? _____
 - (1) Independent sponsor
 - (2) Campaign committee
 - (3) Candidate's party
 - (4) Cannot determine
 - (5) Other (specify) _____
6. Who is speaking in the ad? _____ (code for dominant speaker)
 - (1) anonymous announcer
 - (2) candidate
 - (3) surrogate speaker (public figure, private citizen, spouse or family member)
 - (4) combination (specify) _____
 - (5) others
7. What is the type of ad content? _____
 - (1) image ad
 - (2) issue ad
 - (3) both image and issue
 - (4) cannot determine
8. Content of appeal of the ad: (check all the applicable)
 - (1) Emphasis on partisanship of candidate
 - (2) Issue-related appeal with vague police position
 - (3) Issue-related appeal with specific police position
 - (4) Issue-related appeal that only mention issue concern without showing policy position of the candidate.
 - (5) Personal character of candidate
 - (6) Emphasis on group reference
 - (7) Criticism against opponent
 - (8) Others _____

9. Is there a particular issue emphasized in this ad?

10. What is the type of the ad? _____ (code for dominant theme)

- (1) Candidate-positive focused
- (2) Opponent-negative focused
- (3) Both positive and negative focused
- (4) Cannot determine

11. If ad is opponent negative focused, what is the strategy of the attack?

_____ (check all the applicable)

- (1) Attack on personal characteristics of opponent
- (2) Attack on issue stand, record, policy and consistency of opponent
- (3) Attack on candidate's group affiliations/associations or showing the opponent with undesirable groups or individuals.
- (4) The people against you
- (5) Disparagement Humor
- (6) Other (specify) _____

12. Which strategies are present in the ad? _____ (Check all the applicable)

- (1) Use of symbolic trappings to transmit importance of office
- (2) Presidency stands for legitimacy
- (3) Competency and the office
- (4) Charisma of the candidate
- (5) Speaking to traditional values
- (6) Appearing to represent the philosophical center of the party
- (7) Consulting or negotiating with world leaders
- (8) Using endorsements by party and other important leaders
- (9) Emphasizing accomplishments
- (10) Creating and maintaining "above the trenches" posture
- (11) Depending on surrogates to speak
- (12) Taking the offensive position on issues
- (13) Attacking the record of the opponent
- (14) attack the personality of opponent
- (15) others (specify) _____

APPENDIX B
CODE BOOK

CODE BOOK

1. Coder Name: Your Name
2. Commercial ID: the number of commercial given on the list of ads
3. Candidate Name: Use the selection in the list
4. Length of commercial: record the actually time frame.
5. Who sponsored the ad? _____

(1) Independent sponsor: An organization or group that is not directly linked with a political party or a candidate's campaign organization.

(2) Campaign committee: Candidate's campaign committee, citizen for candidate.

(3) Candidate's party: Party that linked to the candidate and sponsor the candidate.

(4) Cannot determine: No identify sponsor.

(5) Other (specify) _____

6. Who is speaking in the ad? _____ (Code for dominant speaker)

(1) an anonymous announcer: The announcer who speak behind the scene and do not show his/her face and identity.

(2) candidate

(3) surrogate speaker: People who speak in the behavior of the candidate (public figure, private citizen, spouse or family member)

(4) combination (specify) _____

(5) other

7. What is the type of ad content? _____

(1) Image ads: Ads that stress the candidate's characteristics, personality, human qualities, etc. Such ads might proclaim or denounce a candidate's honesty, integrity, competence, caring, trustworthy, intelligent, experienced and active, etc.

(2) Issue ad: Issue ads emphasize specific policy positions or express the candidate's concerns about particular matters of public concern.

(3) Both image and issue

(4) Cannot determine

8. Content of appeal of the ad? _____ (check all the applicable)

(1) Emphasis on partisanship of candidate: ad identifies the candidate's party, mentions other members of the same party.

(2) Issue-related appeal with vague policy position: candidate express the issue concern but vaguely express his/her policy preference. exp. "I favor medial care, or a better health care system, favor of a strong national defense, favor of consumer protection."

(3) Issue-related appeal with specific policy position: candidate specifically express his/her policy preference, or specific policy proposal. May suggest precise legislation or action will take.

(4) Issue-related appeal only mention issue concern without showing the candidate's policy position.

(5) Personal character of candidate: Emphasis the personal characteristics of candidates.

(6) Emphasis on group reference: an attempt to link the candidate with certain demographic groups.

(7) Criticism against opponent: ad emphasize the criticism of the opponent.

(8) Others _____

9. Is there a particular issue emphasized in this ad?

exp.: economy, foreign policy, health care,

10. What is the type of the ad? _____ (code for dominant theme)

(1) Candidate-positive focused: ads emphasize candidate's virtue, accomplishments, and good quality.

(2) Opponent-negative focused: ads emphasize opponent's negative quality, attack the opponent's character, policy, issue standard, faults or their campaign

(3) both

(4) Cannot determine

11. If ad is opponent-negative focused, what is the strategy of the attack? _____ (check all the applicable)

(1) Attack on personal characteristics of opponent: ad attack the personality characteristics of the opponent; use of negative words denoting flaws in character of opponent.

(2) Attack on issue stands, policy, record, and consistency of opponent: criticizes the issue or policy stands of the opponent.

(3) Attack on candidate's group affiliations/associations: attacks the opponent's ties to certain groups which have undesirable characteristics, members, philosophies.

(4) The people against You: people in the ads speak out to against the candidate. For example: the voters turn against you, the home constituency turns against you (voters or newspapers), the party faithful reject you and your own party primary opponents attack you.

(5) Disparagement Humor: a candidate's intelligence, honesty, or political record may be ridiculed.

(6) others (specify) _____

12. Which strategies are present in the ad? _____
(check all the applicable)

(1) Use of symbolic trappings to transmit importance of office: candidates are surround by bodyguards, use of title in addressing candidate, travel with entourage, images used that somehow signify the candidate's official government position.

(2) Presidency stands for legitimacy: ads emphasize on the office of the presidency, its legitimacy, the support and respect it is afforded.

(3) Competency and the office: candidate relays image of a competent world leader; capable of managing the highest office.

(4) Charisma of the candidate: ads show the excitement and hoopla that follows the candidate.

- (5) Speaking to traditional values: reinforcing majority value, the American dream, family value.
- (6) Appearing to represent the philosophical center of the party: candidate has support of his political party and represents its policies and platforms.
- (7) Consulting or negotiating with world leaders: appears in ads with other world leaders.
- (8) Using endorsements by party and other important leaders: party leaders speak on behalf of candidate; link candidate with established, highly respected leaders.
- (9) Emphasizing accomplishments: stressing the achievements of the candidate.
- (10) Creating and maintaining "above the trenches" posture: candidate remains removed from politics, aloof from political battle, rarely acknowledges existence of any opponent, refrains from confrontation with opponents.
- (11) Depending on surrogates to speak: uses others to speak in the ad.
Taking the offensive position on issues: probing, questioning a candidate's issue position.
- (12) taking the offensive position on issues:
- (13) Attacking the record of the opponent:
- (14) attack the personality of opponent:
- (15) others: specify _____

VITA

Jui-Yen Lo

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

**Thesis: A CONTENT ANALYSIS STUDY ON POLITICAL COMMERCIAL
BETWEEN INCUMBENT AND CHALLENGER IN THE 1992
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION**

Major Field: Mass Communications

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Taiwan, on December 21, 1968, the daughter of Kui-Lang and Mei-Kang Lo.

Education: Graduated from the World College of Journalism, Taipei, Taiwan in June 1990; received Bachelor of Art degree in Television Production and Performance from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in August 1990 and December 1992, respectively. Completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree with a major in Mass Communication at Oklahoma State University in December 1994.

Experience: Worked as reporter and editor for campus newspaper at the World College of Journalism in Taiwan; interned with the Education Television Service Center at Oklahoma State University, interned with the KOCO TV at Oklahoma City.

Professional Memberships: Kappa Tau Alpha National Honor Society in Journalism and Mass Communication.