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ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF IMAGES IN THE
1972 CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

by

James Robert Vickers

Master of Arts in Mass Communication

The study examined the role "quality" political advertisements played in the 1972 California Democratic primary. Quality advertisements were defined as those which the voter perceived to be the most informative, the most entertaining, the most intellectually stimulating, the most motivating and the least alienating.

A total of 380 respondents were questioned via telephone survey just prior to the June 1972 primary election. A cluster sample was used to select the respondents from the greater Los Angeles area.

A content analysis of the candidates' speeches, newspaper advertisements and political handouts was also used to test whether the candidates whom the voters perceived as most outspoken on issues actually did speak out the
most on the issues.

The survey revealed that there was a significantly high correlation between the perceived information value of an advertisement and its perceived entertainment value. Also significant correlations existed between the respondent's perceived information value of an advertisement and the attention it reportedly received. Perceived motivation level and perceived intellectual stimulation from the advertisements also were shown to have significantly correlated with reported attention level.

The respondent's estimate of the candidate with the most informative advertisements and the one which the content analysis revealed was most informative did not correspond.

The study suggested that the American voter is now becoming more concerned with the issues and less concerned with the candidate's image.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE ROLE OF IMAGES

IN THE 1972 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY
INTRODUCTION

Many political observers and media critics believe that the image is replacing the issue in today's politics. Marshall McLuhan and others assert that the image is the most important part of a candidate's campaign. It outweighs the issues or partisan considerations. This is especially true of the candidate's image as portrayed on television.

Political scientists are especially critical. Many of them do not believe this is happening, and those who do are alarmed. They feel that from the beginning, democracy was based on an informed electorate with the voters aware of the salient issues and are highly skeptical of any change that would affect this concept, such as McLuhan's idea of a "global village" in which television viewers prefer candidates with a "cool image." That is, they prefer those candidates who do not appear to take a definite stand on any issue and allow the viewers to fill in what they conceive the candidate's stand to be, which will reconcile with the voter's own beliefs.

In contrast to this, "hot" candidates, according to McLuhan, are those who appear to take specific stands on issues. By doing this they do not allow the viewers to fill in their own beliefs. The viewer instead must reconcile the candidate's political beliefs with his own. The viewers often unconsciously refuse to do this
and consequently the candidate with a "hot" image loses.

Although many political scientists cannot accept McLuhan's idea of a "global village" and "hot" and "cold" images, they do recognize the existence of the present candidate packaging in order to present a favorable image. They especially disapprove of the way this packaging prevents the candidate from taking a stand on the issues. A veteran political public relations man, Hal Evry,¹ claims that every time a candidate takes a stand on a specific issue he may alienate as much as 50 per cent of the voters. He said, "The public as a whole doesn't care about or understand issues, party ideology or political philosophy.² They vote for the man they like—or they vote against the man they dislike." Consequently candidates should avoid taking stands on issues.

This new role of the image in politics came about when the 30-second and 60-second spot commercials were substituted for the hour-long political telethons of the early 1950's. It was found that the 30-second and 60-second commercials interspersed between highly rated television shows reached more voters than the longer political television shows during which the candidates spoke out on various issues. The fact that few issues could be contained or even presented in the 30-second and 60-second television spots led to the inclusion of a shorter discussion of a single issue or the substituting
of an image which could be presented in 30 seconds.

The most recent study in the area and the only one that presents much original research is "How Voters React to Electronic Political Advertising: An Investigation of the 1970 Election Campaigns in Wisconsin and Colorado," by Lawrence Bowen, Charles K. Atkin, Kenneth G. Sheinkopf and Oguz B. Nayan in a paper presented to the 26th Annual Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Pasadena, Calif., May 19-22, 1971. This study attempted to determine whether quality or quantity was more important in spot television political advertisements.

Telephone interviews were conducted with 512 Wisconsin and Colorado voters to determine their reactions to political television advertisements during the 1970 gubernatorial campaigns.

After evaluating these interviews the researchers concluded that: 1) individual exposure is related to the amount of advertisements. 2) that the quality of the characterized political advertisements presented is more important in influencing a voter than is the quantity of the advertisements presented. They found that exposure does not equate with interest. In the elections studied, the candidates with the greatest number of spot advertisements concentrated mainly on projecting "images" of themselves, while their opponents concentrated on presenting issues in the television spot advertisements. They
evaluated the advertisement's quality in terms of two criteria: 1) the amount of information a person learned. 2) the entertainment or boredom value of the individual advertisement.

Despite the limited research in this area, the amount of attention given to it by political observers and media critics indicates that it is socially significant. It has even managed to arouse the interest of the general public. Evidence for this can be seen in the wide popularity of books such as those of Marshall McLuhan and Joe McGinnis' best seller, The Selling of the President, 1968.

This study's respondents indicated a higher belief in the power of the media to influence voters than current research studies tend to support.

This research will also focus on the question of quantity versus quality. But unlike Bowen's research, which only tapped two variables, it uses five variables to determine the "quality" of a television spot advertisement. Like the Bowen study, it mainly relies on a telephone survey for learning voter's intentions. The research was conducted during the June Democratic primary in California. The Democratic Primary was selected for its competitive aspects. Nixon was almost a sure winner for the Republican nomination and consequently received little, if any competition.

Relying solely on the use of the media by the
Democratic candidates helped to exclude party prejudices. Since the phone interviews reached members of both parties, it was interesting to see what effect Democratic political advertisements had on Republicans, who should tend to be less interested in the Democratic campaign and not as suspect to Democratic party loyalties or cross-pressures and preferences within the party. They were able to give a more accurate opinion as to the quality of political advertisements.

**MAJOR CONCEPTS**

The Bowen study used one criterion for determining exposure—"which candidate's commercials have you seen more of?" They correlated this with the amount of advertising the candidate actually did to show that an individual's exposure is related to the amount of advertising. This study used a similar method for determining the amount of exposure to the different candidate's advertisements. It also controlled for newspapers and other media advertisements by questions asking if these media were used and where the respondents got their information. It should be noted that an image need not be projected only on television, so a content analysis was used to determine if all of a candidate's advertisements tended to project the same image.

All available newspaper advertisements and political handouts of each candidate were examined, and a content
analysis was made. The analysis focused on specific campaign issues, e.g., unemployment, and the candidates' stand on it. Since obviously no candidate was going to come out in favor of unemployment, some scaling of it as an issue had to be used, such as a simple dichotomy to determine: 1) if the candidate raised the issue, 2) if he had specific plans on policy relating to the issue.

A similar content analysis of each candidate's speeches as reported in the *Los Angeles Times* for 30 days prior to the election was also used to determine the occurrence of item references to the issues and specific plans on policies they may have in regard to the issues. It was predicted that the candidate who has the highest score on the content analysis would have the higher quality advertisements as judged by the respondents. However, it did not necessarily have (and did not) to occur this way due to the other characteristic used to objectively define a quality advertisement, such as the stimulation or entertainment value of the advertisement.

As was previously mentioned, the Bowen study used two variables to determine quality of spot advertisements. This study used five. These included the ability of the advertisement: 1) to inform or pass on information, 2) to entertain the viewer, 3) to motivate the viewer to vote, 4) to stimulate voters to think about issues or find out more about them, 5) to create dislike for the candi-
date because of his image or position on an issue.

The quality of an advertisement was defined in terms of how it measured up to these characteristics. A Likert response scale was used. Each respondent was asked if a specific advertisement did each of the above to him. Positive answers on the first four criteria above added together and a negative answer to the fifth would yield the highest possible quality rating. The respondent was asked questions such as, "Do you find Humphrey's advertisements very informative, somewhat informative, about average, slightly informative, not very informative." The results were then tabulated using a five point scale (see question schedule).³ After totaling the responses for all candidates, the advertisements with the highest number of positive marks was considered of highest quality. The advertisement which the respondent disliked the most was given a negative mark which could be cancelled out by a positive mark.

From the above, it would appear that the advertisement that gives the voter the most information, is entertaining and can stimulate him to some action without projecting negative images and issues is the highest quality spot advertisement.

Using the criteria of the amount of information learned and the entertainment value of an advertisement as the sole criterion for determining the quality of an
advertisement level leaves out of consideration other things that a good advertisement can do. These advertisements are designed to get people to vote, so how effective they are at motivating people to vote should be considered in determining their quality. Since the amount of information is limited and since information is considered important enough to be used as a variable, the ability of an advertisement to stimulate one to seek more information was judged important enough to be considered a separate variable. Every advertisement has the potential of alienating voters, just as it does of persuading them. Therefore some consideration of an advertisement's alienating potential should be made. For these reasons the five criteria outlined above for determining an advertisement's quality were used in this study.

THEORETICAL INTERPRETATION

This research, and Bowen's study to a lesser degree, is based on the belief that spot advertisements that convey more information to voters will not be used by candidates who are "packaged" or who are only concerned with projecting the "proper image." These candidates would not want to include substantive information in their advertisements and they would not want to stimulate the voters to find out more about an issue, since such a candidate would avoid taking stands on issues as much as possible.

If this were true, it follows that the candidate who
has the higher quality advertisements as defined by the content analysis will be the candidate who used images the least, in a two-way election. It may be true, but does not necessarily follow, that the candidate with the highest quality advertisements will rely least on his image.

Several correlations were made with the data gathered from the telephone survey. Among them were the following: 1) the respondent's level of attention to a candidate with the perceived entertainment value. 2) level of attention a respondent pays to a candidate's advertisements with the information value he places on it. 3) level of motivation reported with the amount of attention paid to the advertisements. 4) level of motivation from advertisements with perceived level of interest. When the data were collected and these correlations were made some interesting patterns emerged.

Correlations between the respondent's judgment of the "best" advertisement and his socio-economic level were also made. These were used to test the hypothesis that the "lower socio-economic-educational status respondents will prefer the image candidates advertisements." The reasoning behind this hypothesis is that the voter with a lower educational level would tend to prefer the simpler messages which would require less concentration. The lower socio-economic status group may also be less
concerned in general with the election and would tend to
demonstrate this with a lower interest in the campaign
and the entire electoral process. The lower socio-
economic person may not see his economic and social well-
being as directly related to the election.

However such a generalization need not hold true in
respondent's answers to all questions. For example, a
less interested and perhaps less educated person may find
a given candidate's advertisement more informative than
other respondents because the advertisements are his only
(or at least his primary) source of information on the
candidate's stands. With this in mind, a minor hypothesis
that "the respondent with the lower educational level will
find the advertisement more informative than the high
educational level respondents find them" is in order.

Other hypotheses that will be tested include the
following:

1) The greater the information value a respondent
places on a candidate's advertisement the greater
attention he pays to it.

2) The entertainment value of an advertisement
corresponds positively with the information value of
that advertisement as perceived by the individual.

3) The level of motivation a respondent reports
will correspond positively with his level of attention.

4) The level of motivation a respondent reports
will correspond positively with his intention to vote.

5) The degree of intellectual stimulation caused by the advertisements corresponds positively with the level of interest produced.

6) The level of attention a respondent pays to a candidate's advertisement corresponds positively with information value.

Because of the limited amount of research in the area this study will be exploratory in nature in that it will use hypotheses more to guide it in its research than to establish irrefutable findings.

To test the general utility of this study in supporting the underlying purpose of gathering additional information on the role of images in the electoral process, and more specifically in the 1972 California Democratic Primary, the null hypothesis is "There will be no difference in the impact produced by commercials of high and low information content." Since the information gathered from the respondents reflects only their perceptions of certain qualities of advertisements, a simple content analysis was used to test whether the respondents correctly perceived which candidate actually did speak more on issues.

The results of the content analysis were compared to see if the respondents labeled the candidate they told as the one who "informs them the most" is the one who actually put forth more issues in his advertisements and speeches.
Of course validity depends on operational definitions of issues. To do this, the advertisements were analyzed in terms of how frequently a candidate actually took stands on issues. Then the candidate who took the most stands on issues in his advertisements, as shown from the simple content analysis, was compared to the one the respondents believed to have the highest quality advertisement. As indicated previously the "highest quality" advertisement as here defined contains more information on a candidate's stand and encourages the voter to seek out more information on the issues, while not alienating the voter.

To reject the null hypothesis, the respondent must show that there is a strong positive correlation between information value of an advertisement and the other desirable qualities such as information value and entertainment value of it as perceived by the public.

If the survey results reject this hypothesis by showing that respondents favor the high quality (and high issue-oriented) spot advertisements, then at least it can be shown that issues are important in spot television advertisements—rejecting the popular assumption. The victory of the candidate using quality advertisements would also tend to reject the hypothesis. However, it does not follow that it is necessary to have the highest quality advertisements to win an election. Other factors, such as political or partisan loyalties, also play a role.
If the low quality or image candidate wins, as would be the case if the candidate perceived by the respondents as having low quality, high image advertisements actually has the more issue-oriented advertisements, and the null hypothesis is not rejected, this study would lend support to the fears expressed by political scientists and popular critics.

METHODOLOGY

The basis of this research was 300 telephone interviews throughout the greater Los Angeles area just prior to the Democratic primary election on June 6. The pretest included a similar telephone survey of 80 calls and was conducted in the San Fernando Valley one week prior to the election. In addition to testing the questionnaire and interview schedule, this provided a base to compare late election opinions with earlier opinions in an attempt to see if there was a greater proportional change in opinion formation late in the campaign.

The major survey was conducted between Sunday, June 4, and Monday, June 5. The election was held on June 6. The universe was clustered and the basis of this cluster sample was the proportional political and socio-economic composition of the different communities in the Los Angeles area. For example, an area like Beverly Hills was proportionally weighted on the basis of its population size and relation to the demographic population.
characteristics of the greater Los Angeles area.

1970 U.S. Census tract records and recent voting records which are available from Dr. Philip Present, associate professor of Political Science at California State University, Northridge, were the basis for determining the proportional representation of the cluster sample. Once the number of residents from a community was determined, they were drawn randomly from the San Fernando Valley telephone subscribers list. This was done by first isolating the area by telephone prefix, (e.g. 899- for Pacoima-Arleta) and then randomly calling numbers from the other four digits. Although this method did not allow for as great an isolation of clusters as the telephone directory does it prevents the cultural bias inherent when sur-names are randomly drawn from the same page in a telephone directory.

Code sheets and a coding schedule were used to tabulate this data. Fortunately, as will be shown later, most open ended responses were short and closely related, falling in only a few classifications. The survey responses were transferred to IBM cards for easier handling and processing.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE
There is an abundance of literature available on how the mass media affect the voter. In the last decade, the way in which television affects the voter has become the subject of several popular books and how political strategists manipulate television and other mass media to present the most favorable image of their candidate has been the theme of several best sellers. Among these is Theodore H. White's, *The Making of the President 1960*. In this early work, White's discussion on the role of images focuses mainly around how they were significant in the Nixon-Kennedy television debates. He points out the problem Nixon had with make-up and even how his appearance may have been affected by the pain he was suffering as a result of his hitting his knee on an automobile door just prior to entering the studio. White states that Kennedy's more relaxed delivery and his addressing himself to the audience, as opposed to Nixon's more hurried speech and his tailoring his remarks to be responses to Kennedy's resulted in Kennedy projecting a more youthful and positive image to the audience.

White also indicated that the "fairness doctrine" aided in causing the replacement of the telethon with the spot commercial. He said, "...from 1952-60 television could be used only as an expensive instrument, its time had to be bought and paid for by political parties for their candidates." After finding they could get more
results for their money on spot advertisements, they were forced to abandon the longer, more informative, telethons. Consequently, by allowing the use of television without the equal time requirements, the fairness doctrine helped bring about the dominance of the spot commercial.

Rosser Reeves, Chairman of the Board of Ted Bates and Company, and the one responsible for writing Eisenhower's spot television ads in his 1952 campaign, was the first to introduce the concept of electorate penetration through the use of the television spot advertisement. Reeves claimed spot advertisements were ideally suited for political candidates because they could reach uncommitted and opposite-party voters who would not watch the longer telethons, but simply could not avoid the shorter spot advertisements that are interspersed between their television shows. He claimed the low cost-per-thousand exposure potential of spot advertisements made them a better investment for political candidates.

Despite the advantages of reach potential and cost, Reeves experienced opposition to the acceptance of the spot advertisement. To support his position he conducted a research survey which showed that less than 10 per cent of the voters sampled recalled content from Stevenson or MacArthur's speech, but over 90 per cent could recall the content of Eisenhower's spot advertisement.

An account of Reeves' contribution to the evolution
of the spot advertisement may be found in Martin Mayer's, Madison Avenue U.S.A. 7.

The extent to which politicians have mastered the art of using the spot advertisement to portray the best possible image of themselves was shown by Joe McGinnis in The Selling of the President 1968. McGinnis 8 outlines some of the steps, such as practicing making low pressure deliveries and improving his theatrical make-up, Nixon took to improve his television image. McGinnis also shows how the Nixon camp produced different spot advertisements for different regions of the country in an effort to localize his image for the audience he was trying to reach.

Hal Evry, in his book The Selling of a Candidate 9 claimed that, in effect, politics in the traditional sense is dead. He stated that political party machines and old party hacks are a thing of the past. Evry claims that television has replaced all these by enabling the candidate to be presented directly to the people. He believes that the average voter has a low degree of political sophistication, and consequently appeals that last for more than a minute are "tuned out." He also claims that for every issue on which a candidate takes a stand, he alienates a certain number of voters and the more he openly takes stands on issues, the more voters he alienates. Consequently he encourages candidates to avoid at all costs taking direct stands on issues.
To prevent his clients from being forced into taking stands on issues, he prohibits them (unless under special circumstances) from making public appearances. Instead, he prefers to use the media for portraying the proper image of his candidate through the use of planned news events and spot commercials. He would define the proper image of a candidate as the one which will appeal to the most voters while alienating as few as possible.

Marshall McLuhan also thinks that the nature of television has changed the political scene drastically. He claims not only that television has removed politics from the "smoke filled rooms" and put it in front of the people, but also that the very nature of this new medium itself has caused a change in politics. He claims that persons who project a "hot" image will not come across well on a "cool" medium like television.

A "hot" image, according to McLuhan is one where the character is too well defined, leaving nothing to the viewer's imagination. This would be a characteristic of the issue-oriented candidate. "Cool" candidates would be less well defined and much better suited for the medium of television, according to McLuhan. This type of candidate would rely more on his image, and any reference to issues would be vague, allowing the viewer to "fill in" his perception of the issues. McLuhan claims the Nixon-Kennedy election was an example of what happens when a
"hot" candidate, Nixon, confronts a "cool" candidate, Kennedy.

Robert MacNeils' *The People Machine* tells something of how television and the need to portray the proper image has changed politics. In showing that television may have restricted politics to younger men, he quotes Barry Goldwater saying that it is the cause for "...the end of older-looking men being elected to national office." ¹¹

Joe Napolitan was the first to question the issue of quality versus quantity in political advertising. ¹² He claims that most politicians will not spend the necessary money to produce a quality advertisement. He says instead they prefer to spend their money on program time. He claims that such a policy is a bad investment. ¹³ Although Napolitan did not specifically define "quality" he indicates that longer, more fact-filled advertisements are of a higher "quality". ¹⁴

To this point all the literature reviewed described the problems of television spot commercials and the role of images as they now exist or as they have evolved. There was no mention of methodology above because the writers themselves used no research methodology in gathering their information. They were instead describing the situation. The few methodological studies done in this area offer a much less omniscient view of the powers of television, the passivity of the voter and
role of the image itself.

Angus Campbell et. al. in *The American Voter*\(^\text{15}\) have shown that there are several mediating factors, still in existence since the coming of television, that influence the voter's reaction to any candidate on campaign propaganda. Among these are the voter's party affiliation, religion, age, sex, socio-economic status and geographical region. They discovered that voters will go to great lengths (such as purposely misperceiving his candidate's stand on an issue) so they can reconcile their party's candidate's views with his own views on a salient issue.

The findings in the *American Voter* were the results of extensive national survey research conducted by the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, from 1952 to 1958. The material for the 1952 and 1956 presidential election was drawn from the survey research center's national sample of 2,500 people.

Although not directly related to images and quality advertisements, the "band wagon effect" has been of concern to many political observers, since an unforeseen band wagon effect could throw off the results of any election study. Fears that early Eastern reports of predicted winners might influence Western voters (due to the time difference) to "get on the band wagon" and vote for the winning candidate led Douglas A. Fuchs\(^\text{16}\) to study
the effect early election reports had on Western voters.

By conducting a survey of 900 voters each in Alameda and Orange Counties in California and in Seattle, Washington, with another 900 control group in East Lansing, Michigan, he found that early election results had no measurable effect on either voter turn out or change from planned voting intention in the 1964 Presidential Election.17

He did caution that, even though he could not measure a significant difference, in close elections early election predictions could make a difference. He cites the 1964 Nevada Senatorial Election as an example. In that race Democrat Howard Cannon defeated Republican Paul Lazalt by 48. If only 8 out of 10,000 people stayed away due to the "band wagon effect" or any other reason, the election results could have been changed.18

Angus Campbell is skeptical of those who claim that television has greatly changed the political scene. In an article in the Columbia Journalism Review19 he claimed that television has not caused such a great change to politics because when it came into predominance, the public was already saturated with political information from radio and newspapers. He said:

There was no new frontier for further penetration of the mass media when television appeared in the late 1940's. At that time 90 percent of the population reported listening to the radio and
80 percent read the daily newspaper.\textsuperscript{20} Campbell also said "radio must have contacted many who were beyond the reach of the print media,"\textsuperscript{21} and "the arrival of radio was followed by a great increase in turn out at elections, the arrival of television was not."\textsuperscript{22} He claims television did not bring about the revolutionary changes people thought it would.

Kurt Lang and Gladys Lang\textsuperscript{23} bring up a point that should be given cautious consideration when evaluating the results of any of their studies. They claim that voting influence takes place over a period of time, not on the basis of just one campaign.\textsuperscript{24} They base this contention on the fact that most studies involving the effect of the media on the political process concern themselves with only a given election, while the majority of the factors which influence a voter's decision are occurring throughout his life. So, consequently, any study which measures the effect the media has on his voting in a given election, would fail to determine the media's effect on the factors, such as class identity, which may have a greater overall influence on his voting.

Harold Mendelsohn and Irving Crespi, in their book, \textit{Polls, Television and the New Politics}, are cognizant of the problems of television spot advertising and how it affects politics. The only research performed by them was done by Crespi.\textsuperscript{25} This was the inclusion of a few
questions that were designed to show how television has served to change the attitudes of the electorate on certain issues such as the possibility of a Black Presidential candidate. In this book the authors concerned themselves mainly with explaining the problems of the replacement of issues with images, and suggested that legislation be enacted to limit expenditures for spot advertisements and to provide equal free time for informative political shows.

The most significant research in this area was the previously cited study by Lawrence Bowen et al. on "How Voters React to Electronic Political Advertising: An Investigation of the 1970 Election Campaigns in Wisconsin and Colorado." Besides adding additional variables to the Bowen selections, this study will also look to the print media as a basis for further analysis of the content of the candidates political advertisement to help determine which candidate is the more issue-oriented and which is the more image-oriented.
CHAPTER III

THE ELECTION AND THE ADVERTISEMENTS
One problem with the Bowen study laid in its failure to adequately describe the content of the political spot advertisement. Considering the nature of spot advertisements (specifically their brevity and the dramatics involved) this is understandable. Any content analysis that tried to systematically compare the content of political spot advertisements would be a horrendous task and any generalization based on such an analysis alone, would be of tenuous value. Using reference to issues and campaign stands as a criteria runs one into the problem of the advertisement's time limitation. The 30- and 60-second spots do not allow one to tell if the candidate really intends to speak out on the issues because the time limit prevents him from doing this even if he wanted to. In this campaign all of the spot advertisements of both candidates referred to a single issue in each advertisement.

Nor would analyzing the candidate's position as presented in that advertisement be of much value, since (due to time limitation) they may be forced to tailor their statements to either fit the advertisement or only make statements which leave no questions in the voters mind and at the advertisement. If the latter is the case, then complex issues or statements requiring explanations would have to be avoided.

An extremely valuable content analysis of a televis-
ion spot advertisement would be one that could analyze the candidate's physical or dramatic appeal to the audience—specifically how sincere, honest, enthusiastic and trustworthy he appears to be. But presently measuring these qualities of an advertisement requires subjective judgments, which in the past have been left to non-social scientific critics such as White, McLuhan, McGinnis and Evry.

Consequently the social scientist has been forced to ask the audience how they perceived the candidate's advertisement. Such an approach was the basis of Bowen's study and is the justification for this survey.

In an effort to go beyond perceptual data in evaluating a candidate's advertisement in terms of quality, a content analysis was necessary. Since the content of spot advertisements proved to be relatively immeasurable, the content of other forms of political advertising had to be evaluated to determine the quality of a candidate's advertising in terms of images presented. One assumption made earlier is that a candidate's image can be projected in the print media. Through proper lay-out, design and wording one should be able to influence the image he projects. One look at the commercial products advertisements in any popular magazine will demonstrate this. Although McLuhan\(^7\) and others point out the limitations in presenting images in the print media, it does not
necessarily follow that these images cannot be projected. And if reference to issues and campaign stands are measured, some indication of which candidate is more the "image" candidate and which relies more on issues can be obtained from such a content analysis. However, the content analysis in this study served as a means to compare the respondent's perception of which candidate's advertisements were more image-oriented with who the content analysis revealed as being the more issue-oriented candidate.

One problem that exists in analyzing the candidate's paid messages in the print media is that of identifying the source of these advertisements. Because of the relatively low cost of the print media, different groups such as the Valley Lawyers for McGovern \(^{28}\) or Asian Americans for McGovern \(^{29}\) purchased newspaper advertisements endorsing the candidate of their choice. If these groups do this totally independently of the candidate's general campaign management, then their content may not be indicative of the candidate's overall campaign strategy. Consequently an analysis of their content would not truly reflect the candidate's advertising strategy or lend information for determining which candidate was truly the image candidate.

Despite these limitations these types of advertisements were incorporated into the content analysis, the
justification being that both candidates had advertisements of this nature. And it is impossible to tell if an individual advertisement by a group was not first "planted" or at least cleared through campaign headquarters. Ultimately these groups should be registered with the California Secretary of State, but at the present time information as to the amount of advertising expenditures of the different candidates or the source of these funds is not available. However, newspaper stories indicated that in electronic advertising, McGovern outspent Humphrey by a considerable margin. On Los Angeles network stations, he spent from $2 to 7 times more than Humphrey for television time. It must be noted that some of McGovern's commercial time was for segments longer than the customary 30- and 60-second spots. This pattern remained true even during the general election.

One reason for this, according to Jack Easton, who was director of public relations for Nixon in California during the 1972 election, was the availability of these 15 and 30 minute slots at substantially reduced rates. The television networks were somewhat concerned with the growing pressures to provide free access to national candidates, so they offered attractive greatly reduced rates to encourage enough use of the longer time slots to counter any attempts at either regulating spot advertisements or requiring free use of the stations according to
Easton.

As of the Sunday prior to the election, McGovern spent $62,591 for time on KNXT-TV, while Humphrey spent $23,877 on that station. On KABC McGovern spent $32,104 while Humphrey spent $4,991. On KNBC McGovern spent $37,578 while Humphrey spent $9,267. Eli Segal, who managed McGovern's campaign estimated that McGovern spent $460,000 on television for the California primary. The California Democratic Headquarters reported that McGovern spent approximately $1,500,000 on the California primary, and that Humphrey spent $800,000. No figures as to the breakdown of these expenses were available at that time. Even when such information becomes available it is doubtful if it will be detailed enough to be of significant use for linking individual advertisements with the candidate's campaign management. All the advertisements in the newspapers surveyed were endorsed by some groups.

In general these independent group advertisements for both candidates were more in the form of endorsements and only vaguely referred to the issues. The principal exception to this is the large amount, both in number and size, of advertisements for Humphrey by California Working Families for Humphrey. When the information is available this "group" will probably prove to be only a name used to endorse advertisements placed directly by Humphrey. Their advertisements were extremely issue-oriented.
In analyzing the content of both the candidate's speeches and their advertisements the same criteria were utilized. The criteria for determining when a candidate brings out an issue are as follows:

1. Whenever he refers to a specific stand he has taken in the past. Also his support or opposition to any past or pending legislation, program or policy.

2. Any specific plan, program or proposal that he made to inaugurate or support.

Examples would be Humphrey's reference to his support for the original Medicare bill and McGovern's proposal of a guaranteed annual income of $1,000 per person.

This coding scheme was specifically designed to exclude the generally vague statements such as "I believe every American who wants to work should have an opportunity to work," on the belief that a general statement like the above does not refer to any specific stand or proposal open to debate and would be characteristic of the non-committal type of statements that an image candidate would make. For example, one of McGovern's advertisements in June 2, 1972 Los Angeles Times placed by Religious Leaders for McGovern stated, "The war, racism, poverty, economic injustice, support for Israel," because we believe in the issues we support Senator George McGovern. In the June 5, 1972 issue of the Los Angeles Times, supporters claimed "Senator George McGovern brings a new
purpose to the role of President." Such statements, while mentioning significant issues, did not give an indication of the candidates' stand on them and hence were not counted in the content analysis.

It must be noted that both candidates made this type of statement and thus one reason why it was decided to base the content analysis on frequency of issues presented rather than on total number of noncommittal statements was due to the fact that the latter would prove to be more a function of advertising expenditures or exposure than the former.

A separate tally was kept for speeches and advertisements. Each time a candidate either spoke on or had a newspaper advertisement on a specific issue as outlined above he was given one point on the appropriate tally sheet. Each time he spoke of or referred to his opponent's position in advertisements on a specific issue he was given one half point. The rationale behind this is that speaking out unfavorably about a specific issue gave the public some indication of his views on that issue and showed the candidate's willingness to bring the issue before the public.

An analysis of one month's speeches of each candidate (May 6 through June 6, 1972) as reported in the Los Angeles Times showed some interesting results. This category included each time the candidate made remarks to
CONTENT ANALYSIS

TABLE I

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Humphrey</th>
<th>McGovern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Newspaper Advertisements</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Referred to</td>
<td>131\frac{1}{2}</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Advertising Column Inches</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
any group, such as McGovern talking to a Chicano community center, which were recorded in the newspaper. The responses were broken down into six categories depending upon their content. The categories are as follows: 1) Economic 2) Environment 3) Civil Rights 4) Vietnam and Defense 5) Welfare 6) Other (not covered by the above categories).

Remarks on Vietnam and Defense were necessarily grouped together because some of the candidate's statements could not be separated adequately to fit entirely into one or the other of these categories. In the case of Economic and Welfare there was a clear enough delineation. "Economic" covered references to unemployment, under-employment, balance of payment, stagnant economy and inflation, while "Welfare" referred to welfare payment, guaranteed income, medical and retirement benefits.

Table 2 shows how often the candidates scored on the different issues in accordance with the content analysis. Humphrey spoke out significantly more than McGovern on Economic, Civil Rights, Vietnam and National Defense while McGovern spoke out more on Environment, Welfare and other issues.

It should be noted that McGovern's 4½ points on National Defense were concentrated mainly on anti-Vietnam war remarks and that the period covered by the survey was after the public appraisal of the mining of Haiphong Harbor had settled down. Also some of McGovern's defense
proposals were listed under Economic because they were more construed to be economic statements (e.g. explanation of how planned civil programs could be funded with savings from defense cutbacks) than a position on National Defense.

In total, Humphrey scored 42, McGovern 32½ on the content analysis of their speeches. This would give Humphrey a significant edge as being the candidate who spoke out on the issues although McGovern's score in this area is high enough to substantiate that he certainly did not avoid speaking out on the campaign issues.

In newspaper advertising the situation was considerably different. In examining the political advertisements that appeared in the Los Angeles Times and the Van Nuys News and Green Sheet during this similar period Humphrey had the only advertisements that took a stand on the issues. Using the same criteria for judging an advertisement's issue content that was used for rating the speeches, Humphrey's newspaper advertisements scored 13½ while McGovern failed to score anything in the five advertisements placed in the Los Angeles Times alone, Humphrey scored 73½. Some of those advertisements were full-page and listed Humphrey's position on several campaign issues or full-page advertisements in which half the page listed Humphrey's position on issues and the other half listed McGovern's positions. It should be noted that these one-page advertisements were selective in the issues they
listed in that Humphrey did not even list Vietnam as an issue.

McGovern's newspaper advertisements had several things in common. They were fewer in number, usually smaller, and although allegedly placed by diversified groups (e.g. Valley Lawyers for McGovern) they did not specify any programs or positions on the campaign issues, but merely relied on references to generalized problems such as the South East Asian situation. In effect, many were more endorsements of the candidate by different groups than an actual message from the candidate to the voter.

Table I shows the breakdown of how the newspaper advertisements scored in terms of issue content and total amount of advertising space.

McGovern apparently chose to spend more of his money on the electronic media than on newspaper advertising, while Humphrey preferred to spend more of his more limited funds on newspaper advertisements. This in itself may be due more to the nature of the candidate and his campaign approach than to anything else. Humphrey's reliance on his past record would tend to lend itself better to the print media where he could selectively list his accomplishments. McGovern's apparent emphasis on change and appeals "to the people" may tend to lend themselves more to presentation via the electronic media, especially television.
**CONTENT ANALYSIS**

**TABLE 2**

**ISSUES REFERRED TO IN SPEECHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Humphrey</th>
<th>McGovern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>21½</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam-Defense</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an analysis of political handouts, Humphrey again scored higher than McGovern. When the same content analysis scheme was utilized, both candidate's handouts had a relatively high message content. Both candidate's handouts differed widely in how informative they were on the issues. For example, some of McGovern's said essentially no more than "McGovern, He was Right from the Start," while, another, on the Black Community, listed 13 positions on which he positively took a stand. Apparently, both candidates planned separate handouts to distribute to the different demographic areas.

One problem with utilizing an analysis of political handouts in a content analysis lies with the problem of assuring that the handouts studied are actually being produced by the candidate or his staff. Since many of these handouts are only dittoed or mimeographed copies, and almost everyone has access to this type of equipment, any small group could produce their own independent handouts for the candidate of their choice. Since the candidate has no control over their content, the inclusion of these in this content analysis was avoided. This was accomplished by only including campaign handouts in the content analysis which were obtained directly from the candidate's campaign headquarters. This proved to be a wise move in that a spot comparison of handouts obtained from the campus of California State University, Northridge
and Los Angeles Valley College revealed that many were available on the campuses that were not available at the respective campaign headquarters, and in the case of McGovern, some went way beyond the candidate's campaign promises (e.g. one mimeographed sheet claimed McGovern would spend $50 billion dollars annually on education.)

McGovern put out a total of 22 political handouts from his headquarters. Applying the same rating scale that was used in the previous content analysis, McGovern's rated 63.5 points, with a 2.90 average, while Humphrey put out a total of 17 handouts that scored 116.5 points for an average of 6.85. Table 3 summarizes this information.

In reviewing these handouts, it appears that this method of content analysis gives a candidate like Humphrey, with his considerably longer experience in the U.S. Senate, a definite advantage in that he may merely list all the favorable pieces of legislation he supported and ride along on any favorable impressions they may have created.

For a candidate to state a new position on an issue would probably require more space and the candidate would probably not have as much chance to determine the possible alienating effects that this position would have on the voters. Using one's support on a past bill may be easier to gauge in terms of alienation potential that the bill has already been exposed and tested in terms of public acceptance.
TABLE 3

Content Analysis of POLITICAL HANDOUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Issue Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Handouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue score was based on the total score for the number of issues referred to. Each time a specific stance was taken in an advertisement, a +1 score was assigned. Each time a negative issue concerning the opponent or his stand was mentioned, a +\( \frac{1}{2} \) was added. The total yielded the issue score for each candidate.
On the other hand some of Humphrey's past positions were not too popular, either when he took them, or today, such as his support of the Lockheed Loan or the space shuttle and to include them as he did, deserves credit in terms of issue orientations.

Probably the biggest advantage in this area lies in that it is easier to list a favorable past position than to explain a new one. This may be part of the reason McGovern chose to concentrate more of his efforts on the electronic media.

Having less money to spend and a longer record on which to run, Humphrey's television advertisements emphasized his record on the issues. In this way they were similar in content to his newspaper ads. One recurring theme in his ads was the unemployment situation, especially with reference to the aerospace situation in California. One typical ad spoke of his support for aerospace in the past and of his vote for the Lockheed loan. Humphrey's more limited funds may have prevented him from having ads as well constructed as McGovern.

McGovern's ads had one common characteristic—he was most often talking with a group of people, such as senior citizens or union members. He would outline his proposal in a sort of "off the cuff remark" such as, "I've always figured that if a person wants to work, he should have the chance to---." Then he would answer informal questions
from the group. In this respect, McGovern's ads seemed to be non-political in nature. Rather than being on a platform talking, he would be among a group, directing himself to one individual, or at most a small group. One could get the impression that he was simply one of the group, e.g. union member, who had some good ideas as to how to improve their lot. Perhaps this approach was at least partially motivated by his attempt to remove the radical stigma thought to be in the minds of many.

Both candidates' television ads seemed to cover the issues about equally. Each advertisement was generally addressed to one issue.
CHAPTER IV

SURVEY
In the opinion survey, respondents were selected from a cluster in the greater Los Angeles area. Rough demographics from the U.S. census tract were compared for districts; this was initially planned for breaking down the universe by some type of demographic cluster samples, but when census tracts were compared, the relative desired information on age, education, etc. was too close in most cases to adequately distinguish one census tract from another. Even if there were significant demographic differences in census tracts, these census tracts could not be adequately correlated with telephone prefixes that were selected for inclusion in the sample.

What can be gained by the clustering of prefixes is reducing the possibility of obtaining a disproportionate representation from the demographically extreme communities such as Watts and Beverly Hills. These areas were represented as adequately as possible on the basis of population, in comparison to the population of the greater Los Angeles area. Phone maps giving prefixes in different areas were compared, with rough demographics in these areas. Prefixes were selected randomly from the maps in the different areas, on the basis of the population of the area in comparison with the population of the greater Los Angeles area.

Calls were then based on the number assigned to different areas. The remaining four digits of the tele-
phone numbers were obtained by using a table of random numbers. Appendix 11 gives information on the clusters.

Using this method of selection offers two advantages over the use of selecting people by any system using a telephone directory. First off, it greatly reduces the chance of a cultural bias due to surnames, which often crop up when a directory is utilized. Secondly, it reaches the large portion of non-listed numbers that would be excluded if a telephone directory were used. Another reason for using this technique is that Los Angeles has one of the highest percentage of unlisted telephone numbers in the country.

According to Pacific Telephone only 65 percent of the Los Angeles telephone numbers are listed in the directory. Since 92.9 of the Los Angeles homes have telephones, using this technique significantly increased the chance of reaching a portion of the universe that would be excluded if the sample were drawn from the telephone directories. The principle drawback to randomly selecting numbers is the large amount of disconnections, or business numbers one reaches. In some highly mobile areas, such as West Los Angeles every third call was a disconnected number (due to the crudeness of the clustering method outlined above, no further breakdown of the responses by areas was attempted).

The cluster, at best, provided less chance of a biased
**TABLE 4**

Respondents Opinions Concerning Effectiveness of Various Methods of Disseminating Campaign Information to Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Item</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From your experience, how effective are these methods of informing the voters?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Appearances</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertising</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Door Canvassing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Commercials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Billboards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Documentaries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Telethons</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information From Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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sample and a greater chance of more accurate representation than simple random selection would have. The survey was pre-tested during the final week in May just prior to the election on some 80 respondents in the San Fernando Valley. These responses were selected in the same manner as the other later respondents. During the pre-trial survey, it was found that one question, with its multiple responses, almost doubled the time of the survey, and consequently was dropped about half way through the pre-test survey after respondents began complaining that the interview took too long. Table 4 gives the multi-staged question and the responses received. Due to the small number of responses, no attempt at analyzing the data was made.

In further comparing the results on the remaining question of the pre-test with the final survey, it was discovered that no statistically significant difference in these sets of responses existed which would indicate any late shifts in voter preferences. As a result, both sets were combined for purposes of testing the hypotheses. This can be justified on the basis that all questions were the same, except for the deleted one. The only difference among the respondents would be that those on the pre-test were patient enough to wait through long interviews of approximately ten minutes, while those on the final survey had interviews lasting approximately five minutes. All respondents in both surveys were advised that the inter-
view would take about five minutes.

When the median score of both candidates on information, entertainment, stimulation, and motivation were added and the median score for alienation was subtracted, the candidate with the highest score was declared the candidate with the highest quality advertisements. McGovern had the higher median score and hence had the higher quality advertisements in terms of the criteria previously outlined. Tables 5-10 represent the questions asked respondents, and the respective answers. In total, Humphrey's advertisements were considered slightly more entertaining and informative than McGovern's while McGovern's were considered more motivating and stimulating. The five criteria earlier outlined for determining a quality advertisement are shown in Tables 5-10. Table 11 summarizes this data. From these one may find that what hurt Humphrey in terms of respondent's perception of a quality advertisement, were the alienating effects of his advertisements. His advertisements had a median alienation score of nearly twice McGovern's. Surprisingly enough, many people who favored Humphrey still found his advertisements alienating.

Since Humphrey, according to the content analysis in Chapter 3, had the higher issue orientation in his advertisements, it would follow that for the null hypotheses of "there will be no difference in the impact produced by commercials of high and low information content" to be
rejected, he would also have to have the highest quality advertisements. But since McGovern's advertisements rated higher in quality, it follows that the null hypothesis was not rejected. Failing to reject the null hypothesis does not necessarily invalidate the remainder of this study. It does however indicate that the information level of an advertisement is not related to the other measures of quality. Since the candidate with the greater issue oriented advertisement as operationally defined was not the one whom the respondents rated as being the candidate with the highest quality advertisements defined in terms of the criteria previously outlined. All of the minor hypotheses tested except one showed the positive correlation predicted, and most of these correlations proved significant.33 The first minor hypothesis, that there will be a positive correlation between the amount of information value a respondent places on a candidate's advertisement, and the amount of attention he pays to it, provide an overall positive correlation of +.12. Although this is not significant in itself, it is in the same direction as the other predicted correlations. On this issue, those who were questioned concerning McGovern's advertisements did perceive a significant positive correlation of .36 between information value of his advertisements and attention paid to them. Humphrey registered a .03 negative correlation on this question.
**TABLE 5**

Relative Information in Advertisements

As Perceived by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Level</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Informative</td>
<td>25% (n=46)</td>
<td>18% (n=36)</td>
<td>22% (n=82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat Informative</td>
<td>17% (n=31)</td>
<td>19% (n=37)</td>
<td>18% (n=68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. About Average</td>
<td>10% (n=18)</td>
<td>35% (n=68)</td>
<td>23% (n=86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slightly Informative</td>
<td>31% (n=57)</td>
<td>11% (n=22)</td>
<td>21% (n=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not Very Informative</td>
<td>17% (n=31)</td>
<td>17% (n=23)</td>
<td>17% (n=64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n=183)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=379)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Information Level*  
2.75  
2.90  
2.84

Interview Item

"Some political advertisements tell more about the candidates' stand than others. In this regard would you say the ads are"

*Based on a five point scale, with "very informative" rated 5, and other responses rating 4.3...respectively."
### TABLE 6

Relative Entertainment Value in Advertisements

As Perceived by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entertainment Level</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total (n=380)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Entertaining</td>
<td>40% (n=73)</td>
<td>54% (n=105)</td>
<td>47% (n=178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Entertaining</td>
<td>20% (n=36)</td>
<td>11% (n=22)</td>
<td>15% (n=58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Average</td>
<td>12% (n=21)</td>
<td>10% (n=20)</td>
<td>11% (n=41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Entertaining</td>
<td>12% (n=22)</td>
<td>9% (n=17)</td>
<td>10% (n=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Entertaining</td>
<td>17% (n=32)</td>
<td>16% (n=32)</td>
<td>17% (n=64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Entertaining Level: 2.41, 1.90, 2.17

---

**Interview Item**

"Some advertisements are more entertaining than others. Would you classify these advertisements as"?

*Based on a five point scale, with "very entertaining" rated 5, and other responses rated 4.3...respectively.*
### TABLE 7

Relative Motivation Level in Advertisements

As Perceived by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Motivation</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Motivating</td>
<td>18% (n=33)</td>
<td>30% (n=59)</td>
<td>24% (n=92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat Motivating</td>
<td>16% (n=29)</td>
<td>6% (n=11)</td>
<td>10% (n=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. About Average</td>
<td>23% (n=43)</td>
<td>9% (n=17)</td>
<td>16% (n=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slightly Motivating</td>
<td>17% (n=31)</td>
<td>23% (n=45)</td>
<td>20% (n=76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not at All Motivating</td>
<td>26% (n=48)</td>
<td>33% (n=64)</td>
<td>32% (n=112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Motivation Level*  
3.16 3.27 3.21

---

**Interview Item**

"One goal of a political advertisement is to motivate a person to vote. In this respect do you think these advertisements are"

*Based on a five point scale, with "very motivating" rated 5, and other responses rating 4.3...respectively.*
**TABLE 8**

Relative Stimulating Level in Advertisements

As Perceived by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Stimulation</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Stimulating</td>
<td>16% (n=130)</td>
<td>12% (n=23)</td>
<td>14% (n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat Stimulating</td>
<td>12% (n=23)</td>
<td>17% (n=34)</td>
<td>15% (n=57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. About Average</td>
<td>6% (n=10)</td>
<td>9% (n=18)</td>
<td>7% (n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slightly Stimulating</td>
<td>42% (n=76)</td>
<td>23% (n=44)</td>
<td>31% (n=120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not Very Stimulating</td>
<td>24% (n=45)</td>
<td>39% (n=77)</td>
<td>32% (n=122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Level of Stimulation: 3.5 3.81 3.65

---

**Interview Item**

"Some political advertisements stimulate people to think about campaign issues or seek out other information. Do you think these advertisements are"

*Based on a five point scale, with "very stimulating" rated 5, and other responses rating 4.3...respectively.*
### TABLE 9

Relative Alienating Level in Advertisements

As Perceived by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Alienating</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Alienating</td>
<td>56% (n=103)</td>
<td>11% (n=21)</td>
<td>34% (n=129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat Alienating</td>
<td>7% (n=13)</td>
<td>11% (n=22)</td>
<td>8% (n=32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. About Average</td>
<td>17% (n=31)</td>
<td>13% (n=26)</td>
<td>15% (n=58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slightly Alienating</td>
<td>5% (n=9)</td>
<td>25% (n=49)</td>
<td>14% (n=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not Very Alienating</td>
<td>16% (n=29)</td>
<td>40% (n=78)</td>
<td>28% (n=106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Level of Alienating*  
3.80  2.28  3.06

---

**Interview Item**

"A political advertisement can alienate a voter rather than persuade him. Do you find these advertisements"

*Based on a five point scale, with "very alienating" rated 1, and other responses rating 2,3,4,5, respectively.*
TABLE 10

Relative Likelihood to Vote
As Perceived by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood to Vote Level</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Likely</td>
<td>52% (n=96)</td>
<td>54% (n=107)</td>
<td>54%(n=203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>25% (n=46)</td>
<td>20% (n=40)</td>
<td>23%(n=86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not Very Likely</td>
<td>16% (n=30)</td>
<td>13% (n=25)</td>
<td>14%(n=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Possibly</td>
<td>5% (n=9)</td>
<td>9% (n=17)</td>
<td>7%(n=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Will Not Vote</td>
<td>2% (n=3)</td>
<td>4% (n=7)</td>
<td>4%(n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Likelihood to Vote Level 4.41 4.36 4.39

Interview Item

"How likely is it that you will vote in the primary election?"

*Based on a five point scale, with "very likely" rated 5, and other responses rating 4.3... respectively.
The reason McGovern received a significantly greater positive value between the perceived information of his advertisements and the attention paid to them may be due to the fact that he was the less known of the two candidates and hence voters may have paid more attention to his advertisements because they were learning about the candidate from them.

Since Humphrey was well known to those who favored him, it may logically follow that they would not pay that much attention to his advertisement or that the attention was not related to the amount of information.

The fact that Humphrey's advertisements were rated as being so alienating, even by many of those who favored him, would also help account for this discrepancy. Since people would look with disfavor on an alienating advertisement there viewing it with disfavor could cloud their perception of the advertisement information qualities.

The second minor hypothesis tested—that the entertainment value of an advertisement corresponds positively with the information value of that advertisement as perceived by the individual—had the highest correlation of all the compared variables. The overall correlation was +.69. Those who were questioned concerning McGovern's advertisements registered a +.68 correlation between two variables and those questioned on Humphrey's advertisements registered a +.71 correlation.
### TABLE 11

**Summary of Responses Comprising a Quality Advertisement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Humphrey Mean Score</th>
<th>McGovern Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Level Reported</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Level Reported</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Level Reported</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation Level Reported</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation Level Reported*</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Alienation Score is subtracted from the total of the other scores to give a sum which is indicative of the relative quality of the advertisement. The candidate with the highest total has the higher quality advertisements.*
The third minor hypothesis, that the level of motivation a respondent reports as being inherent in the advertisement will correspond positively with the level of attention he pays to it, also yields a significant positive correlation. Overall a +.35 correlation was reported, while those questioned concerning Humphrey registered a +.32 correlation and those questioned concerning McGovern's advertisement recorded a +.38 correlation.

The next variables correlated were the level of motivation a respondent reports that an advertisement conveys and the respondents intention to vote. The two yielded an overall positive, but not significant correlation of +.09. Those questioned on McGovern's advertisement registered a significant +.30 correlation between these variables while those questioned on Humphrey's advertisements registered a -.06 correlation.

The next minor hypothesis tested was that the degree of intellectual stimulation a respondent reports will correspond positively with the level of attention he pays to them, proved to be significant, overall with a correlation of +.35. Those questioned on McGovern's advertisements registered a +.22 correlation. Although this correlation is slightly less than significant, it is in the same direction. Those questioned on Humphrey's advertisements reported a significantly high correlation of +.44.

The only minor hypothesis tested that did not yield a
positive correlation as predicted was that "the level of attention paid to a candidate's advertisement corresponds positively with the entertainment value he places on it." This variable registered a significant -.56, while those questioned on Humphrey's reported a -.17 correlation. Although this correlation for Humphrey is not significant, it is the same direction of the total negative correlation on these two variables and may be part of a trend.

McGovern apparently had a greater appeal to the younger voters than Humphrey. As indicated in Table 12, 46% of those questioned who favored McGovern were under 30 years old; as compared to 20% of those who favored Humphrey. Humphrey's greatest support was with the 41-55 age group. This group made up 53% of those who favored him.

The occupation level of respondents is summarized in Table 13. The question asked was, "What does the head of your household do for a living?" Consequently the housewives and students responding would be indicating the occupation of their husband or parent respectively. Using this method has one disadvantage in that the occupation of the person answering the question need not necessarily be that which is indicated on the questionnaire, if he is a dependent of the head of the household. However, the occupational level of the respondent was only used as a factor in determining SES level, and no attempt
to break the data down to individual respondents was made in the analysis. Also the educational level of the individual answering the question was used in the analysis, giving a greater connection of responses to respondents.

Responses concerning occupational level were divided into four categories, unskilled, skilled, and managerial and professional. The high percentage of salesmen who responded to the survey were placed in the "skilled" category.

Table 14 lists educational level of respondents. The high percentage of respondents who had greater than a high school education is indicative of the greater Los Angeles areas in itself and its tuition-free or near free Junior Colleges and State Colleges, and their continuing education programs. A recent telephone survey made in Santa Clara County, California, revealed a similar high structure of educational level respondents.34

In using the socio-economic level of the respondent to test the hypothesis that those with a low SES level will prefer the image candidate, each candidate reported educational level was combined with his reported occupational level. This was then correlated with his preference for candidate's advertisements by hypothesizing that a positive correlation would exist between low SES and perceived information value. A +.08 positive correlation was found. Although not statistically significant, it was in the direction predicted.
### TABLE 12

**Age Level of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Level Reported</th>
<th>Those Questioned Who Favored Humphrey</th>
<th>Those Questioned Who Favored McGovern</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 18-23</td>
<td>12% (n=18)</td>
<td>11% (n=15)</td>
<td>11% (n=33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 24-29</td>
<td>8% (n=11)</td>
<td>35% (n=52)</td>
<td>22% (n=63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 30-40</td>
<td>11% (n=15)</td>
<td>27% (n=39)</td>
<td>19% (n=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 41-55</td>
<td>53% (n=74)</td>
<td>9% (n=13)</td>
<td>30% (n=87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 56 and over</td>
<td>16% (n=24)</td>
<td>18% (n=27)</td>
<td>18% (n=51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** (n=142) (n=146) (n=288)

*Median Age Level 3.83 2.90 3.30

**Interview Item**

"What age category do you fit into?"

*Based on a five point scale with 18-23 rated 1, and other responses rating 4.3...respectively.*
### TABLE 13

**Occupation Level of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Level</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unskilled</td>
<td>25% (n=45)</td>
<td>36% (n=68)</td>
<td>31% (n=113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Semi-skilled</td>
<td>18% (n=28)</td>
<td>43% (n=33)</td>
<td>30% (n=111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Skilled</td>
<td>42% (n=76)</td>
<td>11% (n=21)</td>
<td>26% (n=97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managerial &amp; Professional</td>
<td>17% (n=31)</td>
<td>10% (n=17)</td>
<td>13% (n=48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(n=180)</td>
<td>(n=189)</td>
<td>(n=369)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Item**

"What does the head of your family do for a living?"
Further correlations of SES with other variables were made. One qualifying statement on the hypothesis made in Chapter I, was that the lower SES respondents would get more information from the quality advertisement. Humphrey's advertisements had a significant .+35 correlation between SES and perceived information. McGovern's advertisements however, had a -.18 correlation. In total there was not a significant enough correlation to demonstrate that SES level of response and information level are inversely related, since the data do indicate a trend in the opponent's direction. McGovern may have had a smaller correlation between SES and perceived information value because of the fact that his supporters were young and quite possibly more informed about him. Even though those voters favoring Humphrey's and McGovern's had approximately the same educational level (74 percent of the former's and 71 percent of the latter's had more than a high school education) the fact that McGovern's were younger and perhaps more concerned and informed about him and the election could account for the fact that there was not the predicted correlation between SES and perceived information value that was predicted among his voters. They may have received their information about him from sources other than his advertisements. Humphrey's score of .+35 may be even more significant in view of the fact that his advertisements had considerably more information as to his stand on the issue.
The high percentage of persons included who were viewing his TV advertisement would tend to mediate this somewhat in that no acceptable content analysis of the TV spot advertisements was available.

When respondents were asked the question, "which candidate do you think advertised the most", 31 percent of those questioned correctly indicated that McGovern advertised the most. There was a slight, but statistically insignificant tendency for a few respondents who favored McGovern to believe that Humphrey advertised more.

On the question "...is there anything about Humphrey's (or McGovern's) advertisements that you like?, what impresses you?" McGovern was considered by many to be sincere, honest and concerned, while Humphrey was commended for his honesty, perserverance and knowledge. Table 15 summarizes these results.

The next question asked if there was anything the respondent particularly disliked about the candidates' advertisements. Although both candidates received a large number of comments saying they "are not honest" or "I don't trust (or believe) him", Humphrey received more negative comments than McGovern in the area of distrust. However McGovern received "he's too radical" responses that were unique. Also more respondents claimed that "he doesn't know what he's talking about" when questioned concerning McGovern than Humphrey did. Table 16 summarizes these
responses.

One thing that should be noted on these two questions is the respondents unsolicited willingness to jump from a question concerning what impresses them about his advertisement to a response concerning what impresses them about the man. There may be a strong unconscious link in the minds of the public, between the advertisement and the candidate.

Table 17 summarizes what respondents generally liked and disliked about political advertisements. On the positive side, many respondents said "they're honest" and they let you see the candidate. On the negative side, many said "they don't say anything" and some did not trust them.

The coding system used to evaluate these last three questions was simple in scope and application. Most of the responses fit into groups that naturally went together e.g. they're not honest, I don't trust them, they lie and so on. The fact that they were asked to "briefly" state their opinion and that only 2-3 lines were available for the interviewers to score the comments on each of these question's, contributed to the brevity of these responses. Those responses that did not fit with the majority of responses that fell into the common categories, are listed as other on the tables.
### TABLE 14

Educational Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level Reported</th>
<th>Those Questioned On Humphrey's Advertisements</th>
<th>Those Questioned On McGovern's Advertisements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not Completed High School</td>
<td>16% (n=30)</td>
<td>10% (n=20)</td>
<td>13% (n=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Completed High School</td>
<td>10% (n=18)</td>
<td>19% (n=37)</td>
<td>14% (n=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Had Some College</td>
<td>15% (n=28)</td>
<td>25% (n=50)</td>
<td>20% (n=76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Had 2 Years or More of College</td>
<td>17% (n=32)</td>
<td>17% (n=33)</td>
<td>17% (n=65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are a College Graduate</td>
<td>41% (n=76)</td>
<td>29% (n=56)</td>
<td>35% (n=132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(n=184)</td>
<td>(n=196)</td>
<td>(n=380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Level of Education*  
3.85  
3.60  
3.60

Interview Item  
"Of your educational experience, have you"  
*Based on a five point scale, with "not completed high school" rated 1 and other responses rating 4.3...respectively.*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Humphrey</th>
<th>McGovern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He is Sincere</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is Honest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is Concerned</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is Persevering</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is knowledgeable</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those questioned about McGovern were asked the same question except that "McGovern"s" name was substituted for Humphrey's.
TABLE 16

Respondents Unfavorable Comments
Concerning the Advertisements

Question:

Is there anything about his TV ads that you particularly dislike? What annoys you? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Humphrey</th>
<th>McGovern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate is not honest**</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate is radical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate lacks knowledge</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This question followed question in Table 15 and concerned the candidate respondent was questioned on in the that question.

**This category included responses such as he's lying, don't trust him, and similar negative remarks concerning candidates' honesty.
TABLE 17

Respondents Comments Concerning Political Advertisements in General

Question:
Briefly is there anything in general that you like or dislike about political advertisements?

Positive Remarks

Response*

1. Advertisements are honest 113
2. Advertisements show you the candidate (identification) 80
3. Advertisements are informative 34
4. Other favorable 19

Negative Remarks

Response

1. Advertisements do not tell truth 114
2. Advertisements do not say anything 96
3. Advertisements are boring 68
4. Other Negative 21

*Responses were grouped into these categories in accordance with the general context of the response.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS
Despite the fact that the null hypothesis was accepted, some significant information evolved out of this study. The most significant finding was the high correlation of information value and entertainment value of an advertisement. In addition to being the strongest statistical relationship between any of the elements that made up a quality advertisement, it also appears to be the most logical.

As was pointed out in much of the popular literature on this subject, the last thing a "packaged" or image candidate wants to do is to be identified on having taken a specific stand on an issue. To prevent this he would try to avoid placing much information, (which could be later used to pin him down) in an advertisement. Yet, those questioned found the advertisements that were most entertaining were those that were most informative.

This may be indicative of a changing trend in public taste. Advertisers of commercial products are well aware of the fact that the public's taste shifts from one style advertisement to the next over the years. One need look no further than television tooth paste commercials to get an example of this. First it was the cutie jingle, then the scientist in the white laboratory coat stating that "this brand gives 2% less cavities" with its scientifically tested ingredient to some of the recent ones emphasizing an attractive girl with a big smile. The point here is that a point of diminishing returns is reached in adver-
tisements. If every one is doing tooth paste commercials with cutie jingles and one can only go so far with developing a cutie jingle, he may have to inject something else into the commercial (e.g. pseudo-scientist) to get the desired attention. Also the public gets tired of the same thing. The same holds true with presenting facts. When everyone is presenting facts (or pseudo facts) and one is over-taxed with them, he may prefer the more livelier, less factual presentation. This can be true with selling tooth paste or political candidates.

In the case of political candidates this society may be reaching a point of diminishing returns in regard to the use of the image. Contrary to what McLuhan, Evry and others claim, rather than being a new era of communications, our society may be merely going through a cycle of public taste for different types of advertisements and may soon take a swing back to the more factually-oriented advertisements. This may be part of a broadened consumer movement that appears to be gaining favor in the country today. Where as a sizeable segment the public is being more concerned with obtaining all the facts about a product before it buys, they may also soon be insisting on all the facts, before they vote for a political candidate.

One question that McLuhan and the others never answer is what happens when one gets two attractive, low-key, image-oriented and image-conscious candidates running
against each other? How does one choose between a "packaged" Ronald Reagan and a "packaged" Gary Cooper? Perhaps their method of delivery and appearance will be so evenly matched that one will have to turn toward their stand on the issues to make up his mind.

A significant correlation between level of attention and level of motivation was also found. Although respondents were only reporting that they thought the advertisements were motivating, they also reported as to the level of attention they paid to the advertisement. That a significant correlation was established between these variables indicates that the public may tend to pay more attention to what it considers to be a motivating advertisement. This would indicate that a stimulating advertisement would receive more attention than a less stimulating one and that attention may be related positively to intellectual stimulation in political advertisements.

There was also a significant correlation between degree of intellectual stimulation reported and intention to vote. This correlation does not give rise to any casual relationship because it cannot be established that the percentage of those who found the advertisement's level of stimulation high and showed a high level of intention to vote, actually showed this level of intention to vote as a result of the advertisement. They may have had the intention all along.
It may at least be concluded that those with a high intention to vote report a high degree of stimulation from the advertisement and the reverse for those with a low intention to vote. This would indicate that those who have a strong intention to vote find the advertisements more intellectually stimulating. The advertisement may stimulate them in reinforcing their own predisposition toward voting. Also the more serious voters may respond more seriously to political ads.

The less than significant, but still positive, correlations between relative information value of an advertisement and the attention paid to it and the relative level of motivation of an advertisement and the respondent's reported intention to vote at least give some indication that these factors which comprise a quality advertisement may be important, since a significant positive correlation would indicate that these factors are important to the voters and should be included in a quality advertisement.

This study failed to demonstrate that socio-economic factors significantly affect a voter's perception of an advertisement's qualities. At best the study may have indicated that socio-economic factors may be related to how much information one receives from a political advertisement. That is, the lower SES voter may get more information from a candidate's advertisement than the high SES voter. This was indicated by the .-18 correlation for
those questioned on McGovern's advertisements in regard to SES and information level of the advertisement.

The only negative correlation that was encountered in the study was between relative level of attention and entertainment value. At first glance, the very nature of these two variables would tend to indicate a strong positive correlation between the two variables, one would tend to pay more attention to things that entertained.

However, this study demonstrated just the opposite, in that a significant -.36 overall negative correlation was reported. It may be that people actually pay less attention to that which entertains them.

If this were true, it would greatly reduce any significance that this study's most positive correlation has shown (+.69 between information and entertainment levels). It would be of diminished significance if the voters considered the most informative advertisement the most entertaining when they pay less attention to the most entertaining advertisements. But if the voters did find the most informative advertisements the most entertaining, it follows that they must have paid enough attention to the advertisement at least once to be able to judge it the most entertaining.

It may follow then that people subsequently pay a diminishing amount of attention to the entertaining advertisement after they were initially exposed to the facts.
One could argue that information becomes less entertaining after initial exposure.

Another thing that may account for some of this negative correlation was the fact that McGovern's advertisements were rated slightly lower in entertainment value, yet people paid the most attention to them. This may be due to the other variables that make up a quality advertisement, especially his high score in the "lack of alienation" characteristics. Also, there may be some sort of unconscious puritan or intellectual ideal that looks down on entertainment as being wasted time, so one would not feel proper admitting that he paid the most attention to the most entertaining advertisement.

While the negative correlation between attention paid and entertainment value may not negate the high positive correlation between relative information value and entertainment value, it may be as a mediating factor and certainly deserves future consideration. A future study in this area should isolate these two variables. The question concerning each should be placed farther apart in the questionnaire in an attempt to prevent the respondent from remembering which advertisement he said was most entertaining. By doing this there would be less chance of him claiming to pay less attention to it in any attempt to show that he is not influenced only by the entertaining.

One reason for some of the inconsistencies in this
study was that there really was not as great a contest between image-or issue-oriented candidate as existed in (or appeared to exist) some previous elections. McGovern, who was judged the image candidate on the basis of his inferior showing on the content analysis, actually did speak out quite often and while he did not score as high as Humphrey in terms of speaking out on the issues, it can be said that he made his stand reasonably clear in his speeches. What lacked in issue content in his advertisements, he partially made up with his speeches. That is, while not scoring as high as Humphrey's speeches on the content analysis, they were still high issue-oriented.

Despite the content analysis results, a majority of the respondents probably did not view McGovern as the image candidate, and they may be right. The fact that his advertisements and speeches did not score as highly as Humphrey did does not necessarily mean he should be judged an image candidate. The content analysis measures the number of issues mentioned. McGovern may have taken a stand on a smaller number of issues, but it could be argued that the issues he took a stand on were the most salient issues and the strength of his stand on these limited, but more salient issues, such as "stop the war now" were really what the public considered most important in the campaign and consequently they justifiably would rate him as the issue candidate. Since this study did not
measure the saliency of the issues or the strength of the candidate's stand, it remains a question open to speculation.

Another thing unique about this election was the television "debates". Most public relations practitioners would strongly discourage their clients from participating in television debates. Especially if he had a decisive advantage in the polls, as McGovern did, because to do so would only give the trailing candidate more public exposure, and would, by their presence together, show him on an equal plane with the leading candidate. Yet McGovern consented to a series of television debates.

How much these debates served as a source of informing and persuading the voters is not known. This study was designed and formulated before the debates were announced (late in the campaign) so measures to adequately control for their effect on the research as originally designed could not be implemented.

While this study lacked a highly defined dichotomy between an image and an issue candidate, it was not as hindered as one might expect. Although there may have been many campaigns where the image and issue candidate were more clearly defined than this (such as the recent Senate race between Senator Eugene Tunney and former Senator George Murphy), it can be argued that there never was an election in which a clear cut dichotomy existed.
Despite McGinnis's, White's, and Evry's efforts at describing the packaging that goes into an image candidate, no evidence has been set forth that the things reported as making up a packaged or image candidate (e.g. not taking a stand on issues, "cool" appearance, etc.) have any causal bearing on the outcome of an election.

Even if one were to grant that "playing down the issues" and avoiding taking stances is a good political practice, it does not follow that such a procedure is anything more than good political strategy, rather than being indicative of a "new era in politics" or a "cool" image replacing a "hot" image. What they may have been doing was overgeneralizing by including many sound political strategies together and calling them "packaging" or "the image replacing the issue" in politics.

In that none of the literature's reporting that "images" are replacing issues in politics today has established any causal relations or set forth any reliable data on which to base conclusions, it can be argued that issues are still important in political campaigns. The small amount of empirical data contributed in this area by the Bowen study and this study indicate that this is the case. While both of these studies may have exhausted the capabilities of gaining data by telephone survey, other research methods should be able to shed new lights on this subject.
Popular writers like White and McGinnis should be commended for their bringing up the question of images versus issues in political advertisements. However, there are too many other variables to justify acceptance of such a simplified picture without more impartial data, especially with relation to the possibility that the tide may be turning in this area and if "images" were highly important in the past, they may be losing ground to "issues", especially as a younger, better-educated electorate comes into the political arena.

Suggestions for Further Study

One of the major limitations of this study has been its data gathering method, the telephone survey. Telephone surveys are limited in length and the amount of information obtainable. Also, there is a certain amount of selectivity in those who choose to answer and speak with the interviewer. They may not be typical of the overall electorate.

An example of this appeared in this study--the extremely high intention to vote reported in Table 10. Certainly some of this may be explained by the fact that because our society places much importance on an individual's voting, some may claim that they are sure to vote, even when they probably will not vote.

However, much of this high intention to vote may be
accounted for if the people who take the time for the telephone interview are really more interested in elections than the average citizen. While this study has not been that concerned with any predictions regarding the behavior of "average citizen", it can be argued that there may be a significant difference between an "average citizen's" perception regarding a political advertisement and that of the possibly more politically motivated person who answered the interviewer's questions.

A telephone survey is not the best way to gather SES data, especially if one considers how easy it is to lie, or exaggerate on the telephone. While one could also lie to a field interviewer in this regard, it is a little harder for one to lie about his socio-economic status to him when he is standing at his front door.

However SES data in itself was not the most important element in this study. Nor is it apparently that important for determining relevant questions about images and political advertisements. Perhaps a better methodology that could be used for determining the significance of images in political advertisements and to measure what constitutes a quality advertisement would be by use of a well-structured laboratory experiment. The actual television commercials, and newspaper advertisements could be shown in a controlled experimental setting and respondents asked to comment regarding what they saw. This type of
experiment would allow for greater control of partisan influence and SES factors. While such an experimental situation would have the disadvantage of not being indicative of the atmosphere in which one is usually exposed to the different advertisements, it would still probably offer a more reliable body of knowledge as to how important images and quality really are in political advertisements.
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Appendix I

Questionnaire
HUMPHREY QUESTIONNAIRE

(Circle the response)

1. Do you remember seeing any of Humphrey's advertisements?
   
   Yes
   
   No  If no - go on to other questionnaire.

   (Other questionnaire is similar except McGovern's name is substituted for Humphrey's)

2. Were they in newspapers?
   
   on television?
   
   on the radio?
   
   other types, i.e. billboards, bumper stickers, direct mail.

3. Where would you say you came into contact with most of Humphrey's advertisements? Television Radio
   
   Newspapers Other.

4. Some political advertisements tell more about the candidates' stand than others. In this regard would you say the ads are
   
   very informative
   
   somewhat informative
   
   about average
   
   slightly informative
   
   not very informative
5. Some advertisements are more entertaining than others. Would you classify these advertisements as
   very entertaining
   somewhat entertaining
   about average
   slightly entertaining
   not very entertaining

6. One goal of a political advertisement is to motivate a person to vote. In this respect do you think these advertisements are
   very motivating
   somewhat motivating
   about average
   slightly motivating
   not at all motivating

7. Some political advertisements stimulate people to think about campaign issues or seek out other information. Do you think Humphrey's advertisements are
   very stimulating
   somewhat stimulating
   about average
   slightly stimulating
   not very stimulating

8. A political advertisement can alienate a voter rather
than persuade him. Do you find Humphrey's advertisements
very alienating
somewhat alienating
about average
slightly alienating
not very alienating

9. Which of the following candidates do you think advertised the most
   Humphrey
   McGovern

10. Which one's advertisements have you seen the most of
    Humphrey
    McGovern

11. Which candidate's advertisements do you pay most attention to?
    Humphrey
    McGovern

12. Would you say you pay
    a lot of attention to his ads
    about the same as to commercial advertisements
    less than to commercial advertisements
    very little attention

13. Which candidate's advertisements do you like best
Humphrey_____ McGovern_____ Other____

14. Do you like that candidate best  Yes  No

15. Briefly, is there anything about Humphrey's advertising that you particularly like? What impresses you?

16. Is there anything about his TV ads that you particularly dislike? What annoys you?

17. Briefly is there anything in general that you like or dislike about political advertisements.

18. How likely is it that you will vote in the primary election?
   very likely
   more than likely
   not very likely
   possibly

19. What does the head of your family do for a living?
   (be specific)
20. Of your educational experience, have you
    not completed high school
    completed high school
    had some college
    had 2 years or more of college
    are a college graduate

21. What age category do you fit into
    18-23
    24-29
    30-40
    41-55
    56 and over

22. Do you consider yourself
    Republican
    Democrat
    Other ____________________

END: That is all the questions I have. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

INTERVIEWER CODE SEX:    Male       Female
Appendix II

On each telephone survey ten numbers were called from each of the listed prefixes. A prefix may be used in more than one city, however for purposes of this study they were necessarily selected as being representative of the city they were associated with in the directory. Thus a prefix listed as being a Reseda prefix may also be used in Canoga Park, but since it is listed as a Reseda prefix and predominately used in Reseda, it would be treated as a Reseda prefix.

One further problem with this method of clustering is that the telephone company combined some communities and treated them as one city. For example, in the San Fernando Valley, Pacoima was combined with San Fernando on their prefix listing and Panorama City was combined with Van Nuys. This lessened the possibility of a closer demographic breakdown of respondents.

The preliminary survey conducted in the San Fernando Valley used the following prefixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>N. Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>N. Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>Reseda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>Canoga Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ten four digit numbers were selected from a table of random numbers to complete the phone numbers for each prefix in the above list.

On the major survey, ten completed calls using random numbers were made to following prefixes on the weekend proceeding the June 6 election:

1 224 Los Angeles
2 484 Los Angeles
3 241 Glendale
4 248 La Crescenta
5 256 Los Angeles
6 664 Los Angeles
7 274 Beverly Hills
8 278 Beverly Hills
9 286 Alhambra
10 343 Reseda
11 348 Canoga Park
12 352 Sunland-Tujunga
13 358 Monrovia
14 362 San Fernando
15 373 Redondo
16 384 Los Angeles
17 376 Redondo
18 451 Santa Monica
19 472 West Los Angeles
20 478 West Los Angeles
21 761 North Hollywood
22 783 Van Nuys
23 672 Inglewood
24 682 Pasadena
25 687 Canoga Park
26 828 Santa Monica
27 693 Whittier
28 966 Covina
29 657 Beverly Hills
30 676 Hawthorne

The cities and prefixes selected on the basis of a crude proportional representation. That is, mean census scores on income, and educational level of the areas it was possible to identify it. These were then mixed, e.g.
Beverly Hills' mean scores applied against San Fernando's, to get a general mean figure comparable with those of the greater Los Angeles area. Because the greater Los Angeles City demographics could not be broken down this way (since it cannot be identified by telephone prefixes), it was necessary to include a significant number of Los Angeles numbers. These were not included in averaging census score means because the data available on them would not be precise enough.

The prefix tables were taken from the various Los Angeles telephone directories.