THE 2004 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BETWEEN
GEORGE W. BUSH AND JOHN F. KERRY:
AN ANALYSIS OF VISUALLY COMPARATIVE TELEVISED ADVERTISEMENTS

_____

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Communication
University of Missouri—Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

by
REBECCA MAE VERSER

Dr. Jennifer Aubrey, Dissertation Advisor

MAY 2007

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

THE 2004 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BETWEEN
GEORGE W. BUSH AND JOHN F. KERRY:
AN ANALYSIS OF VISUALLY COMPARATIVE TELEVISED ADVERTISEMENTS

presented by Rebecca Mae Verser

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

_____
Professor Jennifer Aubrey

_____
Professor William Benoit

_____
Professor Jonathan Hess

_____
Professor Jennifer Becker

_____
Professor Zoe Smith

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my family: to my husband, Gilbert P. Verser, III; my daughter, Claudia Mae Verser; my dad, Howard Dennis Tillery; and my mother, Peggy Lee Tillery.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

LIST OF TABLES

THE 2004 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BETWEEN
GEORGE W. BUSH AND JOHN F. KERRY:
AN ANALYSIS OF VISUALLY COMPARATIVE TELEVISED ADVERTISEMENTS

Rebecca Mae Verser

Dr. Jennifer Aubrey, Dissertation Advisor

ABSTRACT

This study used impression management theory and framing to explore how George W. Bush and John F. Kerry used nonverbal behavior cues (body movement, eye gaze, facial expression, posture, gestures, and dress/clothing) and production techniques (camera angle, camera shot, light angle, color, motion, production style, setting (formality), setting (location), symbols, others in shot, and shot length) in their respective visually comparative televised advertisements in the general election in 2004. This study sought to determine the differences and similarities between the two candidates in how they portrayed themselves as candidate and how they portrayed each other as opponent.

Several differences were found and expected, since one of the goals of political advertising is to set the candidates apart from one another. However, there were also quite a few similarities in how Bush and Kerry used visual imagery in their respective ads. Both candidates appear to have used visual imagery to create impressions or frame themselves in a manner that emphasizes specific characteristics. It seems that both men wanted to appear serious about the campaign, issues, and being President; that both candidates wanted to appear in control of themselves and their surroundings; and that both men wanted to appear strong/powerful. Additionally, Kerry, it seems, also wanted to appear approachable and average, "of the people."

Regarding how the candidates portrayed each other, it seems that Bush sent mixed visual messages (e.g., leader-like, but also laidback) about Kerry to the viewers of the ads, but that Kerry was more uniform in how he presented Bush (e.g., inferior, deceitful, and threatening) to audiences. Neither candidate, however, used visual imagery in their shots to conclusively create specific impressions of their opponent.

Chapter 1: Introduction & Justification

Even if no words were spoken, the visual images in the form of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques can be especially powerful communication tools in mediated messages. Dale Leathers points out that U. S. General George Patton "practiced his 'war face' in front of a mirror so that he would be perceived as unusually determined, powerful, and brave," and he describes how former U. S. President Richard M. Nixon made repeated attempts to eliminate the shifty eye behaviors and nonfluencies that helped reinforce the widespread public perception that he was "Tricky Dicky" (1986, p. 324). It is believed that the success of a political campaign in part hinges on the right visual image and its emotional impact (Fleming, 1998). Televised presidential advertising offers mere seconds of visual imagery. However, those images may be worth more than a thousand words.

This study will analyze candidate and opponent visual nonverbal behavioral cues and production techniques found in visually comparative televised presidential advertising. Visually comparative advertisements are spots in which the candidate and his opponent are both visually represented by still photographs or moving images in the same advertisement. These ads are important because the candidate can portray the desired image of himself[1] while controlling the opponent's portrayed image, meaning that a

---

[1] Throughout this study, male pronouns will be used to describe the candidates, since there have only been male presidential candidates in the general elections in the history of the United States.

candidate can pick and choose which images of himself and his opponent are used in the advertisement as well as the production techniques used to frame himself and his opponent. Thus, the candidate controls how favorable and unfavorable he and his opponent are seen by the viewers. A visual content analysis focusing on visually comparative ads, comparing the visual images of the candidate and the opponent, has not been done before.

To guide this study, I will utilize impression management theory (Jones & Pittman, 1982) from interpersonal communication research as well as selected features of framing theory (Goffman, 1974) drawn from media studies. This first chapter provides the justification and rationale for the study; particularly, it will explain why visually comparative research is needed in political television advertising, why it is important to study the visual aspects of television advertising, and why it is important to include in one visual analysis both nonverbal behavior cues and visual production techniques.

Television advertising is an important aspect of contemporary political campaigns at all levels. Even though political advertising represents one of the major areas of research in political communication (see Kaid, 2004), further investigations are needed. There are several reasons that warrant additional investigations of televised presidential advertising. First, the majority of presidential candidates' campaign budget is spent on the production and broadcasting of television ads. Each presidential election year, the amount of money the candidates spend on advertising has dramatically increased, nearly tripling over the recent four elections. According to Devlin (1993), Bush, Clinton, and Perot devoted more than three-quarters of their budgets to television ads in 1992. The money devoted to advertising increased in 1996 from $133 million to over $200 million

(Devlin, 1997). In 2000, Bush and Gore spent $240 million combined (Devlin, 2001); and most recently, Bush and Kerry spent over $346 million for television advertising in 2004 (Devlin, 2005). Because candidates spend mass sums of money on advertising in an attempt to persuade voters to make important voting decisions, communication scholars should study and catalog the ads to attempt to understand how these persuasive appeals are crafted and how candidates are presenting themselves and their opponents to voters.

A second reason that television advertising should continue to be studied is that it allows for a unique opportunity for a candidate to communicate directly to voters in a format viewed by millions simultaneously. Other forms of political communication, such as stump speeches, direct mail, and press releases, have a limited audience. Television advertising provides a way to reach a mass audience with the "truth" as the campaign and candidate sees it, while also providing rebuttals of the "untruths" by the other side (Jamieson, 1996). Televised ads need to be studied to determine, specifically, the messages being sent to mass audiences.

A third reason to study presidential television advertising is that it is one of the few forms of communication that is under complete control of the sponsoring candidate. The form of presentation is controlled by the candidate and the media production specialists (Kaid & Johnston, 2001). For example, a candidate can be "made-up" with the use of lighting techniques, make-up, and clothing; the production can be postponed or moved up depending on weather or scheduling conflicts; and editing can eliminate mistakes or unflattering behavioral cues. A candidate can utilize visual images to convey specific messages. At the same time, a candidate can portray his opponent the way he

wants to portray him by choosing which images are used and how they are used in the advertisement.

Essentially, there are two main reasons we need to study visual imagery in political advertisements. First, we need to know what visual messages about the candidates and the opponents are in the advertisements. Second, we need to determine the effects of the visual imagery as well as the possible causes of effects of visual messages once the content of the messages is known. For these reasons, it is important to add to the very small body of literature regarding visually comparative imagery in political communication.

Visual images are powerful message forms. They can be used to enhance a candidate's self image, as well as manipulated to detract from an opponent's self image. The visual elements—visual nonverbal behavior cues and visual production techniques— of televised presidential advertising should be studied for several reasons. First, visual images perform important roles in communication, such as conveying realism, credibility, believability, and truthfulness (Moriarty & Popovich, 1991). In essence, the visual images that people see, they believe to be real, credible, and honest. Messaris (1997) asserts that people perceive visual images as direct copies of reality. Second, visual images can be created to illicit a specific response among audience members (Messaris, 1992). By including certain images in a television commercial, a candidate can elicit a desired viewer's response, which can eventually lead to a positive reaction in his favor or a negative reaction against his opponent. For example, George H. W. Bush's ads—"Revolving Door" and "Willie Horton"—in 1988 helped Bush win the election by

portraying Dukakis as an accomplice to numerous crimes by allowing furlows (West, 1997).

Third, according to Graber (1988), visual images are invaluable for forming opinions about people as they are used to determine credibility, gain the attention of the viewer, and evoke positive and/or negative feelings. In her landmark study, *Processing the News,* Graber (1988) focused on how people read, understand, interpret, remember, and respond to print news stories. She determined that it was not just the words in the stories that were a part of the process, but the visual images also played a large role in how people processed the news. Graber (1988) found that photographs allow people to form more complete and accurate impressions of people and of new stories. She further argues that visual themes of news messages in newspapers are learned more readily and in more detail than verbal themes since participants recounted 19-39% of the visual themes, compared to 3-9% of the verbal ones. Therefore, viewers remember or retain more of what they see than what they read.

Finally, viewers also remember visual images more than auditory messages, which is further explained by West (1997) in his descriptions of two political news coverage events. The first event is CBS news reporter Lesley Stahl's nightly news report coverage of President Ronald Reagan's budget cuts. Verbally, Stahl was quite negative about the administrations policies. The visual picture, however, was quite the opposite with Reagan shown at a carefully staged photo opportunity complete with flag-waving supporters and red, white, and blue balloons being released following Reagan's speech. According to West (1997), Reagan's publicists were very happy with the story because of the four and a half minutes of positive visual imagery surrounding the candidate,

5

knowing that viewers were likely to remember the visual imagery, not the verbal story about Reagan. Similarly, the George H. W. Bush's airing of the "Tank" ad in the 1988 presidential campaign attacking Michael Dukakis was deemed a highly powerful and successful visual attack. This ad image showed a somewhat bewildered and wild looking Dukakis riding in a military tank. CBS news critiqued the ad and subsequently defended Dukakis' record on military spending issues. They also re-ran the full-length ad within the news story. West (1997) claims that viewers of the news story were more likely to remember the silly looking Dukakis than the CBS critique and defense of Dukakis' support for military spending.

In political advertising research, the visual aspect of the medium lacks much needed attention. Numerous scholars have investigated the textual aspect of political advertising, including acclaims, attacks, and defenses (Benoit, 1999; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998; Benoit, Pier, & Blaney, 1997), issue versus image (Kaid & Johnston, 2002), negativity (James & Hensel, 1991; Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 1993), and combined textual content—partisanship, issue content and position, candidate qualities, and group (demographic) affiliation (Joslyn, 1980), among many others.

There have also been numerous effects studies of the verbal messages in political advertising, including a meta-analysis of the effects of negative political advertising (Lau, Sigelman, Heldman, & Babbitt, 1999), reactions to negativity (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 1989), and issue knowledge and salience (Holbert, Benoit, Hansen, & Wen, 2002; Brians & Wattenberg, 1996), among many others, which again lack any focus on the visual messages in the ads.

6

Only a handful of scholars have studied visual imagery in political advertising, including an investigation into the video-style of the advertisements (Kaid & Johnston, 2001), the use of visual elements (West, 1997), and the effects of visual elements (Barbatisis, 2002; Noggle & Kaid, 2000; Crigler, Just, & Neuman, 1994). For a thorough review of political advertising literature, see Kaid (2004).

There are two important elements of visual images that need to be studied: nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques. It is necessary to study nonverbal behavioral cues—communication messages expressed through means other than words (Knapp & Hall, 2002)—in political advertising for several reasons. First, political advertising messages utilize the tele*visual* medium. Meaning that viewers see messages as well as hear them and that much of what we see has had less research focus than what we hear.

Second, political candidates, their campaign managers, and their advertising representatives have discovered that a candidate's nonverbal messages are just as important (if not more so) than the verbal messages. "Politicians have learned just how important body language [nonverbal behavior] is, and they use it to emphasize and dramatize their speeches and also to achieve a more pleasant and more acceptable personality or image" (Fast, 1970, p. 181). A candidate can change his or her appearance, decide to sit or stand, and even try to control his/her facial expressions to be more acceptable, likeable, and favorable to viewers.

Third, Nimmo (1974) reasoned that "what a politician says [the message] may seem less important to an audience than the type of language [verbal vs. nonverbal] and how he uses it" (p. 38). In other words, it may not be the verbal or textual message that

has the most meaning or impact on the audience, but the nonverbal behaviors and a candidate's use of those behaviors that have the most influence. According to Burgoon, Buller, and Woodall (1989), nonverbal communication is important to study because it is helpful in interpreting what is being communicated. In many cases, nonverbal cues are more trusted than verbal ones and can express what verbal cues are unable to convey (Burgoon, 1980). Nonverbal behavior cues are very powerful, especially regarding emotional reactions, which are important in securing voters.

Nonverbal behavior cues are not the only visual messages in political televised advertising. It is also important to study the production techniques, such as camera angle, lighting angle, and background, in televised political advertising for three reasons. First, according to Kaid and Johnston (2001), television production techniques influence how the candidate and the candidate's consultants structure and construct messages which, in turn, influence voters' perceptions of the candidate. Production cues affect how a viewer may perceive a candidate. A candidate can easily manipulate his image by using different production techniques such as camera angle, background, and/or setting. For example, if a candidate wanted to convey an image of patriotism, he may include the American flag, or the colors red, white, or blue in the background.

Second, Millerson (1972) contends that by using television production rhetoric, a person can contrast and compare ideas, link a diversity of subjects, show an unexpected outcome, create deliberate falsification or distortion, provide interpretation, and show repetition, irony, flashbacks, and double-takes. In a short amount of time—thirty to sixty seconds—candidates can use television production cues to piece together a history of the candidate, depict issues that the candidate stands for, attack an opponent, and seem

sincere about becoming the next President of the United States. For example, in 2004, John Kerry ran an ad titled "Born in Colorado." In thirty seconds, this ad visually shows Kerry as a Vietnam veteran, hunter, hockey player, and a supporter of education. In only thirty seconds, viewers learn a great deal about Kerry in his biographical ad. In George W. Bush's "Agenda" advertisement, the streaming images of President Bush mixed in with different images, including manufacturing plants and small businesses leads viewers to visually see what issues Bush is targeting in this ad and his campaign. A large amount of time and space are compacted into a short thirty second advertisement, in which the viewer can learn who a candidate is and what a candidate stands for.

Finally, various production aspects, such as camera angles and movement, color, editing, lighting, camera shots, staging and setting, special effects, and other techniques, can convey specific information from which viewers learn about the candidates in the electoral race (Metallinos, 1996; Millerson, 1972; Zettl, 1997). It is possible for a candidate to portray himself in a specific manner to educate the viewers on his ability to lead the nation, support a cause, or promote an issue. For example, in the 2000 presidential campaign, Al Gore strongly promoted education. He visually showed himself in elementary classrooms and libraries and on playgrounds talking to teachers, parents, and children.

It is important to include both nonverbal behaviors and production techniques within the same study for several reasons. First, it is the combination of nonverbal behaviors and production techniques in political advertisements that viewer's are seeing since the advertisements are mediated. For example, a candidate can be talking to the viewing audience in a style similar to the Eisenhower Answers America series of

9

televised ads in 1952. We can see gestures, eye gaze, body movement, and so on. But that is only part of what people can see. They also observe the lighting, setting, camera angles, etc. Second, both nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques are invaluable for forming impressions. For example, an angry face at a distance may not have as much of an impact on viewers as an angry face up close. Finally, candidates have control over their nonverbal behaviors and can choose which images to include in an ads based in part on which nonverbal features they would like to present to an audience. However, candidates also control how those images are produced, which could influence how they are perceived by the viewers. Essentially, in political advertising, nonverbal behaviors and production techniques work together. For these reasons, it is important to investigate the candidates' usage of both elements in their ads.

Overall, I have several goals for this study. Specifically, I hope to develop a solid theoretical framework to guide this and future visual studies in political communication. Second, I hope to add to the political communication literature in a new way by focusing on the candidate's and the opponent's visual images in visually comparative political advertisements. Third, I hope to detail the importance of knowing the content in political advertisements in order to later determine the true effects of political advertising on viewers, because we may know that political advertising has various effects, but until we know the content, we cannot be sure what the effects are caused by.

In this first chapter, I provided the justification and rationale for the study; particularly, I explained why visually comparative research is needed in political television advertising, why it is important to study the visual aspects of television

advertising, and why it is important to include in one visual analysis both visual

nonverbal behavior cues and visual production techniques

Chapter two provides conceptual definitions of the variables of this study and a

review of all relevant literature from different areas of communication, including

political, nonverbal, interpersonal, and mass media. Chapter three is a description of the

content analytic method used to conduct the study. This chapter includes operational

definitions of all the nonverbal and production variables, as well as a detailed description

of the unit of analysis and coding procedures.

Chapter four provides the results of the first four research questions of the study

and a detailed analysis of the data. Chapters five and six discuss the data from both micro

and macro levels of investigation and the implications the results may have on the future

of televised political advertising. The discussion also includes connections to impression

management theory and framing theory as well as previous research.

Chapter seven offers the conclusion of the study, which includes a brief summary

and overview as well as limitations and directions for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I will discuss in detail the limited political advertising studies that are devoted to visual elements. I continue to build my literature base by discussing non-verbal literature pertaining to specific behavioral cues: body movement, dress/clothing, eye gaze, facial expression, gestures, head movement, and posture. Next, I review impression management theory (Jones & Pittman, 1982). Then I review literature in media production and political communication, followed by a review of framing theory. Finally, I pose research questions regarding the visual nonverbal and production aspects of this study.

As I continue, I discuss the production literature regarding specific production techniques: motion, color, format, setting, symbols, camera angle, camera direction, camera shot, light angle, light direction, others in shot, and shot length. Next I review framing theory literature and pose hypotheses and research questions regarding the production aspect of this study and the overriding research question for this study. Finally, I provide a brief summary of the literature and a transition into the methods of my dissertation.

Kaid and Davidson (1986) suggest that it is possible to understand a candidate's mode of self-presentation in spots by analyzing the verbal, nonverbal, and production characteristics of the candidate's political advertising. In the following literature review, I outline how it is possible for candidates to use visual images to manage their impressions as well as their opponent's impressions with voters.

Mullen (1963) studied Kennedy and Nixon newspaper advertisements, and found that Kennedy used pictures to effectively portray and promote his strengths. I also hope to outline how candidates try to convey their strengths and their opponent's weaknesses through the use of favorable and unfavorable nonverbal and production techniques in their televised advertisements.

Literature Review

Visual Political Advertising and Nonverbal and Interpersonal Communication Literature

Political communication has become highly televisual in form. Each election year political campaign advertising is marked by various uses of televisual messages. Nearly thirty years ago, Nimmo argued that "what a politician says [verbally] may seem less important to an audience that how he says it [visually]" (1976, p. 38). Overall, the visual elements of political advertising may be more meaningful than the verbal content of the messages. Television has certainly helped to structure some of the voters' nonverbal perceptions, and political candidates recognize the influence these perceptions have on the eventual election outcome (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Politicians must pay close attention to how they nonverbally appear in their ads because their visual images can influence the perception the viewers have of them.

When candidates use television to project themselves to voters, they are primarily engaged in a form of "pseudo-interpersonal communication" in which they use television's visual intimacy with the viewer to portray themselves in certain ways (Kaid & Davidson, 1986). A candidate has the ability to create advertisements that portray himself favorably and his opponent unfavorably. The presentation of a candidate's self through television is similar to actor Robin Williams playing the President. As Nimmo

13

and Savage (1976) explain, the role-playing projects a style that reflects how the candidate wants his or herself to be perceived. The role-playing can also project how the candidate wants his or her opponent to be perceived as well.

However, there is very little empirical research on content of visual imagery in political advertising. Kaid and Johnston (2001) investigated several verbal and nonverbal variables along with production techniques in the landmark videostyle study of televised presidential advertising. However, this study was largely atheoretical and only focused on the candidates in the ads, not the opponents. West (1997) has focused on political campaign's utilization of a combination of several key elements: visual text, color, editing, and visual images to convey their messages to potential voters. Erickson (2000) focused on how a candidate's use of visual images can portray active leadership characteristics. Sayre (1994) investigated visual images in Hungarian political televised advertisement to determine a link between images and values. Of these few content studies, many lack a theoretical foundation from which to guide the research and none of them take into account the portrayals of the opponents—a major aspect of political advertising.

There are also only a few studies that focus on the effects of visual images in political communication. Barbatisis (2002) investigated how visual images of presidential candidates can and do elicit desired responses in viewers. Noggle and Kaid (2000) conducted an experimental effects study that tested whether or not manipulations in visual imagery in televised political advertisements affected voters. They found that new technologies are making it possible for candidates to utilize visual images and technological distortions to make themselves appear more favorable and their opponents

less favorable. Crigler, Just, and Neuman (1994) completed a channel effects study that found audio to be just as effective as audiovisual combined, and that visual was the least effective channel in communicating issue messages to audiences. Despite the few effects studies, we do not know what the content within the advertisements is; therefore, we have no way of knowing specifically what is affecting the subjects in the studies.

According to Graber (1986) who studied the 1984 Presidential election, most messages about a candidate's character traits, such as credibility and power, as well as most positive messages were supported by visual images, implying that visuals used in contextual messages enhance the candidates' images. In this study, visual images helped to increase the candidate's perceived favorability with the viewers.

One political characteristic that candidates are obligated to portray is active leadership, and they are typically motivated to signal this activity visually (Erickson, 2000). If the public sees an active candidate in a television advertisement, then it is likely that they will perceive the candidate as active in a leadership role. When political figures go public to reinforce their position on issues, they make short appearances that signal and maximize their activity. For example, during the 2000 election, both George W. Bush and Al Gore displayed televised advertisements promoting their stance on education. Each candidate could be seen, in their respective ads, in a classroom actively working with children and answering questions. Based on research by Erickson (2000) and Graber (1988), this activity could easily be translated to mean that they would be active in education legislation if elected.

One of the pioneers of nonverbal communication research, Mehrabian (1970, 1981) identified three fundamental categories of meaning associated with nonverbal

behavior: immediacy, status, and responsiveness. Immediacy is the extent of mutual

sensory stimulation between two persons (Mehrabian, 1967). This concept can best be

understood in terms of the immediacy principle developed by Mehrabian (1971). This

principle is: "People are drawn toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and

prefer; they avoid or move away from things [or people] they dislike, evaluate negatively,

or do not prefer" (p. 1). Immediacy means that we react to nonverbal behaviors by

evaluating them as positive/negative, good/bad, or likeable/dislikeable. Regarding status,

people perceive behaviors to mean strong/weak or superior/subordinate. Finally,

responsiveness refers to the perception of activity: slow/fast, active/passive (Knapp &

Hall, 2002). In political communication, nonverbal behaviors can lead viewers to

perceive a candidate as good, likeable, strong, and active person, which could possibly

translate into a vote for that candidate. Viewers could also perceive a candidate to be

dislikeable, weak, and passive, which could mean fewer votes.

Nonverbal behavior cues have been found to cause instant reactions and

judgments about leaders. Warnecke, Masters, and Kempter (1992) concluded "responses

to leaders are often governed more by feelings or 'gut reactions' than by conscious verbal

judgments" (p. 280), meaning that these feelings or reactions are based on responses in

nonverbal cues, not verbal or spoken cues. These instant reactions are not formed from

verbal elements in mediated messages, but on visual ones. The visual element of

television encourages 'gut reactions' on the part of viewers, which are not mediated by

cognitive assessments (Sullivan & Masters, 1987). Thus, the visual channel of televised

messages can lead to instantaneous reactions about our political leaders. Not only are

these impressions instantaneous, but once they are formed, viewers will seek information

that confirms those first gut feelings (Burgoon & Hoobler, 2002). For example, if a candidate is first perceived to be serious, then a viewer may look for nonverbal signals that translate into seriousness.

Kaid and Johnston (2001) focused their landmark study on not only the nonverbal behavior cues (body movement, gestures, dress, eye gaze, and facial expression) of candidates in televised political advertising, but also on the production techniques (ad length, format, setting, symbols, others in shot, staging of ad, special effects, camera angle, and camera shot). They coined this combination of elements (also including verbal text) in political advertising "videostyle." The authors found that out of 1,204 presidential advertisements from 1952 to 1996, candidates were found to have serious/attentive facial expressions 84% of the time. The candidates maintained eye gaze with the viewer 49% of the time (but almost never looked at the viewer 23% of the time). They also found that candidates had some body movement, including gestures, 46% of the time, but never showed any body movement or gestures 42% of the time. Overall, the candidates were formally attired 81% of the time. This political advertising study provides insight into how the candidates visually depicted themselves to viewers through televised political advertising.

Modern political candidates are trained to better adapt to television's dominance in politics. This includes training in gestures, physical appearance, and other nonverbal behavior cues (Maarek, 1995). In addition, McGraw (2003) argues "trait perceptions (credibility, likeability, power, and dominance) are under the control of politicians themselves, who can structure communication strategies to emphasize or deemphasize different personality characteristics" (p. 405), through the use of nonverbal behavior cues

17

such as movement, eye gaze, apparel, posture, and facial expressions. Nolan (1995) finds that nonverbal communication strategies, such as smiling, head nodding, direct eye contact, touching, as well as synchronized movements, are important to enhance a candidate's self-image.

From past research, it is apparent that the concept of immediacy and nonverbal behavior cues play an important role in political advertising. Many nonverbal behavior cues are immediacy behaviors. A deeper investigation into immediacy and nonverbal behavior cues literature is needed to determine just what effect they can have on forming perceptions of a person, in this case politicians, in the viewer's eyes.

Body Movement

According to Knapp and Hall (2002), body movement "typically includes gestures, movements of the body (limbs, hands, head, feet, and legs), facial expressions, eye behavior, and posture" (p. 8). Observers of body movements tend to form impressions based on those movements. The more a person uses immediacy behaviors, the more liked the person is to those observing. Relaxed and calm movements as well as positive head movements are seen as more immediate than fewer gestures, tense body position, nervous movements, and negative head movements (Richmond, McCroskey, & Payne, 1991). In political communication, it is important for candidates to be liked by the voters, therefore, they probably utilize more immediacy behaviors when being seen by the public. Graber (1988) found that people make inferences based on a person's movements, which is valuable during election seasons when people have to make important decisions about a candidate's character and ability to perform the tasks in office.

18

Favorability can be determined in part by how active the candidate appears (Moriarty & Garramone, 1986; Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Waldman, 1998). For example, speaking at a podium, shaking hands with constituents, arms above head, hands gesturing, and even kissing babies are all signs of favorable activity (Verser & Wicks, 2006). Unfavorable activities included sitting still, reading, lethargic, dozing, leaning on podium or object, or arms and/or hands at rest. From these image studies, it can be concluded that the more active a candidate appeared, the more favorable the candidate was.

Eye Gaze

According to Knapp and Hall (2002), eye gaze "refers to the eye movement we make in the general direction of another's face" (p. 10). Direct eye gaze is another nonverbal behavior cue that can indicate immediacy with other people. Mehrabian (1972) suggests that increased eye gaze can be positively associated with increased liking between people. Based on this author's interpretation of the nonverbal and immediacy literature pertaining to eye gaze, it would be possible for a candidate to use eye gaze to let the viewer know that he is likeable, which can be a positive quality in a candidate. Hypothetically, the more eye contact a candidate maintains with the viewers, the more successful he could be in the outcome of the campaign. The opposite could also be true. If a candidate limits his eye contact with the viewers or averts his gaze altogether, then he may be seen as unfavorable or even dishonest, which are two negative qualities in political candidates. It should also be noted that too much eye gaze (e.g., glaring or staring) can signal aggression (Mehrabian, 1972) and could possibly reduce liking and make receivers of the eye gaze uncomfortable or even fearful.

Knapp and Hall (2002) indicate that eye gaze is reciprocal. If one person shows liking towards another through eye gaze, then the second person will reciprocate the gaze to indicate his or her liking for the first person. When a candidate speaks in an ad spot, he has the ability to communicate directly with the voter through the use of eye contact (via the camera). It is possible that if a viewer likes the candidate, then he or she will reciprocate the eye contact (via the television unit) with the candidate, which hypothetically, could indicate a stronger liking of the candidate.

Tiemans (1978) argues that one reason for Gerald Ford's loss could be due to the lack of eye gaze with the camera during the debates. Lack of eye gaze can indicate uncertainty or even a lack of confidence, which are two qualities that are unwanted in a political candidate, especially a presidential candidate. Because a candidate is in control of his advertisements, he is able to choose to use images of his opponent in which the opponent does not make eye contact with the viewer.

Facial Expression

According to Knapp and Hall (2002), most studies of the face are concerned with the configurations that display various emotional states. There are six primary affect displays: anger, sadness, surprise, happiness, fear, and disgust (Ekman & Friesen, 1969). Smiles and facial expressions that show pleasure are seen as more immediate than frowns or facial expressions that show displeasure or disgust (Richmond et al., 1991). According to McGraw (2003), attractive facial appearances (smiles) produce more positive trait inferences than unattractive (facial) appearances (frowns). Based on this literature, it is possible that nonverbal behavior cues, specifically positive facial expression, can lead to higher levels of immediacy as well as positive impressions of political candidates.

20

Politicians who smile may be perceived to be more favorable, likeable and vote worthy than politicians who frown. Simply put, when a candidate is seen smiling, he may appear more likeable, honest, trustworthy, dominant, and strong to viewers. However, smiling can also convey weakness (Henley, 1977), which would not be a good quality in a leader. Effects studies would have to empirically investigate these ideas.

However, in opposition to this nonverbal research, Kaid and Johnston (2001), found that in 85% of over 1200 political advertisements, a candidate's facial expression was primarily attentive or serious. Candidates were seen smiling only 11% of the time. This may be due to the demands of the office being sought. The facial expression of the candidate may portray his level of seriousness or toughness of being President, which could lead to favorable or unfavorable voter evaluations. Essentially a serious expression on a Presidential candidate could be a likeable expression to the voters. Based on the nonverbal literature and political communication literature, there may be a fine line between how much a candidate should smile versus how much a candidate should facially express seriousness or somberness.

Gestures

Gestures are movements of the body used to communicate an idea, intention, or feeling (Knapp & Hall, 2002). These actions are mostly made with the hands and arms. Gestures perform many functions, including replacing verbal communication, regulating the flow and rhythm of communication, maintaining attention, emphasizing and/or providing clarity to communication, helping characterize and make memorable the content of the communication, acting as forecasters of forthcoming communication, and helping speakers access and formulate speech (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Gestures can show

21

how the speaker relates to what he/she is saying. For example, palm positions (up, down, away, facing) can suggest different meanings: uncertainty, certainty, ascertains of the listener, or embracing a concept, respectively (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Gestures can also punctuate verbal messages. For example, the chopping motion of an arm and hand can signify the importance of an issue. Speakers can use number signals with fingers to emphasize a point in a presentation.

Gestures can be important aspects of communication in political campaigns. In 1968, Richard Nixon made the "V for victory" gesture (the pointer and index fingers in a "V" shape) with his arms held high at the Republican National Convention in Miami. Joe Lieberman frequently displayed the "thumbs up" (way to go) gesture when campaigning as the vice-presidential running mate of Al Gore in 2000. This gesture typically means things are good or positive.

Posture

Posture can be a rich source of information about emotional states and status in relationships. The way a person sits can indicate interest or boredom. Voters can receive nonverbal messages from a political candidate by the way he sits, stands, leans, reclines, or rests. According to Mehrabian (1981) people can communicate an openness and willingness to communicate, along with a positive attitude, through exhibiting immediacy in one's postural behavior cues. It should also be noted that postural positions can also shut off communication between people.

Observations of posture can be used to determine how involved or attentive a person is or how much a person likes the other people involved in the process of communication (Knapp & Hall, 2002). A forward leaning posture has been associated

with higher involvement and more liking between people as well as higher levels of immediacy in various communication situations. A hunched over, slumped shoulder stance does not communicate immediacy. Crossed arms with a backward lean signals nonresponsiveness.

In political communication, where candidates are trying to win elections to represent or lead the masses of people, it is important for the candidate to appear accessible, likeable, and approachable. One way a candidate can accomplish this is to have a postural stance that is open and responsive to voters. In televised political advertising, it is possible for a candidate to appear immediate with his audience and portray his opponent as closed to the audience.

Dress/Clothing

The way people dress communicates a great deal of information to other people. Acording to Richmond, McCroskey, and Payne (1991), fabric, color, textures, and styles with which we adorn our bodies send messages to others about what we think, who we are, our relationship status to those around us, our values, attitudes, and preferences, goals, and aspirations. In political communication, what a candidate is wearing can tell a voter whether the candidate is comfortable in his role, sets himself apart from a crowd, appears leader-like, or is trying to "be one of the people." During the 2000 election, George W. Bush used formal business suits to appear more leader-like and to reinforce his status as a presidential candidate. On the other hand, Al Gore was frequently seen wearing polo shirts and khaki pants (as well as other casual attire) to try to fit in with his followers in the hopes of being seen as "one of the guys," a clear plain folks persuasive strategy (Verser & Wicks, 2006). It appeared that he was trying to send the message "I'm

23

just like you" to his constituents.

Some research supports the belief that clothes are an important factor in first "gut reaction" impressions. Two important conclusions can be drawn from prior research on apparel (Knapp & Hall, 2002). First, clothes can communicate messages. A very basic example is when an infant is dressed in pink clothes; most people in Western culture will immediately think the infant is a girl. Second, clothing can communicate most effectively when it is adapted to the wearer's role and the context of the communication situation. For example, job applicants for a position at a fortune 500 company would most likely wear a conservative business suit for an interview. If the applicant wore something different (beach apparel), then they would not be communicating the desire for the job as effectively.

Clothing can play different roles in communication. It can communicate status and group identification (Knapp & Hall, 2002). In political settings, a candidate's attire can indicate their status among a crowd of supporters, but it can also indicate the desire to fit in among the supporters. For example, when a candidate is giving a presentation to a large crowd at a town square, he/she may be wearing more formal attire, such as a business suit, which may show that he/she is of a higher status.

Graber (1988) found that people make inferences based on a person's physical appearance, including dress, which is valuable during election seasons when people have to make important decisions about a candidate's character. Analysts have often discussed Nixon's loss to Kennedy in terms of how he presented himself on television. Regarding the first of the 1960 presidential debates between Kennedy and Nixon, discussion often focuses on Nixon's loss in terms of how he presented himself on television, that is, his

five o'clock shadow showing through the stage makeup, lighting conditions that

accentuated his tire and sick face, a suit that blended into the background, and so forth.

Nixon has been quoted as saying he spent too much time studying and not enough time

on his physical appearance (Tiemens, 1978). Research by Davis (1995, p. 213) indicates

that Nixon's appearance was only one of his nonverbal drawbacks.

> Nixon sits with a tense, narrow posture, whereas Kennedy sits with legs crossed,
>
> hands resting easily, his weight centered. In the medium camera shots, Nixon can
>
> be seen gripping the lectern tightly and not gesticulating for long periods of time,
>
> although his head movements are clear and emphatic. And Nixon displays a
>
> disastrous pattern of hyper-blinking—not just abnormally frequent (more than one
>
> per second), but at times with such rapid flutters that his eyes momentarily close.
>
> By comparison, Kennedy clearly winds despite his rather ordinary and constricted
>
> showing.

By 1968, though, Nixon felt he knew a great deal more about the role of nonverbal

behavior and the use of television. Joe McGinniss's book *The Selling of the President*

1968 presents a vivid, if not frightening, picture of the role nonverbal behaviors may play

in televised politics:

> Television seems particularly useful to the politician who can be charming but
>
> lacks ideas. On television it matters less that he does not have ideas. His
>
> personality is what the viewers want to share. He need be neither statesman nor
>
> crusader; he must only show up on time. Success and failure are easily measure:
>
> how often is he invited back? Often enough and he reaches his goal—to advance

from politician to celebrity, a status jump bestowed by grateful viewers who feel that finally they have been given a basis for making a choice.

The TV candidate, then, is measure not against his predecessors—not against a standard of performance established by two centuries of democracy—but against Mike Douglas. How well does he handle himself? Does he mumble, does he twitch, does he make me laugh? Do I feel warm inside? (p. 29-33)

The words would be the same ones Nixon always used—the words of the acceptance speech. But they would all seem fresh and lively because a serious of still pictures would flash on the screen while Nixon spoke. If it were done right, it would permit Treleaven to create a Nixon image that was entirely independent of the words. Nixon would say his same old tiresome things but no one would have to listen. The words would become Muzak. Something pleasant and lulling in the background. The flashing pictures would be carefully selected to create the impression that somehow Nixon represented competence, respect for tradition, serenity, faith that the American people were better people than people anywhere else, and that all these problems others shouted about meant nothing in a land blessed with the tallest building, strongest armies, biggest factories, cutest children, and rosiest sunsets in the world. Even better: through association with these pictures, Richard Nixon could become these very things. (p. 85)

An analysis of the 1976 Carter-Ford presidential debates argues that Ford's loss was attributable to less eye gaze with the camera, grimmer facial expressions, and less favorable camera angles (Tiemens, 1978). Subsequently, Carter's loss to Reagan in the

1980 debate was attributed to Carter's visible tension and his inability to coordinate his nonverbal behavior with his verbal message (Ritter & Henry, 1990).

Effective leaders are often seen as people who confidently take stock of a situation, perform smoothly, and put those around them at ease. Many saw Reagan's nonverbal behavior this way. In 1984, Reagan's expressiveness and physical attractiveness were evident, whereas his opponent, Mondale, was perceived as low expressiveness and attractiveness (Patterson, Churchill, Burger, & Powell, 1992). Expressions of fear may be the biggest turnoff for voters. Looking down, hesitative, making rapid, jerky movements, or seeming to freeze as Dan Quayle did when Lloyd Bentsen told him in the 1988 vice presidential debate, "You're no Jack Kennedy" (Knapp & Hall, 2002).

Kiousis, Bantimaroudis, and Ban (1999) explain that candidates attributes, including external appearance such as dress, help us better understand how people form opinions about public figures. Sybers and Roach (1962) summarized the messages of dress through the following conclusions: 1) clothing serves as a symbol of our status; 2) failure to dress as expected can have a negative effect; and 3) we believe that people have to dress in accordance with their roles in society as well as the workplace. In political advertising, where a candidate has control over his appearance as well as his opponent's appearance (a candidate can choose which images of his opponent are in the advertisement), clothing can be used to positively or favorably portray the candidate and negatively or unfavorably portray his opponent. In fact, all of the nonverbal behavior cues can be controlled by the candidate in his political advertisements to make himself look better than his opponent, which would make him appear more favorable to voters

27

than his opponent. Further information regarding impression management and the corresponding theoretical framework are necessary to guide this study.

Impression Management Theory

Impression management can be defined as the activities a person engages in to regulate and to control the information about themselves that they present to other people (McGraw, 2003). Impression management is based on how an encoder crafts their nonverbal behaviors to create desired images, projecting how they want to be seen by the decoder (Burgoon & Hoobler, 2002). Impressions or judgments are formed based, in part, on visual nonverbal cues in initial interactions. According to Kaid and Johnston (2001), politicians must pay attention to how they nonverbally appear in their televised advertisements because the appearance of a candidate can influence the overall audience's perception. In visually comparative political advertising, a candidate manages his and his opponent's impressions by controlling what variables the viewers can see. A politician and his advertising advisors can strategically craft televisual advertisements using specific gestures, movements, attire, etc., to form impressions of the candidate and the opponent(s) in the viewers' minds.

Jones and Pittman (1982) developed the impression management theory concerning how people encourage positive views of themselves in others while avoiding negative views. Burgoon, et al (1996) argue, "assertive impression management occurs when people attempt to establish specific attributes in the eyes of others" (p. 374). For example, if a candidate wants the viewers to see that he supports education and he wants to be positively associated with that issue, then he might be seen helping a class of students with homework or answering questions of a group of teachers.

28

Tedeschi and Norman (1985) have identified several behaviors, including

entitlements, exemplification, ingratiation, enhancements, self-promotion, attraction,

esteem, prestige, status, credibility, and trustworthiness, which serve to increase positive

perceptions that people have of others. According to Burgoon et al. (1996), one of the

most obvious nonverbal visual cues that convey attractiveness is physical appearance,

including how a person is dressed. Generally, the more physically attractive someone is,

the more positively evaluated they are. Other nonverbal visual cues that can promote

likeability and attractiveness are positive affect cues, such as smiles, head nods, and

raising eyebrows. Research has confirmed that the more a person smiles and nods their

head, the better liked they are and the more attractive they appear (Bayes, 1970;

Mehrabian, 1981). Immediacy cues, such as eye gaze, touch, close proximity, gesturing,

and forward leaning, also promote attractiveness and likeability (Heslin & Boss, 1980;

Mehrabian, 1969, Patterson, 1977).

Impressions can also be managed to increase the perceptions of credibility and

power (Burgoon, et al., 1996). Generally, eye gaze is the main nonverbal cue that

increases the perception of credibility. Other cues that also have a positive impact are

physical appearance, relaxed posture, and the use of more self-adaptors. Overall, the most

basic goal of impression management is to get other people to be attracted to us and to

like us. Generally, the more we like and are attracted to someone, the more likely we will

be to support him or her. Also, the more credible and powerful a person appears to be, the

more likely we will be to support him.

Emphasis is typically on what nonverbal behaviors actually encourage favorable

impressions or are judged to be appropriate in specific communication situations. For

example, in the political arena, a candidate is supposed to act, dress, and appear to be a certain way. If he fails to do so, then he may appear less favorable than his political opponent. In visual political advertisements, a candidate can craft visual messages to make his opponent appear less favorable than himself by utilizing specific visual images containing unfavorable nonverbal behavior cues.

The visual channel, in contrast to the verbal channel, appears to be more important in forming impressions of people (Raines, Hechtman, & Rosenthal, 1990). Factors that strongly contribute to forming impressions are body movements, facial expressions, and eye gaze (Burgoon & Hoobler, 2002).

There are two basic aims to impression management theory. First is the ability to manage impressions of attractiveness, likeability, and immediacy through the use of nonverbal behavior cues. According to Burgoon and Hoobler (2002), there are four areas of nonverbal behavior cues that are instrumental in forming and maintaining impressions of attractiveness, likeability and immediacy: physical attractiveness (including apparel); warmth and pleasantness (including facial expressions and head nods); immediacy (including posture, eye gaze, and body movement); and dominance (including posture and gestures). The second basic aim of impression management theory is the ability to manage impressions of credibility and power through the use of nonverbal behavior cues (Burgoon & Hoobler, 2002). Many of the same nonverbal behavior cues mentioned above, such as apparel and posture, are used to form impressions of power and credibility. Essentially, nonverbal behavior cues can lead to impressions of attractiveness, likeability, immediacy, credibility, and power, which are all essential in forming perceptions of political candidates.

30

Political Communication and Production Technique Literature

Various production techniques can influence how viewers perceive what they are seeing on the screen. Millerson (1972) argued that the rhetoric of production could be just as persuasive to viewers as written or spoken rhetoric. According to Zettl (1976), presenting an event from a variety of points of view, the camera can create an event or the feeling of an event by manipulating emotions and moods through the use of video technology. In other words, the camera helps the audience member to interpret the messages. In political advertising, specific production techniques are utilized by the candidate to produce a particular effect or message for the viewer. Television production techniques can be used to compare or contrast opposing ideas, link a variety of ideas, imply certain meanings, create a deliberate falsification or deceptive idea or meaning, provide an interpretation, and show repetition and/or flashbacks. A politician running for office can use these techniques to portray himself in a favorable manner and his/her opponent in an unfavorable one.

Messaris (1997) asserts that people perceive visual images as direct copies of reality contending that images can be created to influence a response among audience members. The Kuyuleshov effect, which takes advantage of camera angle, proximity, identification, and imagery, can be used to influence image perception (Messaris, 1992; Messaris, 1997). Indeed, political advertising has long taken advantage of image manipulation. During the 1968 presidential campaign, a television ad presented a smiling Hubert Humphrey juxtaposed with images of the Vietnam War and domestic rioting in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention. Voters, it was hoped, would interpret this as a lack of concern by Humphrey for significant national problems.

Kaid and Johnston (2001) focused a second part of their videostyle study on the production techniques (ad length, format, setting, symbols, others in shot, staging of ad, special effects, camera angle, and camera shot) of candidates in televised political advertising, which are techniques that can influence voters' perceptions of the candidates. Their results are broken down within each of the corresponding variables in the following review of literature.

Camera Angle

Camera angle refers to the height and orientation, or level, of the camera in relationship to the subject (Mamer, 2000). There are main camera angle shots: low-angle, high-angle, and eye-level. A low-angle shot is one in which the camera is below the subject, angle upward. This type of angle has a tendency to make characters look threatening, powerful, and/or intimidating (Mamer, 2000; Kepplinger & Donsbach, 1986). According to a political campaign website study of visual images by Verser and Wicks (2006), Al Gore was often shown to be higher than the camera in many of his photographs. This superior camera angle suggests that politicians use low camera angles to signify authority and power (Messaris, 1997). Making a candidate look powerful is favorable, whereas making a candidate appear threatening or intimidating is considered unfavorable.

A high-angle shot is the opposite of the low-angle shot and can have the opposite effect. The camera is located above and is looking down on the subject. According to Mamer (2000), a low-angle shot "tends to diminish a subject, making it look intimidated or threatened and is a conventional way of making characters look insignificant" (p. 8). Essentially, camera shots from above make a candidate appear small or diminutive in

32

stature and in character (Kepplinger & Donsbach, 1986). Thus, high-angle shots can be

perceived to be unfavorable. A candidate would want to avoid using high-angle shots of

himself in his political advertisements, but would want to include these types of shots of

his opponent.

Based on this literature, it can be assumed that both low- and high-angle shots

could make a political candidate appear unfavorable to audiences. If a candidate utilized

these types of shots in political advertisements to portray his opponent, the audience

perceptions may be less favorable of the opponent. According to Mamer (2000), high-

and low-angle shots can be misused, implying things about a character that are not

accurate portrayals of the character. According to Graber (1996), "when photographed

from a low angle, people are judged to be taller and more powerful than when the camera

looks down on them. Extreme angles tend to produce negative evaluations" (p. 12).

Camera angle can contribute to the viewer's perspective in perceiving the candidate.

Mandell and Shaw (1973) argue that below eye-level camera angles have been found to

produce higher evaluations of a subject than above eye-level angles. In political

advertising, a candidate can incorporate images of his opponent seen from inferior

camera angles to portray the opponent in unfavorable ways, which can lead to

unfavorable evaluations.

The third camera angle shot, eye-level, are those taken with the camera on or near

the eye level of the subject being filmed (Mamer, 2000). This type of shot puts the viewer

on the same level or equal footing with the subject, and for that reason, these shots tend

to be neutral. Kaid and Johnston (2001) found that the majority of the presidential ad

spots from 1952 to 1996, had a "straight on" camera angle. Only 4% had a low camera

angle, also known as a superior camera angle, which would make the candidate appear

dominant. Just 2% had a high or inferior camera angle that would make the candidate

appear less dominant and possibly insignificant in the ad. For a candidate to appear

favorable to the audience, he or she would need to utilize a straight on angle, thus

conveying a sense of the candidate being equal to or on the same level as the viewer. It

would benefit the candidate if the opponent was seen from extreme angles, especially if

the candidate wanted to portray the opponent as intimidating, threatening (using a

superior angle) or weak and small (using an inferior angle).

Camera Shot

Camera shot refers to the distance between the subject and the camera. According

to Mamer (2000), there are three basic positions: long, medium, and close-up shots. The

long shot is any shot that includes the full human body and more. A type of long shot is

the *full-body* shot which includes just the person from head to toe. This shot allows the

viewer to see both a subject's body language and facial expressions. Longer shots can be

used to diminish the subject or even make the figure appear to be overwhelmed by the

surroundings (Mamer, 2000).

The medium shot, a shot of a person from the waist up, allows for more detail

than the full-body shot, but is generally neutral in its presentation of the subject (Mamer,

2000). This shot represents how we interact with people in life in neutral situations. In a

medium shot, the subject is neither diminished or emphasized.

A close-up shot is essentially a head shot, usually from the top shirt button up, but

can also be from the mid-chest up (Mamer, 2000). The close-up provides the greatest

identification with a character as well as amplifies details of actions. According to Mamer

(2000), "it is the point in which the viewer is forced to confront the subject and create

some kind of internal psychological self" (p. 6). In a close-up shot, the viewer can get the

sense of intimacy or closeness with a character, but on the other hand, close-up shots

have an in-your-face quality that could have a negative reaction of hostility as when two

people are angry at each other. Understanding the context of the close-up shot is

important in determining the intent of the communicator. For example, if a candidate is

attempting to communicate on an interpersonal friendly level, then a close-up shot would

not necessarily seem intimidating. However, if a candidate is angry or upset and is using

a close-up shot, then he may appear threatening to the viewers.

Kaid and Johnston (2001) found that the majority of the presidential ad spots from

1952 to 1996, included a tight—head and shoulders—camera shot. Nearly a quarter of

the ads had a medium—waist up—camera shot. Only one percent of the ads in this study

were long—full length—camera shots. Obviously, the less a viewer sees of the candidate,

the less they have to make a judgment about. If a candidate is not very television savvy,

then using tighter angles would be a benefit to that candidate. According to Graber

(1996), "The closer the camera, the more people like what the candidate says. Close-ups

also make people seem friendlier and more approachable" (p. 13).

In political advertising, I believe that a candidate would want to portray himself

using a medium or neutral shot so that he would have the best possible perception from

the viewers. However, if a candidate wants to portray a sense of intimacy with the

viewer, then a close-up shot may be more favorable. A candidate would also want to

utilize either long or full-body shots of his opponent, since these shots can be used to

create unflattering portrayals and possible unfavorable audience perceptions. If the

35

candidate wanted to portray the opponent as "in-your-face" to the viewers, then he may employ close-up shots for that purpose.

Lighting

According to Zettl (1999), lighting "is the deliberate manipulation of light and shadows for a specific communication purpose" (p. 17). The basic purpose of lighting is to manipulate and articulate the perception of our environment. It helps us or makes us, see and feel in a specific way. It can also establish the communication context.

Some lighting has a positive influence on our perceptions—high-key lighting and above-eye-level key-light position, and other lighting has a negative influence—low-key lighting and below-eye-level key-light position. People expect the major illuminating light sources to come from overhead and slightly in front of the object or person. High-key lighting is even or flat lighting and could even be called nonjudgmental lighting (Mamer, 2000). In this type of lighting, there is very little contrast between the darks and the lights and the image appears neutral to the eye. According to Mamer (2000), it is used when a photographer does not want the quality of the light to dominate the image or to imply judgments that are not associated with the subject.

The opposite of high-key lighting is low-key lighting. Mamer (2000) describes this type of lighting as "a moody, atmospheric, and might be considered judgmental" (p. 239). Low-key lighting creates a contrast between the lights and darks in the image, which can often be seen in horror films, mysteries, psychological dramas, and crime shows. According to Zettl (1999), the use of low-key lighting and/or below-eye-level key lighting can lead to a disorientation that can translate into surprise, suspicion, or even fear, none of which would be positive characteristics for a candidate to portray in a

36

campaign. The angle and the position of the light source has a decisive influence on a person's perception of someone's character and credibility.

Essentially, high key- or neutral lighting has positive connotations and can be considered favorable lighting, and low key-lighting which is known to have negative connotations can be perceived as unfavorable. In political communication, a candidate would probably want to portray himself using images with high-key lighting to create favorable images and portray his opponent using low-key lighting to create unfavorable images. Based on the previously mentioned literature, an opponent shown in low-key lighting would more likely be judged unfavorable by audiences, and a candidate in high-key lighting would appear neutral.

Color

According to Zettle (1999), color can be used for specific purposes "in the overall quest for clarifying and intensifying a media-transmitted event" (p. 63). Candidates can use color in their political advertisements to clarify and/or intensify themselves and/or their opponents. Color serves many functions. It can help viewers distinguish among things or tell us more about an event (Zettle, 1999). For example, we can tell a black and white photograph has apples in it, but in a color photograph, we can see that there are two varieties of apples, red and golden.

Color can also be used to symbolize events or they can be symbols in and of themselves (Zettle, 1999). Various colors can be used to symbolize life, power, passion,

comfort, and warmth as well as death, hate, anger, sadness, and jealousy.[2] In politics, the use of the color red symbolizes Republican, and the color blue symbolizes Democrat. In our culture, we even have a party of color: the Green Party which is know for its support of environmental issues. We also have meaning behind certain combinations of colors. For example, the combination of red, white, and blue is symbolic of patriotism or nationalism.

Color can also be used to create harmony or conflict in an image. By using various combinations of colors on the color wheel as well as black and white, some images can be harmonized better than others and other images can portray conflict simply by the combination of colors that do not harmonize together (Zettle, 1999). For example, a bright red and bright yellow are two colors that when put together do not harmonize well. A candidate's photograph can be digitally altered to exaggerate one color (yellow). Then the photograph can be placed on a background (red) that dramatically contrasts with the overcompensated color. Thus, a visual conflict is created on screen. Candidates have the ability through the choice of images to use and the use of technology to create visual conflict in their televised advertisements. According to West (1997), in political advertising, monotone or black and white images of candidates can be used to diminish favorability when portraying one's opponent. The use of black and white images in political advertising can also indicate negativity. For example, in 2004, George W. Bush

---

[2] It should be noted that the symbolic meaning of colors is learned and that different cultures have different meanings for the same color. For example, in Asian cultures, red symbolizes death and in many Western cultures, black symbolizes death.

ran an attack ad, titled *Pessimism* against John Kerry, in which the visual images of Kerry

were in black and white. Kerry also ran attack ads in which he portrayed Bush in black

and white images. Candidates can use non-harmonious black and white images of their

opponents mixed with harmonious color images of themselves to indicate conflict

between the two.

There is yet another way to interpret color. Zettle (1999) states that the use of the

full spectrum of saturated colors often lure the viewer to look *at* rather than *into* the

event. The use of black and white, however, does just the opposite. Essentially, the use of

color provides a full picture for the viewer, whereas black and white images require the

viewer to fill in the gaps. Let's use the example of the apples again. If the picture is in

full color, then we do very little thinking about the apples. We know they are red. If the

picture of the apples is in black and white, then we are required to think about the apples.

What color are they? Are they ripe? What do they taste like? And so on. Politicians are

always under public scrutiny and observation. If a candidate uses black and white

imagery, then, based on Zettle's idea, a candidate would be inviting even more scrutiny.

From the public by having them fill in the gaps in the image.

Motion

According to Graber (1996), people tend to be evaluated more favorably when

they are in normal motion than in stationary positions. Reverse motion has the possibility

of giving the impression of backwards progress, while slow motions gives the impression

of working slowly to accomplish goals. Kaid and Johnston (2001) found that of the

presidential ad spots from 1952 to 1996, 25% of negative ad spots contained a motion

production technique—slow motion, fast motion, reverser motion, or freeze-frame. The

plurality of the ads (46%) contained still images or televised freeze-frames. Candidates also used slow motion 10% more than normal motion shots (Kaid & Johnston, 2001). However, the authors make no mention of whose motion is being altered, the candidate or the opponent. Since the ads are considered negative, one could assume that the motion of the opponent is being altered, but there is no evidence from their study to support this assumption.

Production Style

According to Kaid and Johnston (2001), the overall production style of a political advertisement conveys messages about the candidates approach to communicating to the electorate. Candidates have utilized several different production styles in their televised political advertisements. These include cinema verité, slides with voice-overs, head-on, animation or special production, or a combination of these (Kaid & Johnston, 2001). Cinema verité style is designed to portray the candidate in a realistic and naturally occurring event or situation as it is happening. There have been many ads over the years of candidates sitting at a desk working on legislation; these ads would be considered cinema verité.

Slides with voice-overs are when a candidate will use still images or photographs (slides) that are used to indicate motion and involvement while the candidate, an announcer, or a supporter is heard speaking. In 1968, Richard Nixon used this style to avoid using himself in the ads. However, this style was not popular with other candidates until the 1996 election when both Dole and Clinton incorporated this style into nearly half of their ads (Kaid & Johnston, 2001).

Head-on style is when a candidate or another person is speaking to and facing the viewer and the camera appears to be directly in front of or just to the side of the person. The "Eisenhower Answers America" ads are produced in this style. Eisenhower also incorporated animation, or cartoon-like drawings and moving images, which were created by Walt Disney Studios. Kennedy used animation in his ad spots in 1960. However in more recent advertisements, there is little or no animation used by the candidates.

Overall, to determine favorability based on production style, the context of the advertisement has to be considered. For example, if a candidate is trying to make a close connection to the viewers, then they may want to produce a head-on ad. However, if a candidate wants to indicate how his opponent is less active as politician, then he could show a head-on clip of the opponent (in which you can see very little movement, setting, other people, etc.). This is a way in which head-on style is unfavorable.

Setting

Another aspect of political advertisements is setting, which can be defined as the surroundings or environment of the shot or ad. According to Moriarty and Garramone (1986), a monumental (e.g., Independence Hall, Mt. Rushmore) or formal (e.g., campaign rally; Oval Office) setting can be interpreted as favorable, whereas an informal or casual (e.g., living room, kitchen) setting is viewed as unfavorable. It is no surprise then that Kaid and Johnston (2001) found that in 41% of the ads studied, candidates utilized formal settings, either indoor or outdoor. This is double the amount of informal, either indoor or outdoor, settings used.

Formal indoor settings, such as an office, convey a sense of responsibility and trust. The trappings of an office, Oval or not, help the candidate portray a sense of serious

41

attention to the work of the government (Kaid & Johnston, 2001). Based on research, it can be assumed that formal settings are considered more favorable than informal settings. Thus, a candidate would want to portray himself in formal settings and his opponent in informal settings to achieve the desired voter evaluations.

However, it is possible that a candidate, in efforts to shape viewer perception, would utilize informal settings in a favorable manner. For example, in 2000, the media had labeled Gore as "stiff." In the majority (55%) of his photographs on his website, he is shown in informal settings (Verser & Wicks, 2006). The authors posit that Gore was using visual imagery to counter the label and appear relaxed. In this instance, the use of informal settings could possibly be favorable, depending on the context of the campaign.

Favorability can depend on the context of the campaign as well as the context of the advertisement, as in 2000 when Gore and Bush utilized setting in different ways, but both ways were considered favorable (Verser & Wicks, 2006). In some situations, an indoor informal setting could be considered favorable and in other situations, an outdoor formal setting may be considered unfavorable.

Symbols

According to Strother (1999), "the presence of objects within the frame of the image can project symbolic ideas, themes, or emotions onto candidates" such as "the American flag (patriotism), a factory production line (jobs), computers (technology), schoolchildren (education), and so on" (p. 179). Constituents holding campaign signs and banners in the background of visual images can be symbols of support, which according to Barrett and Barrington (2005) are favorable symbols.

In their study of the candidate websites in 2000, Verser and Wicks (2006) found that both Bush and Gore used symbolic props, such as flags, bunting, government seals, etc., to portray themselves as patriotic, presidential, authoritative and thus favorable. In televised advertising, due to technological capabilities, a candidate—when portraying their opponent—can remove any symbols from images that may have a favorable connotation, thus making their opponent appear unfavorable. At the same time, a candidate has the ability to include favorable symbols in the creation and production of their televised advertisements in order to make themselves appear more favorable.

Others in Shot

In various political campaign situations, it is common, if not necessary, for candidates to be seen with other people to indicate that he has a following of supporters. According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), the presence of prominent individuals as a visible sign of support for the candidate can help establish credibility. For example, in 1996, then-California Governor Pete Wilson ran for President. It was observed by the press that Wilson was seen with only his wife in several campaign situations, suggesting that he lacked support from prominent citizens, other party members, or average people (Trent & Friedenberg, 2004). If a candidate has hopes to win an election, he or she needs to visually show that they have support from various groups of people to increase his or her credibility and viability as a candidate. In 2000, the images on George W. Bush's website showed him with large crowds of people, indicating that he had the support of the people, making him appear more credible and viable as a presidential candidate (Verser & Wicks, 2006). In this same study, Gore's website had no pictures of him with then-President Clinton. To the viewers of the website photographs, it may have appeared that

Clinton did not support Gore, which possibly hurt his viability as a presidential candidate. Of course, it was well known that Gore wanted to distance himself from Clinton's scandals and make a clean name for himself. For those reasons, he may not have incorporated pictures of Clinton on the web.

Shot Length

According to Kaid and Johnston (2001), a candidate utilizing shorter time lengths in his advertising may be indicating that he does not desire to have his ideas exposed to too much criticism or that he believes that the viewers are unable to process longer messages. Over the existence of televised political advertising, the length of the spot has been decreasing. Kaid and Johnston (2001) found that the majority of the presidential ad spots from 1952 to 1996 were 15 to 30 seconds in length. About 1/3 of the spots were a minute and only 12% were 2 minutes or longer. They also found that the longer spots were from the earlier campaigns. As time has progressed, political advertisements have gotten shorter and shorter. In 1996, more than 90% of Clinton's and Dole's ads were 30 seconds shorter. Also worth noting, negative ad spots tend to be shorter than positive ad spots. Kaid and Johnston (2001) found that nearly 75% of negative advertisements were 30 seconds or less.

This study did not break down the advertisements by shot, but investigated the time of the entire spot. This begs the question as to how long the candidate and his opponent are on the screen and what does that amount of time mean. Since positive ads spots are longer, it is possible to hypothesize that the candidate shots (positive) in visually comparative advertisements will be longer than opponent shots (negative). However, there is no known literature that discusses this aspect of political

44

advertisements. Hopefully, this study will shed some light on shot length and the implications shot length may have.

Framing Theory Literature

Goffman (1974) believes that in order to comprehend the world around us, everyone had to employ some level of framing. Robert Entman (1993) developed a widely used definition of framing. He defines framing as selecting "some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described" (p. 52). Others have defined framing as "selecting and emphasizing certain aspects of experience or ideas over others" (Miller, 1998, p. 313), and "frames are principles of selection, emphasis, and presentation composed of little tacit theories about what exists, what happens, and what matters" (Gitlin, 1980, p. 6). Frames have also been defined as "a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events. … The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue" (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987, p. 143). In political communication, a candidate uses frames to select specific information about himself and his opponent that he wants the electorate to focus on while watching televised political advertisements.

Frames serve as working routines, allowing journalists to quickly identify and classify information and to package it for quick and easy delivery to their audiences. (Gitlin, 1980). Political candidates use frames in similar way as journalists. They determine how they want to portray themselves and their opponents to the viewers through framing. Candidates identify and classify the messages that will fulfill their idea

of the appropriate visual image for himself and his opponent, and then use the production techniques to quickly and easily convey those messages to the viewers, in the eventual hope that the candidate will be perceived to be the favorable choice and the opponent the unfavorable choice for office.

Frames provide a field of meaning through which messages about people and events may be understood by the general public. Gitlin (1980) adds that frames are a useful and efficient way to channel large amounts of information to an audience, thus making the information easier to manage and comprehend. Robert Cialdini (2002) explains that a frame aligns the perspective of the message, so that the receiver only receives what the sender wants him or her to receive. A political candidate may only want to focus on a few of his characteristics, such as power or credibility, that would make him a good candidate for the office, so he would need to frame himself to portray an image that focuses on just those few characteristics.

According to D'Angelo (2002), to alter trains of thought, news coverage must make a topic and frames accessible to individuals, who are sensitive to accessible information in the process of making decisions, formulating judgments, or expressing opinions. Candidates must make a topic (themselves and/or their opponents) and frames (production techniques) accessible to individuals who, in turn, use the topic and frames to form judgments (perceptions) of the candidate and/or his opponent.

A frame directs the receiver to consider certain aspects of the message and ignore others. Shafir, Simonson, and Tversky (1993) explain that different frames highlight different aspects and initiate different reasons and considerations that are able to influence overall thoughts and opinions. If there are no frames, then the viewers may not

receive the messages that the candidate wants them to receive, and they may receive messages that the candidate does not want them to receive.

Valkenburg, Semetko, and De Vreese (1999) point out that there are several ways news is framed, including conflict and human interest frames. Conflict frames emphasize clashes between people, groups of people, organizations, or institutions (Neuman et al., 1992). This type of frame is related to the language of wars, competitions, and games (Jamieson, 1992). Conflict frames could easily be used in political campaigns, since they are competitions between people for the office of President of the United States. In visually comparative televised political advertisements, the candidates have to show a clash between himself and his opponent.

Human interest frames bring an individual's story or an emotional angle to the presentation of an event, issue, or problem (Valkenburg et al., 1999). Nearly all presidential candidates tell their "story" at some point in the campaign. Usually in a biographical advertisement, they tell us their political story about how they moved up the political chain. In some cases they tell us their familial story about how they were raised and their family values. In both of these examples, candidates are trying to bring their story or to use emotions to present themselves to the viewers.

Other researchers (Iyengar, 1991; Wicks, 2000) identify two other types of frames: episodic and thematic. Episodic framing is event-oriented coverage of breaking news and thematic framing is presenting issues in context with background information (Wicks, 2000). One main difference is that episodic framing provides highly concrete information, whereas thematic framing is more abstract or generalized (Iyengar, 1991). Episodic frames may be short-term such as the "shock and awe" frames of the invasion of

Iraq, where as thematic frames may be repeated over the course of a long-term event, such as the War in Iraq. Thematic frames are more likely to be found in political campaigns for president, since the campaigns can be nearly a year in length. It is possible that episodic frames also occur, when there is a major event/scandal addressed by the candidate during a campaign, such as the allegations that Mondale had an affair.

Framing can lead to themes as Entman (1991) notes that frames emerge as the absence or presence of specific terms and information that can form thematic clusters. In political advertising, the continuous incorporation or continuous lack of incorporation of visual imagery in the form of production techniques can lead to themes. From these themes, a viewer might draw conclusions about the candidate and/or his opponent. The assumption embedded in the theory is that context informs our understanding, behavior, and actions. Through the utilization of frames, candidates have the power to control the information that viewers receive, thus controlling what viewers understand and even possibly viewers' behaviors (e. g., vote choice).

Goals of Study

Even though, from this study, intentional use of specific visual images on the part of the candidates cannot be ascertained, impression management as well as framing can be determined based on a content analysis of the visual images in Bush and Kerry's visually comparative televised political advertisements. This study seeks to determine how candidates use nonverbal behavior cues and in their visual images differently and similarly in portraying themselves and their opponent, as well as the characteristics that the candidates are trying to convey about themselves and their opponents in visually comparative televised advertisements. In addition, this study seeks to determine how

candidates use production techniques in their visual images similarly and differently in framing themselves and their opponent, as well as the characteristics that the candidates are trying to convey about themselves and their opponents through the use of production techniques in visually comparative televised political advertisements.

My examination of nonverbal behavior cues in the following research questions is based on nonverbal communication and impression management literature. My investigation of production techniques in the following research questions is based on media production and media framing literature. Research questions one through four are examined from a microscopic level by focusing on nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques within each shot of the candidates advertisements.

RQ1: How do Bush and Kerry differ in their utilization of visual images in their respective ads with regard to nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to manage their impressions and frame themselves as well as their opponent?

RQ2: How did the candidates use nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to manage their impressions and frame themselves as opposed to their opponents?

RQ3: What are the differences between how the candidates managed their impressions and framed themselves in their respective ads?

RQ4: What are the differences between how the candidates framed and managed each others impressions in their respective ads?

My examination of the characteristics of the candidates and opponents in the following research questions stems from the character traits (e.g., power, likeability,

49

strength, immediacy) developed in nonverbal communication and impression

management literature, as well as media production and media framing literature.

Research questions five and six are examined from a macroscopic level by focusing on

the overall impressions and frames of the candidates televised political advertisements as

a whole.

> RQ5: What characteristic(s) do the candidates portray in themselves through the
>
> use of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques?
>
> RQ6: What characteristic(s) do the candidates portray in their opponents through
>
> the use of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques?

Chapter 3: Method

This study focuses on the 2004 Presidential campaigns for George W. Bush and John F. Kerry for three main reasons. First, it is the most recent Presidential election, and data is more readily accessible for 2004 than previous election years. Second, it is also an election for the highest office in the U. S., which means that the ads are more likely to run nationally and have more potential effects on a wider audience, than say senate or gubernatorial campaigns. Third, as mentioned in the first chapter, the money being spent on presidential campaign advertising is growing. Kerry and Bush combined for the most money spent (Devlin, 2004), which means there should be more data to collect and study in this election than prior elections.

To determine how the Presidential candidates in the 2004 general campaigns portrayed themselves as well as their opponents, I compared and contrasted the nonverbal behavior cues and the production techniques that the candidates utilized in their respective visually comparative political advertisements. This study, by analyzing the visual elements of the 2004 Presidential television advertising, sheds light on how George W. Bush and John Kerry used visual images to portray themselves and their opponent.

By using the 2004 Presidential televised visually comparative advertisements available online from the Stanford University Political Communication Lab website[3], this

---

[3] The Political Communication Lab is located at Stanford University in the Department of Communication and is directed by Professor Shanto Iyengar. It can be accessed through

study is designed to give an overall assessment of the use of visual elements, consisting of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques, by the candidates.

Content Analysis

According to Simon and Iyengar (1996), content analysis can lead to superior measurement and understanding of political communication messages. This study is an opportunity to increase the measurement capabilities of political communication researchers and to increase the understanding of the use of visual messages in political advertisements. Quantitative content analysis is defined as the systematic assignment of communication content to categories according to rules, and the analysis of relationships involving those categories using statistical methods (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005).

To examine, explicate, and appraise the portrayal of the candidates and the opponents by the sponsoring candidate, visually comparative political advertisements were content analyzed according to procedures developed in this study and adapted from procedures by Moriarty and Garramone (1986), Moriarty and Popovich (1991), Kaid and Johnston (2001), and Verser and Wicks (2006). As one of the most frequently used methods in political, mass, and public communication research, content analysis is

_____

the World Wide Web at http://www.pcl.stanford.edu. It was created to develop and administer experimental studies of public opinion and political behavior through the use of both on-line and traditional research methods. The PCL electronically archives political communication messages, including speeches, debates, and advertisements, as well as news coverage of elections, from 2000 to the present. The campaign ads are collected directly from the candidate's campaigns, which provide the titles for each ad.

recognized as a powerful and valuable research tool for making objective, systematic, and usually quantitative (Moriarty & Garramone, 1986; Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Kaid & Johnston, 2001; and Verser & Wicks, 2006) descriptions of communication context, and for making reliable, replicable, and valid inferences from the data within the context that communication occurs (Krippendorff, 1980). Therefore, content analysis is a useful method to examine, describe, and assess how candidates utilize nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to portray themselves favorably and their opponents unfavorably in visually comparative televised advertisements.

Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (2005) suggest that quantitative content analysis involved drawing representative samples of content, training coders to use the category rules developed to measure or reflect differences in content, and measuring the reliability of coders in applying those rules. The data collected in a quantitative content analysis are then analyzed to describe typical patterns or characteristics and/or to identify important relationships among the variables measured. Similar to other methodological approaches, Kaid and Wadsworth (1989) state that content analysis begins with the formulation of research questions and/or hypotheses. The authors further outline content analytic procedures to include: (a) selecting the sample to be analyzed; (b) defining the categories to be applied; (c) outlining the coding process and training the coders who will implement the process; (d) implementing the coding process; (e) determining reliability and validity; and (f) analyzing the results of the coding process. According to Krippendorff (2004), content analysis is process of determining unit(s) of analysis, selecting or gathering the sample, recording or coding the sample, reducing the data to

manageable representations, abductively inferring contextual phenomena, and narrating

the answer to the research question(s) (p. 83).

Sample

One important step in any content analysis is the selection of the sample to be

analyzed. According to Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (2005), there are several types of units in

content analytic studies. The sampling unit is the physical units that will be selected for

study from the entire content of interest (p. 59). For my study, I selected visually

comparative televised political advertisements as the sampling unit. There were three

criteria for choosing the ads for this study. First, the ad had to be from election year 2004.

Second, it had to be a Bush or Kerry sponsored Presidential ad spot. Third, both the

candidate and his opponent had to visually be represented in the ad.

First, I defined visually comparative television political advertisements as being

political spots in which the candidate and his opponent are both visually represented by

still photographs or moving images in the same advertisement, not necessarily in the

same shot or scene. Second, I compiled a list of all political advertisements that fit this

definition that could be accessed from Stanford's Political Communication Lab website

(http://pcl.stanford.edu/campaigns/). The sample size totaled 62 visually comparative

televised political advertisements, 28 sponsored and produced by President Bush's

campaign and 34 sponsored and produced by Senator Kerry's campaign (see Appendix

A, Tables 1 and 2, for the complete list of advertisements used in this study).

A second unit is the unit of analysis, which are units that are analyzed statistically

to test hypotheses or answer research questions (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005). For my

study, I narrowed my unit of analysis to each individual shot that contains the candidate

54

and/or the opponent. According to Tiemens (1978) a shot is a segment in which the visual structure of the image remains constant. Instances in which camera movement changes the visual structure of the images are treated as separate shots. For this study, when the camera angle changed, it signaled a new and distinct shot. The 62 visually comparative advertisements yielded $N = 622$ (Bush = 390; Kerry = 232).

By analyzing each shot, I gathered more specific data than previous research that allows for more detailed results. In previous research (e.g., Kaid & Johnston, 2001), the unit of analysis was the overall advertisements. The variables in the ads were coded for "dominance," in which the coders had to subjectively determine in a 30-second to 5 minute ad what aspects of the variables were dominant. For example, if a candidate was shown smiling *most* of the time and serious only *some* of the time, then the ad was coded as smiling (Kaid & Johnston, 2001). By narrowing the unit of analysis to a smaller unit, I can numerically and more objectively determine dominance.

Coding Procedure

Two coders were recruited and trained to code the 62 visually comparative televised political advertisements using the written codebook and code sheet (see Appendix G). Coders included two graduate students, one in political communication (the principal researcher), and one in interpersonal communication.

Reliability. During the four training sessions, the principal researcher discussed the general purpose of the study, had each coder read the codebook and code sheet, and explained the categories and coding procedures. Coders had the opportunity to ask any questions at that time. Next, the coders jointly coded a visually comparative televised political advertisement from a non-presidential election, but for a federally elected

position (e. g., United States Senate). This step allowed coders to clarify and identify areas of disagreement and/or confusion.

When the coders appeared to understand the definitions and application of the coding instrument, they were instructed to independently code two more visually comparative televised political advertisements from the same training sample of non-presidential (federally elected position) advertisements. These results were compared to one another to determine any further areas of confusion or disagreement. This process continued until the training results indicated that the coders understand the coding instrument and the coding procedures, at which point, the coders were given a representative sample of visually comparative televised advertisements from the overall sample of this study. Specifically, a random selection of ads (15% of the total to be analyzed) was coded by each of the independent coders, and the primary researcher coded the entire sample. According to Wimmer and Dominick (2003), 10% of a sample is adequate to determine intercoder reliability (p. 157).

According to Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (2005), research usually reports reliability scores between .80 and .90. However, research that is breaking new ground with concepts that are rich in analytical value may go forward with reliability levels somewhat below that range. This is especially the case if the emphasis is on developing a method rather than actually seeking valid substantive findings. Substantive content research with reliability assessment below .70 becomes hard to interpret and the method of dubious value to replicate. According to Krippendorff (2004), reliable conclusions can be drawn from variables with a .80 or higher, and tentative conclusions can be drawn from

variables with a .667 to .79. Anything conclusions drawn from variables with a reliability score below .667 may be erroneous and unreliable.

Although there are several recommendations for Cohen's *kappa*, Dewey (1983) argued that despite its drawbacks, *kappa* should still be "the measure of choice" and this index appears to be commonly used in research that involves the coding of behavior (Bakeman, 2000). Thus, using Cohen's *kappa*, a test that corrects for chance agreement between coders, reliability was calculated for each of the 16 categories after each round of coder training, until calculations of intercoder reliability on the categories produced co-efficients ranging from .72 or higher (see Appendix B, Table 1, for *kappa* co-effiecients for each category). Thus, all variables for this study were deemed reliable.

As the advertisements were not randomly drawn, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the larger population of visually comparative political televised advertisements. Thus, the results are used to describe this particular sample.

Validity. Validity in content analytic research revolves around "face validity," which addresses the question: does the instrument actually measure what it purports to measure? The use of tested instruments is one way to assure validity (Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989), however, face validity is more appropriate in other research. Face validity was used in this mostly exploratory study and the coding instrument is largely untested. To determine validity, I re-examined parts of the sample to check qualitatively the quantitative results derived from the coding instrument. According to Krippendorff (2004), qualitative examinations should be used to support the quantitative results. These informal qualitative checks will also help to provide examples of how context is needed to determine the overall characteristics that Bush and Kerry emphasized through their use

57

of nonverbal behavior cues (e.g., facial expression, posture) and production techniques (e.g., camera angle, camera shot).

Categories

Typically, in content analysis after the sample is collected, categories need to be developed and defined to investigate the unit of analysis. In content analytic research, there is often a need to create categories or adapt categories that have been used in previous research, because according to Krippendorff (1980) due to the lack of agreed upon standardized categories, the researcher often has to develop categories to answer the questions and/or hypotheses posed in the study. The categories must be exhaustive and mutually exclusive (Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989), meaning that there can be no options left out of the categories, and the categories must not have any connections to each other.

Categories for this study were created and adapted from prior research by Moriarty and Garramone (1986), Moriarty and Popovich (1991), Kaid and Johnston (2001), and Verser and Wicks (2006). Once the categories were created, the codebook and code sheet were developed (see Appendix C). Moriarty and Garramone (1986) created categories for hands, torso, face, setting, dress, interaction, and camera angle; Moriarty and Popovich (1991) developed categories for posture, hands, eyes, expression, interaction, camera angle, setting, and dress; Kaid and Johnston (2001) created categories for production style, setting, symbols, eye contact, expression, body movement, dress, camera angle, camera shot, and motion; and Verser and Wicks (2006) included categories for hands, interaction, posture, expression, dress, eye contact, props, setting, camera angle, color, and lighting. All of these categories were used as a foundation for the creation of the 16 categories in this study; six nonverbal behavior cues (body movement,

eye gaze, facial expression, gestures, posture, and dress/clothing) and 10 production

techniques (camera angle, camera shot, lighting, color, motion, production style, setting,

symbols, others in shot, and shot length). For a comprehensive list of the categories and

operational definitions, see Appendix B.

Body movement. Kaid and Johnston (2001) operationalize favorable body

movement as frequent activity and unfavorable body movement as no activity. Other

prior research (Richmond, McCroskey, & Payne, 1991) operationally defines favorable

body movement as calm movements of the torso, arms, and legs as well as positive head

movements (e.g., nodding). Unfavorable body movements are operationally defined as

closed body position (e.g., arms folded across chest), tense or nervous body movements,

as well as negative head movements (shaking head to indicate "no"). Favorable body

movement has also been operationally defined as demonstrating dynamic behavior such

as speaking, shaking hands, hugging, kissing babies. Unfavorable body movement is also

defined as passive or lethargic activity such as listening, reading, or dozing (Verser &

Wicks, 2006; Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Moriarty & Garramone, 1986). In this study,

body movement was coded as calm movements of arms, legs, torso, and/or positive head

movements or lethargic behavior or tense/nervous movement of arms, legs, or torso, or

negative head movements.

Eye gaze. Kaid and Johnston (2001) operationalized eye gaze as having eye

contact with the viewer of the advertisement. Richmond, et al. (1991) define favorable

eye gaze as direct eye contact and mutual gaze between speaker and listener. They define

unfavorable eye gaze as having limited eye contact between speaker and listener, or

averting eye gaze altogether. Verser and Wicks (2006), Moriarty and Popovich (1991),

59

and Moriarty and Garramone (1986) operationalized eye gaze as a candidate looking directly at the camera or at someone in the visual image or looking up at the sky, down at the ground, or having eyes closed, thus avoiding any kind of eye contact or having eyes closed.

Facial expression. Favorable facial expression is operationalized as having positive affect displays (e.g., displays of happiness or joy), expressions that show pleasure, and smiling. Unfavorable favorable facial expression is operationalized as having negative affect displays (i.e. displays of anger, sadness, fear, or disgust), expressions that show displeasure, and frowning (Richmond, McCroskey, & Payne, 1991). According to prior research, favorable expression has been operationalized as cheerful, confident, or smiling, while unfavorable expression is unhappy, worried, tired, frowning, or glaring (Verser & Wicks, 2006; Kaid & Johnston, 2001; Moriarty & Popovich, 1991). Favorable expression has also been operationalized as looking determined and unfavorably operationalized as looking sad (Waldman & Devitt, 1998). Some research has found a serious or attentive facial expression to be operationalized as neutral (Kaid & Johnston, 2001; Moriarty & Garramone, 1986). Thus, coders coded facial expression as smiling, pleasant, joyous, and/or happy expressions or angry, sad, fearful, or disgusted.

Gestures. Richmond, McCroskey, and Payne (1991) operationalized favorable gestures as the use of more hand movements and signals and unfavorable gestures as the use of fewer hand movements and signals. Verser and Wicks (2006), Moriarty and Popovich (1991), and Moriarty and Garramone (1986) operationalized favorable gestures as the movement of hands, whereas unfavorable gestures are hands at one's sides or at

60

rest. For this study, gestures were coded as the use of hand movements, or the lack of hand movement or hands at rest.

Posture. Richmond, McCroskey, and Payne (1991) operationally define favorable posture as leaning toward another person and unfavorable posture as leaning away from another person. Verser and Wicks (2006) and Moriarty and Popovich (1991) operationalized favorable posture as standing or sitting tall and upright and unfavorable posture as bowed or slumped over, or leaning on another person or an object. Posture was operationalized for this study as upright, bowed, slumped, hunched over, leaning toward someone, or leaning away from someone.

Dress/clothing. Kaid and Johnston (2001) operationalized favorable dress as formal and unfavorable dress as casual. Other prior research has operationalized favorable dress and clothing as attractive, clean, neat, and/or formal (e.g., suit and tie, button-up shirt and slacks) and unfavorable dress and clothing as unattractive, dirty, unkempt, sloppy, and/or informal (e.g., t-shirt, shorts, polo style shirt) (Richmond, McCroskey, & Payne, 1991; Verser & Wicks, 2006). Other research operationalized favorable clothing as dignified suit and tie and unfavorable clothing as sports clothes, shirtsleeves, or casual appearance (Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Moriarty & Garramone, 1986). Thus, clothing was coded as formal, informal, or varied.

Camera angle. Waldman and Devitt (1998) operationalized favorable camera angle as eye-level shots and unfavorable camera angle as shots from above the candidate. Moriarty and Garramone (1986), Moriarty and Popovich (1991), and Verser and Wicks (2006) viewed favorable camera angle as shots looking up at the candidate and unfavorable camera angle as shots looking down on the candidate. They also

61

operationalized neutral camera angle as level to the candidate. Kaid and Johnston (2001) agree and considered favorable camera angle to be high shots, unfavorable to be low shots and neutral to be straight-on shots. Camera angle was operationalized for this study as high, straight-on, or low.

Camera shot. Kaid and Johnston (2001) operationalized camera shot as tight (e.g., head and shoulders), medium (e.g., waist up), and long (e.g., full body), but did not associate favorable or unfavorable connotations to the types of shots. Based on the review of literature, the type of shot being used in an ad by the candidate is determined as favorable or unfavorable in the context in which it is being used. If a candidate is trying to create an intimate portrayal, he may employ tight shots of himself. On the other hand, if the candidate is trying to portray his opponent as "in-your-face," he could also use a tight shot. Thus, the context is important to understand how a shot is being used. For this study, camera shot was coded as tight, medium, or long.

Lighting. According to prior research (Verser & Wicks, 2006), lighting from above and/or in front of the candidate has been operationalized as favorable, while lighting from below and/or behind the candidate has been operationalized as unfavorable. Lighting was operationalized in this study as high, straight-on, low, or behind the candidate.

Color. Verser and Wicks (2006) operationalized favorable color as the use of full-color in a visual image and unfavorable color as black and white or monochromatic (i.e. varying shades of a single color). Unfavorable color is also operationalized as non-harmonious color combinations that clash with each other, like neon-pink and neon-

orange (Zettle, 1999). For this study, color was operationalized as full-color, black and white, or monochromatic (i.e., shades of a single color).

Motion. Kaid and Johnston (2001) operationalized motion as slow, fast, reverse, or freeze-frame/still image. Based on the literature review, all of these can be considered unfavorable uses of motion in political advertising. Favorable motion is operationalized as normal speed/motion (Graber, 1996). Thus, motion for this study was operationally defined as slow, fast, reverse, or still, or normal speed.

Production style. Prior research by Kaid and Johnston (2001) operationalized production style as cinema verite (e.g., sitting at a desk working on legislation), slides with voice-over, head-on (e.g., "Eisenhower Answers America" ad series), and animation (e.g., cartoon style drawings). Based on the review of literature, the type of style being used in an ad by the candidate is determined as favorable or unfavorable in the context in which it is being used. For example, JFK used animation in his 1960 television ads in a favorable manner, but other candidates could use animation to portray an opponent as childlike or comical, thus, unfavorable. For this study, production style was coded as cinema verite, slides, talking-head, or animation.

Setting. Favorable setting has been operationalized as monumental or formal and unfavorable setting has been operationalized as informal or casual (Moriarty & Garramone, 1986; Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Verser & Wicks, 2006). Based on Kaid and Johnston's (2001) videostyle work, favorable and unfavorable settings can be either indoor or outdoor. They also included famous American landscapes (e.g., Mt. Rushmore) as a favorable setting. For this study, setting was operationalized in two ways. First it was coded as formal or informal, then setting was coded as indoor or outdoor.

63

Symbols. Verser and Wicks (2006) along with Moriarty and Popovich (1991) operationally defined favorable symbols as patriotic props (e.g., flags, bunting, official seals) and unfavorable symbols as business style charts and graphs. Kaid and Johnston (2001) also included favorable symbols as any item with national colors, the national bird (e.g., Bald Eagle), famous documents (e.g., the Declaration of Independence), and representations of past presidents or other famous figures. For this study, favorable symbols were operationally defined as patriotic props, objects with national colors, the Bald Eagle, famous U. S. documents, representations of past presidents or historical figures.

Others in shot. Based on previous research, others in shot is operationally defined as favorable by having other people (e.g., family, supporters, celebrities) in the shot with the candidate and unfavorable by the candidate all alone in the shot (Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Verser & Wicks, 2006). However, to more accurately determine favorability of others in shot, who the other people are has to be considered. For example, due to digital alterations, it could appear that a candidate is standing next to Hitler. Obviously this would not be viewed as favorable. For this study, others in shot was operationalized as having family, running-mates, or supporters in the shot, or the candidate was alone, without others in the shot.

Shot length. There is no known literature that discusses the favorability or unfavorablity of this category in political advertisements. However, based on Kaid and Johnston's (2001) research, it may be an important determinant in the overall favorable or unfavorable portrayal of the candidate and his opponent. If a candidate is giving more visual time on-screen in unfavorable ways (nonverbal behavior cues and production

64

techniques), then shot length may play an important role in how a candidate portrays his opponent as well as himself. Shots were timed in seconds to determine the length of the candidate's shots as compared to the length of the opponent's shots.

Data Analysis

Frequency counts and *chi-squares* were calculated using the VassarStats: Web Site for Statistical Computation[4] (http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/VassarStats.html) in order to examine the nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques used by candidates in visually comparative televised political advertisements in the 2004 Presidential general campaigns between President Bush and Senator Kerry. Additionally, power indices (see Cohen, 1988) will be provided for all non-significant *chi-square* data to help explain the results. According to Keppel and Wickens (2004), desirable power levels are .6 or higher.

Pearson *chi-square* tests were conducted to determine the overall differences between the candidates usage of visual images in their respective visually comparative political advertisements to answer the first research question, which asks:

RQ1: How do Bush and Kerry differ in their utilization of visual images in their respective ads with regard to nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to manage their impressions and frame themselves as well as their opponent?

---

[4] Vassar Stats is a useful and user-friendly tool for performing statistical computation. It was founded by Richard Lowry, Professor of Psychology Emeritus at Vassar College.

Pearson *chi-square* calculations were completed to determine the differences in how the candidates used visual images to portray themselves with how they portrayed their opponent in their respective ads to answer the second research question which asks:

RQ2: How did the candidates use nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to manage their impressions and frame themselves as opposed to their opponents?

Further Pearson *chi-square* tests were calculated to determine how the candidates used visual images to portray themselves across all of the visually comparative advertisements from Bush and Kerry to answer the following research question, which asks:

RQ3: What are the differences between how the candidates managed their impressions and framed themselves in their respective ads?

Pearson *chi-square* tests were calculated to determine how the candidates used visual images to portray their opponent across all of the visually comparative advertisements from both candidates to answer the fourth research question, which asks:

RQ4: What are the differences between how the candidates framed and managed each others impressions in their respective ads?

Once significant results were identified from the *chi-square* tests, then pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). This post-hoc test determined which pairs of cells in the *chi-square* tests were significantly different from one another.

Simple frequency counts and percentages were used to answer the following research questions and hypothesis which posit:

RQ5: What characteristic(s) do the candidates portray in themselves through the

use of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques?

RQ6: What characteristic(s) do the candidates portray in their opponents through

the use of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques?

Chapter four provides the statistical results for the first four research questions

which are answered from a quantitative perspective. Then, in chapter five, I discuss the

first four research questions which focus on the microscopic level (i.e., nonverbal

behavior cues and production techniques in each shot of Bush and Kerry) of the televised

political advertisements and the differences and similarities in the candidates' visual

portrayals of themselves as well as each other.

A comprehensive micro-level discussion of the differences and similarities of the

uses of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques by Bush and Kerry is

necessary in order to better understand the overall impressions the candidates seek to

create. These overall impressions are addressed by research questions five and six which

are answered by overall qualitative observations of the advertisements and which focus

on the overall characteristics of Bush and Kerry as both candidate and opponent from a

more broad perspective (i.e., character traits emphasized by Bush and Kerry in their

respective ads as a whole). Chapter six focuses on a comprehensive macro-level

discussion of the characteristics of the candidates and opponents. Implications for future

research are discussed in both chapters five and six. Finally, chapter seven serves as a

conclusion for this study.

Chapter 4: Results

Descriptive Statistics

Before the results are discussed for the research questions and hypotheses, it is

important to note certain overall statistics and findings (refer to Appendix A, Table 1 and

Table 2 for frequency data for each advertisement). The two candidates presented a total

of 622 shots of themselves and their opponents in just 62 ads, resulting in 10.03 shots per

ad. Of those shots, Bush had 87 images of himself and 303 images of Kerry; while Kerry

had 133 images of himself and 99 of Bush. An independent samples two-tailed *t* test

($t(60) = 1.52$, $p = .13$) revealed that Bush's number of shots per ad ($M = 13.52$, $SD =$

26.72) did not significantly differ from Kerry's number of shots per ad ($M = 6.63$, $SD =$

4.88).

However, a Pearson *chi-square* analysis revealed a significant difference ($X^2[1] =$

76.52; $p < .0001$; $V = .35$) in the overall usage of visual images in visually comparative

televised advertisements. A Marascuilo contrast[5] (Glass & Hopkins, 1996) indicates a

significant difference between Bush's total number of visual images (78% were of Kerry

and 22% were of him) and Kerry's total number of visual images (57% were of Bush and

only 43% were of him). However, it was noted early in the coding that numerous

---

[5] Marascuilo contrasts were calculated for each pair of cells in all significant *chi-square*

results. Only the pairs of cells that were determined to be significantly different are

included in the results section. Refer to Appendices C, D, E, and F for the significance

results of the Marascuilo contrasts.

repetitive images were used by both candidates. Bush had 112 (29%) unique images and 278 (71%) repeated images; Kerry had 163 (70%) unique images and 69 (30%) repeated images. A *chi-square* test indicates this observation to be significant ($X^2[1] = 100.09$; $p < .0001$; $V = .40$). To avoid inflating the statistics, only the unique images were used in the calculations for the variables in this study. A *chi-square* test indicates that the focus of shot (using only unique images) is also significant ($X^2[1] = 13.76$; $p < .0005$; $V = .23$). Bush had 37% unique images of himself and 63% unique images of Kerry, while Kerry had nearly the opposite. He had 60% unique images of Bush and only 40% unique images of himself.

With regard to time, each shot was timed to the nearest second. Both unique and repeated shots were calculated for both candidates to provide a more accurate investigation into how they used time in their respective ads. Furthermore, many images were repeated, but the image was visible on the screen for different periods of time. To maintain consistency in analyzing time, the entire sample (N=622) was used in the calculation. Images of Bush and Kerry were on-screen for a combined 1,958 seconds, resulting in 3.15 seconds per shot. Images that Bush used of himself and Kerry were on-screen for an average of 2.77 seconds and images that Kerry of himself and Bush were on-screen for an average of 3.78 seconds. An independent samples two-tailed *t* test ($t(60) = 1.48$, $p = .14$) revealed that the total seconds in Bush's ads ($M = 38.64$, $SD = 47.47$) did not significantly differ from the total seconds in Kerry's ads ($M = 25.82$, $SD = 15.98$).

However, a *Pearson chi-square* analysis revealed a significant difference between how the candidates used time ($X^2[1] = 169.09$; $p < .0001$; $V = .29$). In Bush's advertisements, images of himself were on-screen for 217 seconds ($M=7.75$, $SD = 2.58$)

and images of Kerry were on-screen for 863 seconds ($M=30.82$, $SD = 47.16$). In Kerry's

advertisements, images of Kerry were on-screen for 420 seconds ($M=12.35$, $SD = 6.29$)

and images of Bush were on-screen for 458 seconds ($M=13.47$; $SD = 16.30$). Bush spent

more time focusing on Kerry (80%) and less on himself (20%) than Kerry focused on

Bush. In fact, Kerry displayed images of himself (48%) and his opponent (52%) for a

nearly equal amount of time.

Another overall finding was that all of the shots were from a high light angle.

Both candidates used images that had indoor lighting from above or were outside and the

natural sunlight was from above. There were no images of either candidate in their

respective ads where the light was from straight on or from below the candidate. Thus,

this category was not included in the calculations or the results. However, it is necessary

for discussion in the following chapter.

Research Question 1

Research question one queried how Bush and Kerry differ in their utilization of

visual images in their respective ads with regard to nonverbal behavior cues and

production techniques. It is important to understand how they used these variables in their

ads, overall, before we delve into how they used them specifically regarding themselves

and their opponent, because we need the larger numerical picture to better understand the

more specific numerical picture. *Pearson chi-square* tests indicate significant differences

in eye gaze ($X^2[2] = 20.61$; $p < .0001$; $V = .28$) and body movement ($X^2[1] = 3.77$; $p <$

.05; $V = .13$). Bush utilized images of himself and Kerry that had eye gaze directed at the

camera/viewer more (29%) as opposed to Kerry's eye gaze with the camera/viewer

(13%). Kerry utilized more images of himself and of Bush that had eye gaze directed at

someone else in the ad (30%) than Bush did (10%). Both Bush and Kerry incorporated images that displayed body movement. However, Kerry incorporated more images of movement (83%) and Bush less (72%); see Appendix C for tabular data.

All other nonverbal behavior cues, gestures ($X^2[1] = .05$; $p = .82$; $V = 0$); facial expression ($X^2[2] = 2.16$; $p = .34$; $V = .09$); posture ($X^2[2] = .21$; $p = .90$; $V = .03$); and dress/clothing ($X^2[2] = .78$; $p = .68$; $V = .06$), were found to be non-significant based on *chi-square* calculations. According to Cohen's (1988) power indices, power is less than .30 for all of these non-significant results.[6]

Regarding the production techniques, *Pearson chi-square* tests indicate significant differences in color ($X^2[2] = 7.41$; $p < .05$; $V = .16$), camera shot ($X^2[1] = 12.10$; $p < .0005$; $V = .21$), focus of shot ($X^2[1] = 13.76$; $p < .0005$; $V = .23$), others in shot ($X^2(4) = 36.57$; $p < .0001$; $V = .39$), and symbols ($X^2[1] = 13.53$; $p < .001$; $V = .23$).

Bush incorporated more black and white images (23%) than did Kerry (19%). Kerry used more full color images of himself and his opponent (86%) than did Bush (74%). Regarding camera shot, Kerry used more of medium to long camera shots (41%) compared to Bush (21%), while Bush used a higher percentage of tight shots (79%) than Kerry (59%). Concerning who was the focus of the shot, Bush focused more of his images on Kerry instead of himself (63% to 37%), while Kerry focused more attention on himself than he did Bush (70% to 30%). Pertaining to who was in the shot, Kerry had

---

[6] Power results for all of the non-significant chi-square results calculated in this study are .30 or less. According to Keppel and Wickens (2004), it is likely that this study was not able to detect significant results based on the sample size.

more images that contained supporters, including family and running mates (44%) as compared to Bush (20%). Kerry also had more images that had other people, including reporters, factory workers, other politicians (21%) in the image with the candidate as compared to Bush's use of others in the ads (10%). Overall, Bush employed more images of himself or Kerry alone (70%) than Kerry did (35%). Kerry used more symbols (37%), including the American flag, patriotic bunting, the capital building, and military emblems, than Bush (15%).

Differences between Bush and Kerry ads for all other production techniques, including setting location ($X^2[1] = .13$; $p = .72$; $V = .03$); setting formality ($X^2[1] = .02$; $p = .89$; $V = 0$); camera angle ($X^2[2] = 1.41$; $p = .49$; $V = .07$); production style ($X^2[2] = .45$; $p = .80$; $V = .04$), and motion ($X^2[2] = .82$; $p = .66$; $V = .05$), were found to be non-significant based on *chi-square* calculations.

Research Question 2

The second research question focused on how the candidates used nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to portray themselves as opposed to their opponents? In Bush's ads, differences in eye gaze ($X^2[2] = 8.78$; $p < .01$; $V = .29$) and facial expression ($X^2[2] = 6.87$; $p < .05$; $V = .25$) were found to be significant based on *Pearson chi-square* tests. Bush utilized images of Kerry whose eye gaze was directed elsewhere (e. g., out a window, down at a desk, or toward an unknown person/object) more often (72%) than he used images of Kerry gazing at the camera/viewer or at others in the shot. Bush also incorporated images of himself smiling (67%) more than he incorporated images of Kerry smiling (33%). In fact, he used more pictures of Kerry with

a serious expression (68%) than he did of himself looking serious (32%) (see Appendix D for tabular data).

In Kerry's ads, eye gaze ($X^2[2] = 7.86$; $p < .05$; $V = .22$) and facial expression ($X^2[2] = 9.76$; $p < .01$; $V = .25$) were determined to be significantly different. Kerry used more images of himself making eye contact with the camera/viewer (76%) more often than he used images of Bush making eye contact with the camera/viewer (24%). Kerry also incorporated more images of himself looking at other people within the ad (69%) than he used of Bush looking at others (31%). With regard to facial expression, Kerry utilized more shots of himself smiling (78%) and expressing seriousness (60%) than he did of Bush (22% and 40%, respectively). However, he did use more shots of Bush frowning (72%) than he did of himself (28%).

Also significantly different was Kerry's use of gestures ($X^2[1] = 3.99$; $p < .05$; $V = .24$), body movement ($X^2[1] = 12.05$; $p < .0005$; $V = .28$), and dress/clothing ($X^2[2] = 19.62$; $p < .0001$; $V = .35$) in the visual images he incorporated into his ads. Kerry employed more images of himself using hand gestures (77%) than he did of Bush (23%). Kerry also used more images of himself with calm movements of the body (67%) than he used of Bush (33%) and fewer images of himself with no movement (31%) than he used with images of Bush (69%). Kerry utilized images of himself informally attired more often (88%) than he utilized ads of Bush informally attired (12%).

Other nonverbal behavior variables were found to be non-significant. For Bush, these included gestures ($X^2[1] = .17$; $p = .68$; $V = .10$), body movement ($X^2[1] = .67$; $p = .41$; $V = .08$), posture ($X^2[2] = 1.6$; $p = .45$; $V = .13$), and dress/clothing ($X^2[2] = 1.3$; $p = $

.52; $V = .12$). For Kerry, posture was the only non-significant result ($X^2[2] = 1.24$; $p = .54$; $V = .09$).

Pertaining to the production techniques, there were significant differences in Bush's visually comparative ads differences for setting formality ($X^2[1] = 9.05$; $p < .005$; $V = .40$) and camera shot ($X^2[1] = 5.74$; $p < .05$; $V = .23$) were found to be significant based on Pearson *chi-square* tests. Bush utilized images where he was in more informal settings (74%) than Kerry was in (26%). He also utilized images of Kerry in more formal settings (68%) than he did of himself (32%). Bush also incorporated more tight shots of Kerry (69%) than he did of himself (31%). In Kerry's ads, camera shot ($X^2[2] = 9.76$; $p < .01$; $V = .25$) was determined to be significantly different. Kerry used more medium shots of himself (59%) than he did of Bush (41%).

Also significantly different was Kerry's use of camera angle ($X^2[2] = 7.86$; $p < .05$; $V = .22$), production style ($X^2[2] = 9.76$; $p < .01$; $V = .25$), others in shot ($X^2[2] = 9.76$; $p < .01$; $V = .25$), motion ($X^2[2] = 9.76$; $p < .01$; $V = .25$), and symbols ($X^2[2] = 9.76$; $p < .01$; $V = .25$) in the visual images he incorporated into his ads. Kerry employed more images from a high camera angle of Bush (64%) than he did of himself (36%). Kerry used more images of himself from a low camera angle (80%) than he used of Bush (20%). Regarding production style, Kerry employed a cinema verite style (65%), in which he was seen in a real-life setting and a talking head style (76%), in which he speaks directly to the viewing audience, more often than he did for Bush (35% and 24%, respectively). Plus, Kerry portrayed Bush using the slide with voice-over style more frequently (76%) than he portrayed himself using the same style (24%).

74

Kerry utilized images of himself with supporters more often (85%) than he

utilized ads of Bush with supporters (15%). Kerry also used images of Bush with other

people (e.g., military officials, Dick Cheney) more frequently (63%) than he used images

of himself with others (37%). Pertaining to motion, Kerry displayed more moving images

in a normal speed (77%) than he did of Bush (23%). Instead, he displayed more shots of

Bush as still images or freeze frames (70%) compared to still image shots of himself

(30%). Regarding the use of symbols in the advertisements, Kerry used more symbols in

his shots (77%) than he did in the shots of Bush (23%).

Other production technique variables were found to be non-significant. For Bush,

these included camera angle ($X^2[2] = 1.83$; $p = .40$; $V = .13$), setting location ($X^2[1] = .19$;

$p = .66$; $V = .06$), color ($X^2[1] = .18$; $p = .67$; $V = .04$), production style ($X^2[2] = 3.82$; $p =$

.15; $V = .19$), others in shot ($X^2[2] = .16$; $p = .62$; $V = .10$), motion ($X^2[2] = 4.19$; $p = .12$;

$V = .20$), and symbols ($X^2[1] = .78$; $p = .38$; $V = .11$). For Kerry, both setting formality

($X^2[1] = 2.90$; $p = .09$; $V = .14$) and color ($X^2[1] = 2.74$; $p = .10$; $V = .13$), approached

significancy, and setting location was the only non-significant result ($X^2[1] = 1.69$; $p =$

.19; $V = .13$).

Research Question 3

The third research question seeks to determine the differences between how the

candidates portray themselves in their respective ads. Significantly different were shots of

body movement ($X^2[1] = 10.69$; $p < .001$; $V = .28$), eye gaze ($X^2[2] = 14.74$; $p < .001$; $V =$

.33), color ($X^2[1] = 3.78$; $p < .05$; $V = .19$), production style ($X^2[2] = 9.94$; $p < .01$; $V =$

.26), others in shot ($X^2[2] = 8.18$; $p < .05$; $V = .25$), motion ($X^2[2] = 13.31$; $p < .001$; $V =$

.31), and symbols ($X^2[2] = 6.69$; $p < .01$; $V = .22$) (see Appendix E for tabular data).

Of the total number of unique images with visible body movement, Kerry had more calm body movements (76%) compared to Bush's calm body movements (24%). Regarding eye gaze, Kerry appeared to be gazing at others in the ad (87%) or had non-directed gaze elsewhere (70%), as compared to Bush's gaze at others (13%) and non-directional gaze (30%).

Of the total color images, Kerry used more of himself (73%), and Bush used less (27%) of himself. Pertaining production style, of the images using a cinema verite style, Kerry had more shots (75%) than Bush (25%). Of the images using slides with voice-overs, Bush had more shots (63%) than Kerry (37%) had. Of the images in the talking-head style, Kerry had more (76%) than Bush (24%). Regarding the category of others in shot, for the total number of images with supporters, Kerry had more images with supporters (87%), with others (62%), and of himself alone (63%) than Bush had with supporters (13%), with others (38%), and by himself (37%). Of the total number of unique images with regard to normal speed motion, Kerry had more images (80%) than Bush (20%) utilizing normal speed. Similarly, Kerry had more slow motion images of himself (72%) as compared to Bush (28%). Finally, with regard to the use of symbols in the shots, Kerry used more shots of himself with symbols (83%) than Bush used of himself (17%). Kerry also incorporated more images without symbols (63%) than Bush did (37%).

There were differences in other variables for both Bush and Kerry regarding how they portrayed themselves as candidates that were determined to be non-significant based on Pearson *chi-square* tests. These variables include gestures ($X^2[1] = 1.77$; $p = .18$; $V = .18$), setting location ($X^2[1] = .08$; $p = .78$; $V = .03$), setting formality ($X^2[1] = 2.62$; $p =$

.11; $V = .17$), facial expression ($X^2[2] = 2.02$; $p = .36$; $V = .12$), camera angle ($X^2[2] =$ 2.50; $p = .29$; $V = .13$), camera shot ($X^2[2] = 2.40$; $p = .12$; $V = .13$), posture ($X^2[2] =$ 1.89; $p = .39$; $V = .12$), and dress/clothing ($X^2[2] = 3.55$; $p = .17$; $V = .17$).

Research Question 4

The fourth research question focused on the differences between how the candidates portray each other in their respective ads. Significantly different were body eye gaze ($X^2[2] = 7.48$; $p < .05$; $V = .24$), dress ($X^2[2] = 9.44$; $p < .01$; $V = .28$), production style ($X^2[2] = 5.84$; $p < .05$; $V = .21$), others in shot ($X^2[2] = 8.74$; $p < .01$; $V = .26$), and motion ($X^2[2] = 7.32$; $p < .05$; $V = .24$) (see Appendix F for tabular data).

With regard to eye gaze, the total number of images in which an opponent was looking at the camera/viewer, Bush incorporated more images of Kerry (72%) than Kerry did of Bush (28%). On the other hand, with regard to the total number of images in which eye gaze was directed at others in the shot, Kerry used a large majority of images of Bush (71%) than Bush used of Kerry (29%). Pertaining to dress/clothing, with regard to the number of images where the opponent was informally dressed, Bush had more images of Kerry (78%) than Kerry had of Bush (22%).

As for the production techniques, with regard to slides with voice-overs with in the category of production style, Kerry incorporated more images of Bush (70%) than Bush did of Kerry (30%). Pertaining to others in shot, in the images that had the opponent seen with supporters, Bush had more images of Kerry (63%) as compared to the images that Kerry had of Bush (37%). However, Kerry had more images of Bush with others (77%) than Bush used of Kerry (23%).

Finally, with regard to motion and the images in normal motion, Bush incorporated more images of Kerry at a normal speed (61%) than Kerry did of Bush (39%). However, pertaining to the still images, Kerry utilized more images of Bush (68%) than Bush used of Kerry (32%).

There were differences in other variables for both of the candidates regarding how they portrayed each other that were determined to be not significant based on *Pearson chi-square* tests. These include gestures ($X^2[1] = 1.57$; $p = .21$; $V = .16$), setting location ($X^2[1] = .01$; $p = .75$; $V = .04$), setting formality ($X^2[1] = .23$; $p = .63$; $V = .05$), body movement ($X^2[1] = 068$; $p = .41$; $V = .08$), facial expression ($X^2[2] = 4.50$; $p = .11$; $V = .19$), color ($X^2[1] = 1.47$; $p = .23$; $V = .11$), camera angle ($X^2[2] = 1.30$; $p = .50$; $V = .10$), camera shot ($X^2[1] = 1.98$; $p = .16$; $V = .13$), posture ($X^2[2] = .78$; $p = .68$; $V = .08$), and symbols ($X^2[2] = .53$; $p = .47$; $V = .06$).

Chapter 5: A Close Inspection

One of the goals of this study is to contribute to scholarship by using interpersonal communication and mass communication lenses to investigate visual imagery utilized by candidates in political communication messages, specifically political advertisements. Through a content analysis of 62 visually comparative political ads (28 from Bush and 34 from Kerry) totaling 622 visual shots this study was designed to investigate the differences of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques in the overall images used by the two candidates and the differences in how the candidates portrayed themselves and how they portrayed their opponent using visual images. Thus, this study helps to illuminate the manner in which the candidates manage their impressions and their opponent's impressions as well as how they visually frame themselves and their opponent through the use of visual imagery.

This chapter addresses the implications of the significant differences and similarities from the visual images in the Bush's and Kerry's visually comparative televised advertisements from a micro-level perspective. The following chapter addresses the implications of the use of visual images in the candidates' advertisements from macro-level perspective when discussing research questions five and six.

Implications for Impression Management

According to McGraw (2003), one of the most central building blocks of voter's perceptions of politicians is trait inferences, because they are functional and help the voter understand the politician and his/her behavior. McGraw also states that traits are unobservables. Unlike colors, textures, or tastes, people cannot sense honesty, integrity,

credibility, etc. However, people can observe tangibles to infer traits. For example, facial expressions can be readily observed. According to Rosenberg, Bohan, McCafferty, and Harris (1986), absent any other information about a candidate's qualities (and holding race and gender constant), attractive facial appearances produce more positive trait inferences than unattractive facial appearances for both male and female candidates.

Trait inferences are rooted in the perceiver's need to understand the causes of human behavior and to be able to predict future human behavior (McGraw, 2003). A number of scholars have argued that traits perform this instrumental role in political impressions, namely, the ability to predict how a given leader will perform in elected office (Barber, 1972; Kinder, 1986; Page, 1978). In order to infer traits of the candidates in 2004, viewers had to observe their nonverbal behaviors. In Kerry's and Bush's visually comparative advertisements, the candidates could utilize nonverbal behavior cues to create impressions of themselves in which viewers could perceive specific traits that would benefit the candidate. Kerry and Bush were also able to incorporate shots of each other in their respective ads that contained nonverbal behavior cues to create impressions of their opponent in which viewers could perceive specific traits that would indicate weak or damaging traits to the opponent.

According to Knapp and Hall (2002), gestures perform many functions, including replacing speech, regulating the flow of communication, maintaining attention, and adding emphasis or clarity to the spoken message. Gestures, including handshakes, waves, emblems (gestures that have a direct verbal translation, like the thumbs up sign or Nixon's victory hand gesture), and illustrators (gestures that accompany speech) help to articulate what is being verbalized. Gestures are invaluable to candidates at the various

80

campaign stops. Handshakes and shoulder pats help to create a connection with other people in the image, but also show the viewer how the candidate can connect to others. Gestures also are invaluable for helping people to better understand what is being said (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Kerry uses quite a number of gestures when he is speaking, which allows the viewer to better understand what Kerry means and how strongly he means it. For example, in *100 Days*, he is talking to a crowd of supporters about bringing an end to Bush's radical agenda and is emphasizing his words by punctuating them with a gesture in which he points his index finger and appears to tap the podium (as if he is pointing at item after item on a list radical things Bush has done while in office). This gesture shows how adamant Kerry is about stopping Bush. On the other hand, by limiting the number of gestures that Bush has, Kerry potentially limits the level of immediacy or the depth of the connection Bush has with viewers. Bush also incorporated a fair amount of gestures and hand movements, especially waves to crowds of supporters. And he too, limited the number of gestures for his opponent. For each candidate, it may have been strategic and effective to incorporate gestures, so that the viewing audience can get a better understanding of what the candidate means and possibly, how emphatically he means it. On the other hand, it also appears strategic on the candidate's part by limiting the gestures of their opponent. If viewers are not able to see gestures, then it is possible for them to not fully understand the opponent's message(s).

According to Birdwhistell (1983), body movement can be an indicator about a person's intentions and personality. For example, if a person is walking at a fast rate, then one can safely assume that he/she is in a hurry. Body movement that is calm and relaxed indicates that he/she is relaxed and in control. In opposition, Birdwhistell (1983) argues

that body movement that is tense, stiff, rigid, or wild can indicate inflexibility, sternness, or being out of control. For example, after the Iowa caucus in early 2004, Howard Dean was shown on a stage using rigid movements of his hands and arms, and at times he seemed to be stomping on the stage. According to Vincent Morris (2004), a reporter for the *New York Post*, Dean had "a disastrous post-Iowa caucus rally in which he looked like a madman" (p. 8). Andrew Miga (2004), a reporter for the *Boston Globe,* called the event "an angry Iowa Caucus night rant" and "a nationally televised tirade" (p. 1). Bush even incorporated a few of Dean's images into one ad, *Rest*, early in his campaign, possibly in order to reinforce the idea that Dean is out of control and not suited to be President. Both Kerry and Bush used numerous images of themselves with very calm body movements to indicate that they were in control of themselves. This visual representation of control may have been a strategic move on the part of the candidates to indicate that they could maintain control over their actions as President and that it is important for the leader of the United States to remain calm and in control in situation that may not be calm and under control.

However, each candidate used similar calm images of their opponents that show their opponent was also in control. Strategically, if candidate's want to show weaknesses of their opponent or differences between their opponent and themselves, it would have worked in Bush's and Kerry's favors to portray each other with tense, rigid, stiff, or wild body movements, which would have indicated that the opponent lacked some characteristics (e.g., calmness, control, flexibility) that are necessary for the office of the President. It is possible that there were no images of Bush or Kerry available that either could have incorporated into their respective ads of each other, to indicate these

weaknesses. It appears that only Howard Dean had images available that could be used to portray him in a weakened manner as compared to the other contenders in 2004.

According to Knapp and Hall (1992), facial expressions can be used to determine a person's emotional state. In turn, the knowledge of one's emotional state can be used to make judgments or evaluations of the person. Thus, likeability and immediacy could diminish if viewers see a candidate as threatening. Both Kerry and Bush incorporate mostly serious facial expressions of themselves and of each other, which implies that they are both serious about the campaign, about the issues, and about being president. The position of president of the United States is a position with serious tasks dealing with serious issues, so it would be expected that the candidates running for that office would have facial expressions that reflect the position of President. Both candidates also included images of themselves and their opponents smiling, which can imply that they find humor in life, can be likeable to others, and are friendly.

On the other hand, frowning expressions can be a sign of displeasure, unhappiness, frustration, and possibly anger (Knapp & Hall, 1992). People with angry expressions are judged more harshly than those with neutral or happy expressions (Savitsky & Sim, 1974). Angry facial expressions can cause people to feel threatened, which can create distance between people.[7] Kerry incorporated images of Bush frowning, glaring, or looking angry in several ads, including *Despicable, Keep Our Word?, Not True, Real Americans, Reasons, Right Track,* and *Uninsured*. If a significant number of

---

[7] Knapp and Hall (1992) relate this idea, distancing ourselves from threatening behavior, to our survival instincts as a species.

these images had been used, then imagery could potentially lead voters to distance themselves from Bush because they feel threatened by him and thus could lead to fewer votes for Bush based on the images that Kerry chose to use. However, this was not the case for either candidate, possibly because there may be a limited number of images available for the candidate's to use of their opponent and of those images, frowning expressions may be rare. Candidates appeared to use their own facial expressions to their advantage, but possibly failed to use each other's facial expressions to their advantage and their opponent's disadvantage. The use of visual images of differing facial expressions between one's self and the opponent, could have indicated stronger differences between the candidates, which could have created viewer perceptions of the candidates that would have emphasized the differences.

According to Bond and Shiraishi (1974), when a person leans forward in an interpersonal communication situation, the other person displays expressive behaviors, speech patterns, and emotional reactions indicative of rapport. On the other hand, when a person is closed off from the other person (i.e., slouched) or leans away from another person, it can be detrimental to the rapport between individuals. If a person leans away from another, it is a sign that they are trying to distance themselves from the other person. In one ad, *Doesn't Get It*, Kerry used a series of images of Bush being interviewed by a reporter. Both were seated, but Bush was leaning away from the reporter who was leaning toward Bush. Based on Bond and Shiraishi's observations, the reporter may have been attempting to establish a rapport with Bush, but Bush was not allowing that to happen based (in part) on his posture. Kerry may have incorporated this image and others to indicate that Bush is closed off to the viewer, possibly even secretive or unwilling to

openly provide information to the report (and the public). These images could also have been used to hinder the viewers from building a connection with Bush.

However, the majority of the images for both Kerry and Bush showed themselves and their opponent with an upright posture, which can be a sign of likeability. According to Mehrabian (1972), more immediate postures and positions of a communicator are associated with greater liking of the addressee. Both Bush and Kerry portrayed themselves as likeable and, they each portrayed the other as likeable. It would be to the candidate's advantage to portray himself as likeable (Knapp & Hall, 1992). Thus, if political candidates include more immediate nonverbal behaviors in the visual images of their political ads, the viewers may respond with greater liking for the candidate. On the other hand, it would not necessarily be to the candidate's advantage to portray his opponent as likeable. If the candidates had included fewer immediate posture stances of their opponent in the visual images of their political ads, the viewers may respond with less liking for the opponent. The images that the candidates had access to of their opponent may have led to this result. When a person is standing at a podium, as political candidates frequently do, they stand upright. Or, if a person is seated and speaking directly to another person or into a camera, they will most likely be seated upright or leaning forward, toward the camera/viewer. Thus, Bush and Kerry may not have had access to many shots of each other in which they were not upright or forward leaning.

According to Exline, Gray, and Schuette (1965) and Nachshon and Wapner (1967), eye contact between the communicator and the listener/receiver is typically associated with positive attitudes the listener has for the communicator. It is important for a candidate to make eye contact with the voters in order to be more immediate and to

85

increase likeablity. However, neither candidate seemed to make direct eye contact with the viewers often. In fact, most of the time, Bush and Kerry were looking to others in the ad or to something off-screen. Based on the literature and the results from this study, it appears that neither of the candidates were using eye gaze to their advantage to increase positive impressions of themselves. However, they may have been using images of indirect eye gaze to lower the overall impressions of their opponent.

Both candidates used images of them dressed in dark suits and ties. According to Knapp and Hall (2002), dark colors, such as dark blue, brown, and black, are associated with protection and defense. Black is also associated with power, strength, and masterful feelings. It is not surprising then that both candidates used images in which they wore dark colors. Light blue is associated with feelings of security, comfort, calmness, and serenity, which may explain why in the few images of Bush and Kerry dressed in informal clothing, they were most often wearing a *light blue* button up shirt.

However, they also incorporated a small percentage of images of themselves dressed informally in jeans and a casual button up shirt with no tie. Bush was wearing informal clothing (denim shirt and jeans) at the ranch in Crawford, Texas, where he looked relaxed. Informal clothing can also make a person look approachable and friendly (Knapp & Hall, 2002), whereas business suits and uniforms can decrease approachability but increase respect, authority, and power. Since Bush currently held the office of President (a position of significant power, authority, and seriousness) during this election, one would expect him to wear business suits and ties. At other times, he could be seen wearing varied formal and informal clothing consisting of a suit jacket and button-up shirt with the top button undone and no tie, which gives the appearance of having power

or being in control, but also relaxed and possibly approachable. Kerry also used a similar style of attire and for probably the same reasons. He wore suits and ties to increase his credibility, appear strong and powerful, etc. While he also chose to wear more informal clothing to possibly appear more accessible to the viewers.

Most likely, this was intentional on the part of the candidates. For obvious reasons, a president (and those competing to hold that title) should be seen as powerful and strong, as would nearly any leader. Thus, dark colors would be appropriate for a person in such a high position of leadership. On the other hand, a leader most likely wants to be seen as secure in themselves and comfortable doing their job. Bush and Kerry utilized both styles of clothing to appear strong and powerful, as well as secure and comfortable. It would not make sense to have a leader that is powerful, but at the same time, uncomfortable with the power.

It is interesting to note that Bush incorporated several images of Kerry, who was dressed in beach clothes. In *Windsurfing*, Bush portrayed Kerry as a candidate who could not make up his mind regarding several issues of the election, especially, the War in Iraq. Bush incorporated images of Kerry windsurfing. Obviously, the images of Kerry in surfing shorts and a t-shirt were not being used in a presidential or even professional manner. It appears that Bush incorporated these images to negatively represent Kerry and to possibly create negative impressions of his opponent.

According to Bromley (1977), when political analysts describe the personalities and the patterns of interaction that determine political maneuvering and the course of government, they use virtually the same terms of reference and forms of explanation that are used to describe people in everyday life and ordinary forms of interpersonal behavior.

87

Political impressions are about gaining, maintaining, enhancing or losing status, esteem, trust, and/or support in society.

One way that political impressions can be created and/or altered over time is through the use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors which, according to Mehrabian (1972), include posture, touching, and eye gaze. According to Burgoon, Buller, and Woodall (1996), approachability is closely connected to immediacy. Gestures, body movement, and clothing are nonverbal behaviors associated with approachability.

Essentially, politicians can use the six nonverbal behavior cues analyzed in this research study to create and alter their impressions or their political style. According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), a candidate's style directly relates to a voter's image or perception of the candidate. If the voter perceives the candidate to be approachable, likeable, authoritative, strong, etc., then there may be an increased chance that that voter will cast a ballot in favor of that candidate.

In this study, it appears that both candidates use nonverbal behavior cues to create impressions of themselves of power, security, seriousness, as well as approachability and likeability, and both candidates seem to use the nonverbal behavior cues represented in their images to their advantage. Bush and Kerry appear to be on fairly equal political ground due to the similarities between the two candidates. Essentially, they are both equally qualified to run for President and to hold that position. The use of visual imagery, especially posture, body movement, clothing, and facial expression lead one to believe that both candidates were serious about running for President, that they would be strong and confident in that position and that they would be a powerful leader of the country. Thus, you would expect them to use images similarly to portray these characteristics

(seriousness, strength, power, etc.). However, you would also expect them to portray each other differently, even negatively. The objective of any political election is to win votes. In order to do that, candidates must convince the voters that they are the best suited for the office by creating positive impressions of themselves or framing themselves more positively. In political advertising, the candidates have the ability to also create impressions and frame their opponent in a negative manner. This is also one way candidates can portray their opponent differently from themselves. Bush would want to portray Kerry as weaker and Kerry would want to portray Bush as the weaker candidate. However, this was not supported by the evidence in this study. Again, this may be due to the limited access the candidate's had to one another's visual images.

The results of this study have led to a possible weakness in impression management theory, which is most often used in explanations of interpersonal, face-to-face interactions. This study employed impression management theory to guide and explain nonverbal communication of political candidates when presenting themselves and their opponents to an audience through a mediated channel. The theory is quite useful in explaining why candidates would incorporate certain images of themselves depicting specific nonverbal behaviors (e.g., direct eye gaze, smiling or serious facial expression, upright posture, gestures, etc.). And, this study attempts to extend the theory to explain how these same nonverbal behaviors could be used in situations, like political advertising, in which one person has control over how another person appears to an audience.

However a strong weakness of impression management theory is that it fails to account for positive gestures, facial expressions, eye gaze, etc. used in negative ways.

According to Mehrabian (1972), gestures that are used to accent, illustrate, and regulate verbal communication are seen as favorable gestures that help addressees better understand the overall message of the speaker. Now, consider Howard Dean's rally speech immediately following the results of the Iowa caucus. His hands were fisted and he had very sharp, rigid arm movements. According to Dean, he was trying to fire up his constituents after an unexpected loss (Miga, 2004). However, it appeared that he was on a rampage, was angry, and out of control, which appears to be the impression that Bush was trying to create of Dean for the viewers in *Rest*.

Another example of how a positive nonverbal behavior may have been used negatively was through eye gaze. Bush incorporated several images of Kerry in which Kerry was gazing directly at the viewer. According to Mehrabian (1972), Knapp and Hall (1992, 2002), Bayes (1970), and Burgoon, et al. (1996, 1989), direct eye gaze is an immediate behavior that increases favorable characteristics, including likeability and approachability. However, at some point, direct eye gaze crosses a line into staring, or even glaring, at others. Smiling can become negative if it is perceived to be false or even a sneer or smirk. Leaning forward can become negative if it invades one's personal space and makes a person feel uncomfortable. Impression management theory fails to consider that over-usage of immediate nonverbal behavior cues can be damaging to impressions.

This research suggests that nonverbal behavior cues can be used to create and manage positive or favorable impressions of people, but can also be used to create and manage negative impressions as well. This study contributes to the body of literature regarding the uses of nonverbal behaviors to create immediacy as well as distance between a person (i.e., political candidate) and another person (i.e., the voter) through

mediated channels. This study also investigates new ways in which impression

management theory can be used to explain communication in non-interpersonal

situations.

Implications for Framing

Both candidates incorporated mostly full color images into their ads. A small

percentage of black and white images were used by Bush and Kerry to portray

themselves and their opponent. According to Zettle (1999), black and white images entice

the viewers to perceive them in all its depth and subtleties. In one case, Kerry used

images of Bush giving a State of the Union Address and presented those images in black

and white (*Keep Our Word?*). It is safe to assume that this was intentional, because the

speech was filmed and broadcast in color. Events, when displayed in black and white,

become more transparent and invite the audience to apply psychological closure to fill in

the elements of low-definition images (Zettle, 1999). In this way, the viewers will

inevitably get more involved in the event than if they were looking at high-definition

color images. They may ask themselves questions to try to determine what Bush is

talking about, who he is talking to, what the reactions are, etc. The use of full color

images does not entice the viewer to think too deeply about what they are seeing on the

screen. Full color allows the viewer to take what they are seeing at face value as reality

and there is no need to think of it as any different. We live in a world of color (green

grass, blue sky, etc.), and that world is our reality.

We only stop to think more deeply about that world when the color changes. In

political advertising, that happens when the images are in black and white or

monochromatic. Bush and Kerry could have used color to their advantage to put their

opponents under a visual microscope, where viewers would be likely to think more deeply about the person in the black and white image. However, this was not the case. The lack of the variations of the color spectrum indicates that the candidates and their campaign consultants are in the dark about using color to their advantage. Both candidates failed to use color to their opponent's detriment. This is one production technique that is not dependent upon the access or availability of images a candidate has of his opponent. If Kerry or Bush wanted to focus more depth on their opponent, they could have incorporated more black and white or monochromatic images. Political media consultants could pick up on this for future elections.

Camera angles can be used to signal different attributes (Mamer, 2000). Low or superior angle can be used to signal power and strength. High or inferior camera angles can be used to signal weakness or small stature. For both Kerry and Bush, the majority of the images were shot from a straight-on angle, which has been noted in literature as a neutral angle (Mamer, 2000). What is interesting though is that a few of Kerry's shots of Bush were from a high angle. For example, the shots of Bush at the Republican convention (*He's Lost, He's Desperate*), in the House chambers presenting the State of the Union Address (*Keep Our Word?*), and walking on the aircraft carrier after landing in a military jet (*Aircraft Carrier*), were all from a high angle, where the camera was positioned higher than Bush. From this angle, Bush appears very small. This appearance can potentially lead to a perception that Bush is not a very dominant figure and thus not very powerful both literally and figuratively. In a direct comparison of images, Bush also used shots of Kerry at the Democratic convention. However, these shots were either straight-on or from a low angle. It was possible that Bush wanted the viewers to visually

see other aspects of Kerry from these angles, and used the straight-on and superior angles as opposed to inferior angles. Or, it is possible that the camera angles that Kerry employed at the Democratic Convention were different than the camera angles Bush employed at the Republican Convention. If this is the case, then Bush may have been more limited in the camera angles he could use of Kerry than Kerry was of Bush.

According to Kaid and Johnston (2001), cinema verite is the most common production format across the years and is designed to provide the viewer with a "slice of life" of the candidate. For both Kerry and Bush, the majority of the shots were of this production style, which allows the voters to see the candidates "in action" and to get an idea of his style, which can lead to perceptions of the candidate. This is significant because, according to Messaris (1997), what viewers see in visual images, they believe to be real. If voter's see the candidate at work in their office, then the candidate may be perceived to be hard-working. Many of these shots were of Bush walking on the White House lawn, Kerry giving speeches at various locations, both men working in their offices, etc. This style allows for viewers to witness the candidate in a realistic setting for a politician. These images also provide viewers with more information about the candidate that can be used when deciding whom to vote for.

However, both candidates used numerous slides with voice-overs, which are still images that are literally framed within the shot. Using slides with voice-overs allows the candidates to create the illusion of motion and involvement, but without actually having motion. For example, Bush used slides of Kerry with voice-overs in *Doublespeak, Taxing Our Economy,* and *Global Test,* and Kerry used slides of Bush with voice-overs in *Keep Our Word?, He's Lost, He's Desperate,* and *Immediate Help,* to name a few. Without

moving images, viewers may have a more difficult time visualizing the candidate/opponent in the position for which they are running (as compare to the cinema verite style). The candidates may be limited to what moving images they have available of their opponent and may opt to use slides to instead. This option may create limited impressions of the opponents while the candidates are employing cinema verite for themselves. This appears to be strategic in how the candidates control their own image as well as their attempt at controlling their opponent's image. However, more research is necessary to substantiate that claim of using different production styles to portray differences between candidate and opponent.

Candidates can also control setting. There are two aspects to setting: location and formality. The majority of Bush's and Kerry's images portray themselves outdoors and their opponent indoors. For both candidates, their respective images portray themselves in an informal setting the majority of the time and their opponent in a formal setting the majority of the time. Context plays an important role in determining if these images were strategically used by Kerry or Bush to frame themselves positively and/or frame their opponent negatively. Most of the outdoor images were in formal settings. For example, on the campaign trail, numerous rally speeches are given outside at stadiums or fair grounds, which could be seen as favorable to the candidate. There were also some outdoor informal images where Kerry would be standing on a busy street corner talking directly with the television viewer about why he is the better choice for President (e.g., *More Than Anyone*, *Keep Our Word?*). Even the informal indoor images could be seen as favorable to Kerry. For example, there were shots of him inside a factory talking to several factory workers (e.g., *10 Million New Jobs*). This could be construed as positive

because the candidate appears to be taking an interest in the workers and the factory. That

interest can be an element that voters incorporate into their overall perception of the

candidate. Many of the shots were of Bush giving a State of the Union address or a

speech at the Republican convention, which could be seen as favorable to the candidate.

There were also a few outdoor informal images of Bush that could be construed as

negative, based on the context of the images. For example, Kerry used several shots of

Bush on the aircraft carrier while Bush was still in the flight uniform (e.g., *100 Days*,

Aircraft Carrier, *No, Mr. President*). The images were shot from a high or inferior

camera angle that make Bush appear small. Beyond what is in the image, Bush received a

lot of negative feedback from the media about this pseudo-event that used taxpayer

money to declare "Mission Accomplished" in Iraq in 2003, when the war was still on-

going.

Regarding camera shot, both candidates utilized a majority of images with a tight

shot. The tight shot does not allow the viewer to see much of the physical characteristics

and mannerisms of Bush. For the most part, you see just his head and shoulders.

Although, in a few of these tight shot images, Bush's hands and arms are partially visible.

For example, in one shot in *Wrong Choices*, Bush can be seen from the shoulders up and

he is waving to the camera and his right hand and arm are fully visible in the shot.

However, this was not common. When the candidates would use images of each other, it

appeared that the opponent was "in your face." When the candidates would use images of

themselves, the shots had more of an intimate feeling. For example, in Kerry's talking-

head shots (e.g., *Keep Our Word?*, *Misleading America*), he would be "conversing"

directly to the viewer as if in an interpersonal communication situation. This strategy on

the part of the candidates may have been employed to not only portray the differences in style between the candidates, but also create very different viewer perceptions of the two choices for President. Kerry's tight shots appeared to be more intimate and attentive to the viewer as you might find in a back-and-forth conversation between two people. Kerry used tight shots of Bush in which his expression showed displeasure (*Despicable, Keep Our Word?, Not True, Real Americans, Reasons, Right Track,* and *Uninsured)*, and since it was a tight shot, it seems to imply that the displeasure is with the viewer's. This may have been a strategy that Kerry employed to create a perception that Bush was unhappy with the public (possibly regarding issues like protesting War in Iraq and Bush's approval rating).

Medium shots were also incorporated by both candidates. Additionally, Kerry's ads used a few long shots of Bush in *More Than Anyone* and *100 Days*, where the viewer could see Bush from head to toe. This allows for the viewer to witness more of Bush's mannerisms (e.g., how he stands or walks, if he is relaxed or nervous/tense). It is interesting to note that all but one of the long shots of Bush were also from a high camera angle. So even though viewers could see Bush from head to toe, they could also see how diminutive he appeared on screen in a huge room, on a stage at a convention center, or on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier. Medium and long shots allow for viewers to see more of the candidate or opponent and his style, which Trent and Friedenberg (2004), claim that style can be directly connected to candidate image.

With regard to the people that the candidates have along side them in their ads, it is important for political candidates to be seen with people who support them in order to strengthen a candidate's credibility with voters (Trent & Friedenberg, 2004). For both

candidates, they appeared in their own shots alone a large percentage of the time. Fortunately, they also presented their opponent alone as well. The number of images of the candidates by themselves could suggest that they lacked support from prominent citizens, other party members, or average people. In the few images of Bush with supporters, they were of rally events of the convention and none were in informal or intimate settings. Kerry had a few more images of himself with supporters and several of himself with Edwards, his running-mate.

There were images of Bush with the First Lady and images of him with Dick Cheney. On closer inspection of the images with Cheney (all of which were from Kerry's ads—*Can't Win* and *Despicable*), Bush's facial expression was one of displeasure or anger. It seems apparent that Kerry tried to form an impression of Bush that was not in Bush's favor not only by the use of an unfavorable facial expression, but also by associating him with Vice-President Cheney who had been under attack regarding his Halliburton connections. Kerry also made it clear in *Despicable* that Halliburton was the largest corporate contributor to Bush's campaign for re-election. There were also images of Kerry with John Edwards, in which the two were standing at a podium obviously at a speaking event. They are framed from a superior camera angle, have their hands and arms held high in unison, and are smiling. These images appear to be in Kerry's favor, since they indicate a unity between the candidate and running-mate, power due to the camera angle, and confidence due to the body posture and victory gestures.

According to Burgoon, Buller, and Woodall (1996), symbols have associative properties. For example, the White House is associated with the President. The American Flag is a symbol of freedom. The colors red, white, and blue (when displayed together)

97

represent patriotism. Of all the production cues, the use of symbols may be the most surprising. In the majority of their own images, Kerry and Bush had no political or campaign symbols (e.g., donkey or elephant, famous landmarks, documents, patriotic symbols, celebrities) For example, if Kerry had used the Statue of Liberty or the Declaration of Independence in his ads, then one could associate the idea of freedom with Kerry. However, fewer than half of his shots had no symbols. Bush did use the White House and Oval Office, but rarely. He also incorporated images of himself at Mount Rushmore, where some of our greatest presidents have been memorialized. But, unfortunately, the use of symbols was very few for Bush and Kerry when the displayed images of themselves. Instead, viewers had to rely on other features of the ads to associate the candidates with certain concepts. This may have been a missed opportunity for Bush and Kerry and their campaign strategists. Candidates could easily have incorporated more symbols in the images of themselves, especially with modern technological capabilities. Backgrounds could have been altered to include banners, bunting, seals, famous landscapes, national monuments, the Bald Eagle, etc. to help to create impressions of patriotism, nationalism, credibility, leadership, strength, liberty, democracy, power, etc.

On the other hand, not having symbols in their opponent's images may have been a plus. Candidates would not have wanted to associate their opponents with positive values like those mentioned above. Kerry would not have wanted to portray Bush with the Presidential seal, because that may add to Bush's credibility, viability, and electability as President. Bush would not have wanted to portray Kerry with the Statue of Liberty, since that is a symbol of freedom. Bush and Kerry may have intentionally failed to

incorporate symbols in their shots of each other in order to disassociate their opponent from traditional American and political values. However, they may have accidentally failed to use symbols in their shots of themselves that could have strengthened voter perceptions.

Goffman (1974) believes that in order to comprehend the world around us, everyone has to employ some level of framing. Entman (1993) defines framing as "to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described. Miller, Andsager, and Riechert (1998) defined framing as "selecting and emphasizing certain aspects of experience or ideas over others" (p. 313). Gitlin (1980) called frames "principles of selection, emphasis, and presentation composed of little tacit theories about what exists, what happens, and what matters" (p. 6).

In this study, one way that candidates could have framed themselves and their opponents would have been remain constant in their use of the same elements in the images they chose to utilize, but also to frame themselves differently. However, this was not the case. From the results, we can conclude that the candidates did not effectively frame themselves or their opponents. Nor did they effectively distinguish themselves from their opponents.

Through the use of symbols, motion, others in the shot, camera angle, light angle, camera shot, production style, setting, and color, the candidates could have attempted to frame themselves in a way that was favorable to them and set themselves apart from their opponent. Neither Kerry nor Bush did this to the fullest degree possible. In fact, because

99

of the similarities in how the candidates represented themselves and each other, it appears

that they were only slightly aware of the potential. There was a lack of consistent framing

on the part of the candidates and their campaigns in their use of visual images to portray

themselves. Granted, the candidates are limited in how much time they can spend in a

studio, filming advertisement segments. However, if the media consultants were aware of

the potential meanings associated with the production techniques, then they could have

scripted specific camera angles, camera shots, color, production style, etc. to better

portray their candidate. Future research needs to further investigate why there is such a

lack of framing of the candidates in televised advertisements.

However, it should be noted that many of the images that the candidate's have of

their opponent are limited to what images are available. The candidates hire campaign

media consultants; spend hours filming scenes in offices, on the campaign trail, etc. that

can later be edited for various advertisements. Candidates do not have access to the

opponent in the same way. Instead, candidates have to rely on images that are considered

public domain. For example, Kerry used shots of Bush from press conferences and State

of the Union Addresses (e.g., *Aircraft Carrier, Rest, 100 Days*). Thus, candidates are

limited in the availability of images of their opponent. Plus, candidates are limited in how

they can edit those images they choose to use.

According to Price and Tewksbury (1997), priming refers to the tendency of

audience members to evaluate their political leaders on the basis of events and issues

given recent public attention. Research on priming has been combined with studies

focusing on framing (e.g., Iyengar, 1991; Iyengar & Simon, 1993), which refers to the

ability to alter the perceptions people have. Gitlin (1980) argues that the selection of

information as well as how that information is presented to the public through production techniques can affect how political events (and candidates) are perceived by the public. Essentially, candidates can use visual imagery in their ads to frame themselves as well as their opponent to create certain perceptions by the viewers. At the same time, candidates are priming the viewers to have the same cognitive reactions each subsequent time a specific visual image is viewed. For example, Kerry used several images of Bush on the aircraft carrier, which could have been used to frame Bush as a weak leader. Each time one of these images was used, viewers were primed to recall that initial frame and have a similar perception of Bush.

Based on this information, televised political advertisements sponsored by the candidates can be used to frame the candidates in specific ways, in order to attempt to alter the impressions that viewers have of the candidates, thus priming the viewers to perceive the candidates in a certain light. Viewers are constantly evaluating the performance of the candidates during the campaigns leading up to Election Day, based upon events revolving around the campaign. For example, Kerry used the "Mission Accomplished" video footage of Bush landing on an aircraft carrier to prime the viewers to perceive Bush in a negative manner. By using this recent event, that received much media publicity that the war was still on-going when Bush announced mission accomplished, Kerry may have been using the footage to activate/re-activate negative perceptions viewers had of Bush. According to Reed (1988), priming occurs when a decision about one concept makes it easier to decide about another concept. In the case of election 2004, visual images of the candidate may have been used by viewers to make

decisions regarding likability, strength, power, assertiveness, superiority, etc. in order to make the decision of which candidate to vote for a bit easier.

Priming may also help to explain use of repetitive shots in Bush and Kerry's ads. Due to limited amounts of time and monetary reasons, both candidates would have repeated shots in their ads. As mentioned early in this study, candidates spend the majority of their campaign funds on advertising. Additionally, candidates have very little time to produce new scenes to be incorporated into advertising. However, those reasons may explain part of the use of repetition. According to Iyengar and Kinder (1987), the foundation of priming rests on the tendency of viewers to expend very little cognitive effort when processing political information. In fact, most people use cognitive shortcuts instead of processing all available information. If candidates are using visual images to create specific impressions in themselves (e.g., likeability, strength, flexibility) and other impressions of their opponent (e.g., frustration, rigidity, weakness), then they could use the same shots repeatedly and prime the viewers to perceive those characteristics/impressions again and again. Since the information in the visual image is not new, then the viewer can take the cognitive shortcut directly to the perception the formed from the ad the first time they viewed it. According to Nordhielm (2003) suggests that when people engage in minimal processing of a stimulus, a positive affective response (e.g., agreement, liking) is likely to occur even at high levels of repetition of visual images. This repetition of visual imagery may then strengthen the original perception or primed evaluation of the candidate and the opponent.

However, the question still remains as to whether or not priming occurs based on the frames that the candidates attempt to create through their use of production

102

techniques in their televised advertisements. If priming occurs, does repetition of images

increase positive affect responses in viewers for the candidates? What are the responses

to the opponent frames in candidate ads? Further research regarding cognitive processing

of visual images is necessary in determining the answers to these questions.

Chapter 6: Candidate and Opponent Characteristics

The preceding chapter focused on the similarities and differences of the candidates use of visual images at a micro-level (e.g., shot). However, another aspect of this study was to determine what (if any), characteristics the candidates emphasized in themselves as well as their opponent through the use of visual imagery in their respective political advertisements. This chapter, from a macro-level perspective, helps to illuminate the manner in which the candidates manage their impressions and their opponent's impressions as well as how they visually frame themselves and their opponent through the use of visual imagery. Specifically, this chapter addresses the overall characteristics Bush and Kerry to emphasized in themselves and their opponent, and to explore the challenger strategy of attacking the incumbent in Bush's and Kerry's visually comparative televised advertisements.

Characteristics of the Candidates

Before the characteristics of the candidates are discussed, it is important to revisit the idea that candidates have complete control over their advertising. Political communication scholars have noted that sponsoring candidates and their staff members make decisions as to what to include/exclude in the televised spots (Devlin, 1993, 1997, 2001, 2005; Diamond & Bates, 1992; Kaid & Johnston, 2001). Choices are made regarding the themes, words, and visual imagery. Candidates shoot video specifically to use in various advertising outlets, including television ads. When the choice is made to include footage of their opponent, they are limited to what is available. In the case of election 2004, Kerry had access to public domain messages given by President Bush,

including his State of the Union Addresses, press conferences, acceptance speeches, prior political debates, and his 2000 inauguration address. Bush had access to video of Senator Kerry in Senate hearings, the Democratic National Convention, press conferences, and prior debates. Ultimately, the candidates were limited in what visual images were available of their opponent. However, the candidates could also manipulate the visual images to suit their purposes. For example, Kerry used several shots of Bush from a State of the Union Address (e.g., *Keep Our Word?*). Instead of showing Bush as he was originally taped, Kerry selected a few specific shots and used them as still images. He also changed the images from full color to black and white. Bush also altered images of Kerry. In *Doublespeak*, Bush used video footage of Kerry in press conferences or interviews with reporters. He altered them from the original version to slides (that scrolled across the screen) with voice-overs and used them in full color, and he used the same image in the same ad as black and white slides scrolling across the screen in the background. The point being, nothing is left to chance in candidate sponsored political advertisements. Control of the content is of key importance.

One of the overall goals of political candidates is to set themselves apart from one another (Trent & Friedenberg, 2004) in a positive way. With regard to political advertising, candidates can visually set themselves apart. If the sponsoring candidate is using normal speed, full-color video footage from a low camera angle, and he is dressed formally in an outdoor setting with supporters in the shot (all of which could potentially be positive), then he can select an image of his opponent that is the complete opposite (and potentially negative) in an attempt to visually distance himself from his opponent.

Another overall goal of candidates is to create an image of themselves through the use of style that viewers will find favorable. Favorability and image of a candidate are judgments made by the viewers. However, based on prior research, there are certain qualities and characteristics that people in the United States expect politicians to have (Knapp & Hall, 1992). Candidates can use visual images to enhance or emphasize certain characteristics that voters deem important to a political candidate, including trust, charisma, strength, power, security, likeability, etc. This study investigated the characteristics that candidates seemed to present in themselves as well as their opponents through the selections and choices of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques apparent in the visual images in their televised political ads.

Research question five asks what characteristics the candidates are attempting to portray in themselves through the use of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques. Looking at the bigger picture with regard to all of the nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques, it appears that Bush and Kerry are trying to emphasize certain qualities in themselves. First, Bush appears to be forming the impression that by using calm body movements (69%), formal clothing (61%), a serious facial expression (63%), a straight-on camera angle (74%), and an upright posture (69%) that he is serious about his duties as Commander-in-Chief and about winning a second term in office. It appears that he wants to be seen as confident, calm, and in control.

As for Kerry, it appears that through the use of calm body movement (91%), a serious facial expression (68%), an upright or forward leaning posture (91% combined), vast hand gestures (91%), a straight-on or low camera angle (95%), and a cinema verite style (78%) moving at a normal speed (58%), that he is trying to portray power, strength,

106

credibility and viability as a candidate for President of the United States. At the same time, he is also informally dressed (38%), in informal locations (54%), and with supporters, family, politicians, or reporters (53%). This indicates that even though he is serious about winning the election and leading the country, he also wanted to portray a more immediate side to himself. One in which people could see the *real* John Kerry, who is approachable and well liked by others.

Both candidates appear to have used visual imagery to create impressions or frame themselves in a manner that emphasizes specific characteristics. It seems that both men wanted to appear serious about the campaign, issues, and being President; that both candidates wanted to appear in control of themselves and their surroundings; and that both men wanted to appear strong. Additionally, Kerry, it seems, also wanted to appear approachable and average, "of the people."

Characteristics of the Opponents

Research question six asks what characteristics the candidates are attempting to portray in their opponents through the use of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques. Kerry appears to visually describe Bush using some glaring or angry facial expressions (21%), slouched posture or leaning away from others (18%), indirect eye gaze, high/inferior camera angle (14%), tight "in-your-face" camera shots (70%), by himself (70%), off in the distance eye gaze (69%), with relatively no symbols (80%), in slow or still frames (75% combined). From these numbers, it appears that Kerry is creating an impression of or framing Bush as weak, upset, distracted, without support from other politicians or constituents; very un-presidential or leader-like. A president or just about any leader would want to appear strong, confident, supported by others, and

107

focused by incorporating upright posture, direct eye gaze, superior camera angles, as well as having supporters in the shots along side the candidate and even symbolic trappings of the office (e.g., Presidential seal, oval office setting).

Bush, similarly, appears to visually characterize Kerry somewhat differently. Kerry appears calm (77%), serious (84%), and upright or forward leaning (89% combined), which could lead to the impression of a man who is serious about being President, in control, and confident. However, Bush also used imagery to characterize Kerry in a different way. Kerry also appeared in tight "in-your-face" shots (76%), by himself (74%), in slow or still motion (58% combined), with off in the distance eye gaze (72%), and with relative no symbols (85%). These leave the impression that Kerry may be distracted, slow to make political moves and decisions, and has very little support from family, fellow Democrats, and his constituents.

It seems that Bush sent mixed visual messages about Kerry to the viewers of the ads, but that Kerry was more uniform in how he presented Bush to audiences. Neither candidate, however, used visual imagery in their shots to conclusively create specific impressions of their opponent.

Implications for Political Communication

Research points out various incumbent and challenger strategy differences when campaigning. According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), incumbents tend to use symbolic trappings of the office, such as surrounding themselves with body guards, using the office seal, and using their office title instead of just their name. Incumbents tend to also create pseudo-events to attract and control media attention. An example of a pseudo-event is when President Bush landed in a jet on an aircraft carrier with a banner

108

displaying the message "Mission Accomplished." Incumbents tend to consult with world leaders and try to maintain an above the political trenches posture during a campaign.

Challengers also have certain strategies that are widely used. According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), challengers will attack the incumbent more. Kaid and Johnston (2001) agree that attacking the incumbent may also be a necessary strategy for challengers in order to point out to voters what the incumbent's flaws in office have been. Hale, Fox, and Farmer (1996) focused on incumbent and challenger differences and found that negative ads were significantly more likely to be produced by challengers. Benoit (1999) also agrees that in televised political ads for president from 1952 to 1996, challengers attacked the incumbents more than the incumbents attacked the challengers (45% to 33%).

This study investigates the uses of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques by Kerry as the challenger. Did Kerry use these variables to form a more negative impression of Bush than Bush did of Kerry. In six of the categories, it appears that Kerry did use nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to form a more negative impression of Bush than Bush did of Kerry. Kerry incorporated fewer percentages of calm body movements (69% to 77%), higher percentages of Bush with a negative facial expression (21% to 8%), slumped or leaning away (18% to 10%), inferior camera angle (14% to 8%), slides with voice-overs 30% to 12%), in slow or still images (75% to 58%) as compared to Bush.

However, in six other categories, it appears that Bush used nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to form a more negative impression of Kerry than Kerry did of Bush. Bush incorporated fewer percentages of gestures (45% to 72%), direct eye

gaze with the viewer or others in the ad (28% to 31%), higher percentages of Kerry in black and white (24% to 16%), tight camera shots (86% to 70%), by himself (74% to 72%), and without symbols (85% to 80%).

The results, that Kerry as the challenger would use visual imagery to attack his opponent more, are inconclusive. Both the incumbent and the challenger used visual imagery to attack their opponents. They each used six *different* variables in an attempt to possibly negatively portray or attack their opponent. However, the difference in what variables were used by which candidates does imply that there are differences between the incumbent and the challenger.

Unfortunately, there is no previous literature that investigates the use of visual images to attack an opponent or acclaim one's self. It is possible, that candidates can use visual imagery to attack their opponent and acclaim themselves, based on how the images in the televised ads is used. However, it is vitally important to determine favorable/unfavorable and/or positive/negative degrees of the nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques before analyses can be conducted to accurately determine if challengers use a similar strategy regarding visual images in their advertisements as they do verbal communication. One approach to determining favorability or positivity and unfavorability or negativity is to conduct focus groups in which people are asked to look at various political images and discuss how positive or negative the images are, and to discuss why some images are more positive/negative than other images. Do challengers utilize visual images to attack the incumbents more than the incumbents use visual images to attack the challengers? Are there varying degrees of favorability/unfavorability or positivity/negativity? Is there a neutral visual political image? Once these questions are

answered sufficiently, then future content studies could investigate challenger/incumbent

strategies with regard to visual imagery in their ads as well as other forms of political

communication, using similar methods (with a few alterations) from this dissertation

project. Overall, this dissertation is a stepping stone to numerous future research projects

Chapter 7: Conclusion and Future Research

Candidate style is about presentation. Trent and Freidenberg (2004) claim that style is what a candidate says and how a candidate says it. In the age of technology, style consists of nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques as well as verbal messages. Candidates focus much of their attention on style, because the verbal, nonverbal, and production values of political communication can greatly influence a candidate's image, or voters' perceptions of the candidate (i.e., what the voter believes to be true/untrue, desirable/undesirable about the candidate). In political advertisements, candidates have the power to alter their style as well as their opponent's style, which can lead to various voter perceptions. In television advertisements, style can be altered with the use of imagery. According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), television commercials that present candidates in certain situations (e.g., surrounded by family, talking earnestly with senior citizens, walking through a peanut field, or standing in front of a sea of flags) are clearly designed to build or maintain certain perceptions voters have of the candidate. Other television commercials in which candidates present their opponent in certain situations (e.g., looking like a kid in a candy store while riding around in a tank) are clearly designed to lower perceptions voters have of the opponent.

Candidates can manage their impressions and frame themselves to emphasize certain (hopefully positive/favorable) characteristics through the use and editing of visual images in their televised advertisements. At the same time, they can attempt to manage their opponent's impressions and frame their opponent to emphasize certain (hopefully negative/unfavorable) characteristics in their opponent through the use and editing of

visual images in their ads. Through impression management of nonverbal behavior cues

and through framing with production techniques, candidates have control over their style

and to an extent, their opponent's. And style, as noted by Trent and Friedenberg (2004) is

directly connected to voter perceptions of candidates, or the candidate's image. Voters

make their vote choice based on who they perceive is the better candidate (Trent, Short-

Thompson, Mongeau, Nusz, & Trent, 2001).

It is important to note that not all nonverbal behavior cues need to be controlled in

order for a certain impression to be created or an image perceived. Based on the results of

research questions one through four in which some significant differences were found as

well as many similarities, candidates may only need to control just one or two of the

variables mentioned in this study for the desired characteristic(s) to be emphasized or

differences between the candidates made apparent. For example, in *Keep our Word?,*

Kerry altered the original footage of Bush presenting the State of the Union Address from

a moving image to a still frame, in which Bush was seen with a threatening facial

expression. By focusing on just these two variables (production style and facial

expression), Kerry emphasized the idea that Bush is menacing with out having to alter all

of the other variables. In fact, if a candidate did attempt to control all of the visual

elements in the advertisements, the viewer may find it to be transparent or too heavy

handed.

Throughout the discussion, I mentioned several immediacy behaviors (e.g.,

posture, facial expression, gestures, eye gaze) in conjunction with one another. However,

it is possible that by simply altering one behavior (facial expression from pleased to

angry), it is no longer immediate, but possibly threatening. This is an area in which

113

impression management needs to be further investigated to determine the effectiveness of managing impressions by the combination of variables. Future effects studies may also be able to determine if certain variables have greater effects than others (facial expression as compared to posture) or if the greater effect is truly a combination of certain variables. The subtle differences between the candidates may be enough to have a great effect.

This study also revealed that candidates are not always uniform in how they presented themselves and their opponents. Based on the results and discussion of research questions five and six, it appears that the candidates may not be using visual images to effectively characterize themselves or their opponent. In some instances, Bush used images of Kerry in formal clothing and later in casual clothing and he also used images of himself in formal attire as well as casual attire. In these instances, there is too much similarity in the visual elements of the ads; there is essentially no overall (macro-level) difference in how Bush characterized himself as opposed to how he characterized Kerry. From Bush's images, both men were characterized as powerful, strong, and leader-like.Visual images could easily be used to show audiences how the candidates differ, especially regarding positive and negative character traits (as visual elements in this study did not focus on campaign issues).

The overall purpose for political campaign messages is, for the most part, to differentiate between the candidates in order to secure votes. Visual images could be another strategy available to the candidates in showing how the candidate differs from the opponent. However, for differentiation of the candidates through the use of visual imagery to be effective, the candidates have to consistently emphasize different characteristics in themselves as opposed to competing candidates through the use of

nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques throughout their overall advertising campaigns. Future research needs to investigate other political candidate campaigns to determine if there are consistent overall differences in how candidates portray and frame themselves and their opponents. Future effects research is also needed to determine the level of effectiveness of consistent differences.

Micro-level and macro-level investigation of the visual elements in political advertising needs to be included in future studies that focus on more than one election between two candidates. Future research needs to be conducted over a larger sample of ads to better understand the content of the ads and how candidates present themselves and their opponents. It would be interesting to see if a content analysis study of political televised advertisements from 1952 to the present would yield similar results. It would also be interesting to see if a study of non-Presidential advertisements would have similar findings. It is important to note that due to the low power indications, it is probable that this study was not likely to detect significant results based on the sample size. Future studies of this type should use a larger sample size to better determine significant differences between candidates.

Impression management theory needs to be tested in areas other than interpersonal and nonverbal research. This theory has the potential to explain communication phenomena in political communication and possibly other sub-fields of communication as well. Impression management research could lead to determining specific favorable and unfavorable behaviors for a candidate. These behaviors could be studied to determine their effects on the viewing audience. It is possible that through this

avenue of research, political televised advertisements will be created to more advantageous to the candidate and more disadvantageous to the opponent than in 2004.

Also, this project did not consider the verbal messages that coincided with the nonverbal and production messages. It would be interesting to determine if attack statements were being uttered at the same time opponent images were on-screen and whether or not those images would be considered favorable or unfavorable. However, another content analysis would need to be conducted in order to determine this.

This content analysis study could lead to future effects studies. With regard to political advertising, what purpose does the repetition of visual images serve (except maybe to reduce the amount of money that the candidates spend on advertising)? Does the repetition of images reinforce or solidify a viewer's perception of a candidate or their opponent? Does repetition of visual images help with voter recall? Future research is necessary to answer these and other remaining questions.

We also know there are some differences in how the candidates portrayed themselves and how they portrayed each other. Do those differences have an effect on the viewing audience? If the candidates were to dramatically change their ads for the 2008 election and incorporate more favorable images of themselves and less favorable images of their opponent, would it affect the viewer's perceptions of the candidates? The opponents? Future research would be able to answer these questions.

Also, it seems that by using the audio and visual channels in sync with each other, that a candidate's message could have more of an impact on the voter. Unless this were tested in an experimental study, it would be hard to make a definite claim about the impact on voters.

It is also very difficult, if not impossible, to determine the candidate's intent of the usage of the ad shots in a content analysis study. A qualitative study in which interviews are conducted with the campaign consultants would be highly valuable for determining intent as well as what characteristics the campaigns are attempting to represent through the use of style. Once intent is determined, then it would be interesting to quantitatively determine if viewers perceive the characteristics that the campaigns intended.

Overall, I had several objectives for this study, all of which have been achieved. Specifically, I developed a solid theoretical framework to guide this and future visual studies in political communication by combining impression management theory and framing theory to help explain candidates uses of visual imagery in their ads to portray themselves as well as their opponent. Second, I added to the political communication literature in a new way by focusing on the candidate's and the opponent's visual images in visually comparative political advertisements. Third, I detailed the importance of knowing the content in political advertisements in order to later determine the true effects of political advertising on viewers, because we may know that political advertising has various effects, but until we know the content, we cannot be sure what the effects are caused by.

Appendix A

Table 1A

Summary of Bush's Visually Comparative Televised Advertisements

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
Clockwork	October	30	2	2	4	11	15	26
Differences	Jan-March	30	3	2	5	6	8	14
Differences (en Espanol)	Jan-March	30	3 (0)	2 (0)	5	6	8	14
Doublespeak	April-May	60	4	12	16	10	56	66
Global Test	October	30	3	1	4	10	20	30
Healthcare Hypocrisy	October	30	2 (1)	2	4	3	27	30
Impuestos	October	30	2	3 (2)	5	10	12	22
Intel	August	30	3	6	9	8	26	34
Inteligencia	August	30	3 (0)	6 (0)	9	8	26	34
Kerry's Yucca	August	30	2	4 (3)	6	9	20	29

(continued)

118

Table 1A *continued*

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
Medicare Hypocrisy	September	30	2 (0)	2 (0)	4	3	27	30
No Limit	October	30	2	7 (4)	9	5	28	33
Patriot Act	April-May	30	6 (5)	3 (1)	9	3	12	15
Pessimism	June	30	6 (1)	1	7	13	6	19
Prioridades	July	30	5 (0)	103 (3)	108	9	111	120
Priorities	July	30	5 (0)	103 (0)	108	9	111	120
Rest	Jan-March	30	1	7	8	5	9	14
Searching	October	30	3	6	9	7	21	28
Taxing Our Economy	August	30	2	5	7	8	24	34
Troops	Jan-March	30	4 (0)	2	6	10	6	16

(*continued*)

119

Table 1A *continued*

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
Troops/Fog	Jan-March	30	4 (0)	2 (0)	6	10	6	16
Troops/Fog Revision	April-May	30	4 (0)	2 (0)	6	10	6	16
Troubling	April-May	30	3 (0)	2	5	6	5	11
Valores Familiares	October	30	2 (0)	1	3	5	4	9
Wacky	Jan-March	30	2	2	4	7	7	14
Windsurfing	October	30	2	13 (4)	15	8	228	236
World View	October	30	3	2 (1)	5	8	12	20
Yakuza	July	30	4 (0)	2	6	10	22	32
Totals		870	87	303	390	217	863	1080
Total Unique Shots			41	71	112			

Note. Numbers in parentheses are the number of unique shots.

Table 2A

Summary of Kerry's Visually Comparative Televised Advertisements

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
10 Million New Jobs	April-May	30	1	7	8	12	18	30
100 Days	F/W 2003	30	2	6	8	8	24	32
Aircraft Carrier	F/W 2003	30	1	9	10	3	20	23
Bush's Mess	October	30	1	1	2	23	5	28
Can't Win	October	30	5 (4)	2	7	15	5	20
Cheney Halliburton	September	30	1 (1)	5	6	5	12	17
Defend America	September	30	1	7 (5)	8	3	28	31
Dispicable	September	30	1	2	3	26	9	35
Different Story	September	30	1	9 (7)	10	13	25	38
Doesn't Get It	September	30	4	2	6	8	12	20

(continued)

121

Table 2B *continued*

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
Flu	October	30	4 (3)	1 (0)	5	8	15	23
He's Lost, He's Desperate	October	30	2	2	4	6	6	12
Hoover	October	30	3 (1)	2 (1)	5	8	10	18
Immediate Help	September	30	3	2	5	17	7	24
Issues	August	30	3	2	5	16	5	21
January Surprises	October	30	1	2	3	21	8	29
Keep Our Word?	Jan-March	75	14	2	16	69	6	75
Leading	October	30	2 (0)	2 (1)	4	5	5	10
Lobbyist--NH	F/W 2003	30	1	5	6	8	14	22
Looking	October	30	1	9	10	3	21	24

(continued)

122

Table 2B *continued*

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
Middle Class Families	October	30	1 (0)	1 (0)	2	8	10	18
Misleading America	Jan-March	30	2	7	9	2	14	16
More Than Anyone	Jan-March	50	1	1 (0)	2	5	7	12
No, Mr. President	F/W 2003	30	2	4 (2)	6	5	12	17
Not True	September	30	3	6	9	5	21	26
Real Americans	October	30	3 (2)	2 (0)	5	9	8	17
Reasons	September	30	25 (2)	4 (0)	29	77	12	89
Right Track	September	30	2	6 (4)	8	17	16	33
Sided w/ Lobbyists	F/W 2003	30	1 (0)	5 (0)	6	8	14	22
Sided w/ Lobbyists IA	F/W 2003	30	1 (0)	5 (0)	6	8	14	22

(*continued*)

Table 2B *continued*

Ad Title	Month Ran	Length	Bush Shots	Kerry Shots	Total Shots	Bush Seconds	Kerry Seconds	Total Seconds
Strength	F/W 2003	30	1 (0)	5 (0)	6	8	14	22
Uninsured	September	30	2	3	5	17	9	26
Wrong Choices	September	30	2	4	6	9	9	18
You Saw	October	30	1	1 (0)	2	3	5	8
Totals		1085	99	133	232	458	420	878
Total Unique Shots			65	98	163			

Note. Numbers in parentheses are the number of unique shots.

Appendix B
Table 1B

Operational Definitions and Kappa Inter-coder Reliability Co-efficients

Category	Cohen's *kappa*	Operational Definition
Focus of Shot	.92	Kerry or Bush
Body Movement	.80	Frequent dynamic activity, calm movements of arms, legs, or torso, positive head movement; or lethargic behavior, closed body position, tense or nervous movements of arms, legs, or torso, negative head movement
Eye Gaze	.72	Looking directly at camera/viewer, eye contact between candidate and someone else in shot; or looking up, down, or away from viewer and/or others in shot has eyes shut
Facial Expression	.76	Showing happiness, joy, cheerfulness, confidence and/or pleasure, smiling; or serious/attentive; or frowning, glaring, worried, tired, or angry, showing displeasure fear, sadness, or disgust

Table 3 *continued*

Category	Cohen's *kappa*	Operational Definition
Gestures	.85	Use of more hand movements; use of fewer or no hand movements, hands at ones sides or at rest
Posture	.72	Standing or sitting tall/upright, attentively leaning toward a person; or bowed, slumped over, slouched, leaning on a person or object, leaning away from a person
Dress/Clothing	.82	Formal: business attire, suit and tie; Varied: button-up shirt and slacks; Casual: shirtsleeves, t-shirts, polo shirts and shorts or casual pants
Color	.88	Full color; black and white; or monochromatic (shades of a single color)
Production Style	.88	Cinema verite (real life setting); slides with voice-over, head-on (talking head), animation (cartoon)
Setting (Location)	.86	Indoors or outdoors
Setting (Formality)	.85	Informal (e.g., house, farm, field); Formal (e.g., office, speech, rally)

(*continued*)

Table 3 *continued*

Category	Cohen's *kappa*	Operational Definition
Symbols	.74	American flag; national colors (red, white, and blue); national bird (bald eagle); famous American landscapes or structures (e.g., Mt. Rushmore or Statue of Liberty); famous American documents (e.g., Declaration of Independence); famous figures (e.g., media celebrities, past Presidents)
Camera Angle	.82	Eye-level shots; shots from above the candidate or shots below the candidate
Camera Shot	.85	Tight (head and shoulders), medium (from waist up) and long (full body)
Light Angle	.90	above and in front of the candidate; or below and/or behind the candidate
Motion	.79	normal speed/motion; or slow, fast, reverse, or freeze-frame/still image
Others in Shot	.82	with running-mate, family, a crowd of supporters, or unknown persons; or the candidate/opponent is portrayed by himself/alone

Appendix C

RQ1: How do Bush and Kerry differ in their utilization of visual images in their

respective ads with regard to nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques?

Table 1C

Repetitive Shots and Unique Shots in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Unique Images	Repetitive Images	Total
Bush Ads	112 (29%) [a]	278 (71%) [b]	390 (100%)
Kerry Ads	163 (70%) [a]	69 (30%) [b]	232 (100%)
Total	275 (44%)	347 (56%)	622 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 100.09; $p < .0001$; $V =$

.40). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass &

Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .0001$.

Table 2C

Focus of Shot for Unique Images in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Candidate Images	Opponent Images	Total
Bush Ads	41 (37%) a	71 (63%) b	112 (100%)
Kerry Ads	98 (60%) c	65 (40%) d	163 (100%)
Total	139 (51%)	136 (49%)	275 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 13.76; $p < .0005$; $V =$ .23). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at a, b $p < .0001$ and c, d $p < .001$.

Table 3C

Eye-Gaze in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Camera or Viewer	Others in Ad	Other Gaze	Total
Bush Ads	32 (29%) a	11 (10%) b	67 (61%) c	110 (100%)
Kerry Ads	21 (13%) a	48 (30%) b	90 (57%) c	159 (100%)
Total	53 (20%)	59 (22%)	157 (58%)	269 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 20.61; $p < .0001$; $V =$ .28). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .0001$.

Table 4C

Body Movement in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Activity	None	Total
Bush Ads	73 (72%) [a]	28 (28%) [b]	101 (100%)
Kerry Ads	129 (83%) [a]	26 (17%) [b]	155 (100%)
Total	202 (79%)	54 (21%)	256 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 3.77; $p < .05$; $V = .13$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .0001$.

Table 5C

Color in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Full Color	Monotone	Black and White	Total
Bush Ads	81 (74%) [a]	4 (3%) [a]	25 (23%) [a]	110 (100%)
Kerry Ads	147 (86%) [a]	4 (2%) [a]	19 (11%) [a]	170 (100%)
Total	228 (81%)	8 (3%)	44 (16%)	280 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 7.41; $p < .05$; $V = .16$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .0001$.

Table 6C

Camera Shot in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Full Color	Monotone	Total
Bush Ads	83 (79%) [a]	22 (21%) [b]	105 (100%)
Kerry Ads	96 (59%) [c]	68 (41%) [d]	164 (100%)
Total	179 (67%)	90 (33%)	269 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 12.10; $p < .0005$; $V = .21$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$ and [c, d] $p < .005$.

Table 7C

Others in Shot in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Supporters	Other	Alone	Total
Bush Ads	22 (20%) [a]	11 (10%) [b]	75 (70%) [c]	108 (100%)
Kerry Ads	56 (44%) [d]	27 (21%) [e]	44 (35%) [f]	127 (100%)
Total	78 (33%)	39 (17%)	119 (51%)	235 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 28.28; $p < .0001$; $V = .35$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .001$, [a, c] $p < .0001$, [b, c] $p < .0001$, [d, e] $p < .001$, and [e, f] $p < .05$.

Table 8C

Symbols in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Symbols	None	Total
Bush Ads	17 (15%) [a]	93 (85%) [b]	110 (100%)
Kerry Ads	61 (37%) [c]	106 (63%) [d]	167 (100%)
Total	78 (28%)	199 (72%)	277 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 13.53; $p < .001$; $V = .23$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$ and [c, d] $p < .001$.

Table 9C

Time in Bush and Kerry's Respective Ads

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Bush Ads	217 (20%) [a]	863 (80%) [b]	1080 (100%)
Kerry Ads	419 (48%)	458 (52%)	877 (100%)
Total	636 (32%)	1321 (68%)	1957 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 169.09; $p < .0001$; $V = .29$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Appendix D

RQ2: How did the candidates use nonverbal behavior cues and production techniques to portray themselves as opposed to their opponents?

Table 1D

How Bush Used Eye Gaze

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Camera or Viewer	19 (59%)	13 (41%)	32 (100%)
Others in Ad	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	11 (100%)
Other Gaze	19 (28%) [a]	48 (72%) [b]	67 (100%)
Total	41 (38%)	67 (62%)	108 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 8.78; $p < .01$; $V = .29$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Table 2D

How Bush Used Facial Expressions

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Smiling	10 (67%) a	5 (33%) b	15 (100%)
Serious	26 (32%) c	56 (68%) d	82 (100%)
Frowning	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	11 (100%)
Total	41 (38%)	67 (62%)	108 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 6.87; $p < .05$; $V = .25$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.001 and $_{c, d}$ p < .0005.

Table 3D

How Bush Used Setting (Formality)

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Informal	14 (74%) a	5 (26%) b	19 (100%)
Formal	12 (32%) c	26 (68%) d	38 (100%)
Total	26 (46%)	31 (54%)	57 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 9.05; $p < .005$; $V = .40$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001 and $_{c, d}$ p < .005.

Table 4D

How Bush Used Camera Shot

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Tight	26 (31%) [a]	57 (69%) [b]	83 (100%)
Medium	13 (59%)	9 (41%)	22 (100%)
Total	39 (37%)	66 (63%)	105 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 5.74; $p < .05$; $V = .23$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Table 5D

How Kerry Used Gestures

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Movement	61 (77%) [a]	18 (23%) [b]	79 (100%)
None	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	13 (100%)
Total	67 (73%)	25 (27%)	92 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 3.99; $p < .05$; $V = .24$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Table 6D

How Kerry Used Body Movement

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Calm	86 (67%) $_c$	42 (33%) $_d$	128 (100%)
None	8 (31%) $_a$	18 (69%) $_b$	26 (100%)
Total	94 (61%)	60 (39%)	154 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 12.05; p < .0005; V =

.28). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass &

Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001

and $_{c, d}$ p < .001.

Table 7D

How Kerry Used Eye Gaze

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Camera or Viewer	16 (76%) $_a$	5 (24%) $_b$	21 (100%)
Others in Ad	33 (69%) $_a$	15 (31%) $_b$	48 (100%)
Other Gaze	45 (50%)	45 (50%)	90 (100%)
Total	94 (59%)	65 (41%)	159 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = .7.86; p < .05; V = .22).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001.

Table 8D

How Kerry Used Facial Expressions

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Smiling	25 (78%) [a]	7 (22%) [b]	32 (100%)
Serious	65 (60%) [c]	43 (40%) [d]	108 (100%)
Frowning	5 (28%) [a]	13 (72%) [b]	18 (100%)
Total	95 (60%)	63 (40%)	158 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 9.76; $p < .01$; $V = .25$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$ and [c, d] $p < .05$.

Table 9D

How Kerry Used Dress/Clothing

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Formal	50 (48%)	55 (52%)	105 (100%)
Informal	35 (88%) [a]	5 (12%) [b]	40 (100%)
Varied	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	13 (100%)
Total	91 (58%)	67 (42%)	158 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 19.62; $p < .0001$; $V = .35$). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Table 10D

How Kerry Used Camera Angle

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
High	5 (36%) c	9 (64%) d	14 (100%)
Straight-On	73 (59%)	50 (41%)	123 (100%)
Low	20 (80%) a	5 (20%) b	25 (100%)
Total	98 (60%)	64 (40%)	162 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 7.64; $p < .05$; $V = .22$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$ and $_{c, d}$ p

$< .001$.

Table 11D

How Kerry Used Camera Shot

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Tight	50 (52%)	46 (48%)	96 (100%)
Medium	46 (77%) a	14 (23%) b	60 (100%)
Total	96 (62%)	60 (38%)	156 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 10.45; $p < .005$; $V = .25$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$.

Table 12D

How Kerry Used Production Style

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Cinema Verite	79 (65%) $_c$	42 (35%) $_d$	121 (100%)
Slides	6 (24%) $_a$	19 (76%) $_b$	25 (100%)
Talking Head	16 (76%) $_a$	5 (24%) $_b$	21 (100%)
Total	101 (60%)	66 (40%)	167 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 19.08; $p < .0001$; $V =$ .34). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$ and $_{c, d}$ $p < .0005$.

Table 13D

How Kerry Used Others in Shot

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Supporters	39 (85%) $_a$	7 (15%) $_b$	46 (100%)
Other	10 (37%) $_c$	17 (63%) $_d$	27 (100%)
Alone	44 (52%)	40 (48%)	84 (100%)
Total	93 (59%)	64 (41%)	157 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 19.58; $p < .0001$; $V =$ .35). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$ and $_{c, d}$ $p < .05$.

Table 14D

How Kerry Used Motion

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Normal	57 (77%) a	17 (23%) b	74 (100%)
Slow	31 (55%)	25 (45%)	56 (100%)
Still	11 (30%) a	26 (70%) b	37 (100%)
Total	99 (59%)	68 (41%)	167 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 23.53; p < .0001; V = .37). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001.

Table 15D

How Kerry Used Symbols

	Candidate	Opponent	Total
Symbols	48 (77%) a	13 (23%) b	61 (100%)
None	54 (51%)	52 (49%)	106 (100%)
Total	102 (61%)	65 (39%)	167 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 11.40; p <.001; V = .27). Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001.

Appendix E

RQ3: What are the differences between how the candidates portray themselves in their

respective ads?

Table 1E

How Bush and Kerry Used Body Movement to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Calm	27 (24%) a	86 (76%) b	113 (100%)
None	12 (60%)	8 (40%)	20 (100%)
Total	39 (29%)	94 (71%)	133 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 10.69; $p < .001$; $V = .28$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$.

Table 2E

How Bush and Kerry Used Eye Gaze to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Camera or Viewer	19 (54%)	16 (46%)	35 (100%)
Others in Ad	5 (13%) a	33 (87%) b	38 (100%)
Other Gaze	19 (30%) a	45 (70%) b	64 (100%)
Total	43 (31%)	94 (69%)	137 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 14.74; $p < .001$; $V = .33$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a,\ b}\ p < .0001$.

Table 3E

How Bush and Kerry Used Color to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Color	33 (27%) a	91 (73%) b	124 (100%)
Black and White	9 (53%)	8 (47%)	17 (100%)
Total	42 (31%)	99 (69%)	141 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 3.78; $p < .05$; $V = .19$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a,\ b}\ p < .0001$.

Table 4E

How Bush and Kerry Used Production Style to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Cinema Verite	26 (25%) a	79 (75%) b	105 (100%)
Slides	10 (63%) c	6 (37%) d	16 (100%)
Talking Head	5 (24%) a	16 (76%) b	21 (100%)
Total	41 (29%)	101 (71%)	142 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 9.94; $p < .01$; $V = .26$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$ and [c, d] p

$< .01$.

Table 5E

How Bush and Kerry Used Others in Shot to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Supporters	6 (13%) a	39 (87%) b	45 (100%)
Other	6 (38%) c	10 (62%) d	16 (100%)
Alone	26 (37%) c	44 (63%) d	70 (100%)
Total	38 (29%)	93 (71%)	131 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 8.18; $p < .05$; $V = .25$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$ and [c, d] p

$< .05$.

Table 6E

How Bush and Kerry Used Motion to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Normal	14 (20%) $_a$	57 (80%) $_b$	71 (100%)
Slow	12 (28%) $_a$	31 (72%) $_b$	43 (100%)
Still	15 (58%)	11 (42%)	26 (100%)
Total	41 (29%)	99 (71%)	140 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 13.31; p < .001; V = .31).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001

Table 7E

How Bush and Kerry Used Symbols to Portray Themselves

	Bush of Bush	Kerry of Kerry	Total
Symbols	10 (17%) $_a$	48 (83%) $_b$	58 (100%)
None	32 (37%) $_c$	54 (63%) $_d$	86 (100%)
Total	42 (29%)	102 (71%)	144 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [1] = 6.69; p < .01; V = .22).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ p <.0001 and $_{c, d}$ p

<.005.

Appendix F

RQ4: What are the differences between how the candidates portray each other in their

respective ads?

Table 1F

How Bush and Kerry Used Eye Gaze to Portray Each Other

	Bush of Kerry	Kerry of Bush	Total
Camera or Viewer	13 (72%) a	5 (28%) b	18 (100%)
Others in Ad	6 (29%) a	15 (71%) b	21 (100%)
Other Gaze	48 (52%)	45 (48%)	93 (100%)
Total	67 (51%)	65 (49%)	132 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 7.48; $p < .05$; $V = .24$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins,

1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at a, b $p < .0001$.

Table 2F

How Bush and Kerry Used Dress/Clothing to Portray Each Other

	Bush of Kerry	Kerry of Bush	Total
Formal	41 (43%)	55 (57%)	96 (100%)
Informal	18 (78%) [a]	5 (22%) [b]	23 (100%)
Varied	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	13 (100%)
Total	65 (49%)	67 (51%)	132 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 9.44; $p < .01$; $V = .28$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Table 3F

How Bush and Kerry Used Production Style to Portray Each Other

	Bush of Kerry	Kerry of Bush	Total
Cinema Verite	53 (56%)	42 (44%)	95 (100%)
Slides	8 (30%) [a]	19 (70%) [b]	27 (100%)
Talking Head	6 (55%)	5 (45%)	11 (100%)
Total	67 (50%)	66 (50%)	133 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 5.84; $p < .05$; $V = .21$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at [a, b] $p < .0001$.

Table 4F

How Bush and Kerry Used Others in Shot to Portray Each Other

	Bush of Kerry	Kerry of Bush	Total
With Supporters	12 (63%) $_c$	7 (37%) $_d$	19 (100%)
With Others	5 (23%) $_a$	17 (77%) $_b$	22 (100%)
Alone	49 (55%)	40 (45%)	89 (100%)
Total	66 (51%)	64 (49%)	130 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 8.74; $p < .01$; $V = .26$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$ and $_{c, d}$ $p < .01$.

Table 5F

How Bush and Kerry Used Motion to Portray Each Other

	Bush of Kerry	Kerry of Bush	Total
Normal	27 (61%) $_c$	17 (39%) $_d$	44 (100%)
Slow	25 (50%)	25 (50%)	50 (100%)
Still	12 (32%) $_a$	26 (68%) $_b$	38 (100%)
Total	64 (48%)	68 (52%)	132 (100%)

Note. The *Pearson chi-square* statistic was significant (X^2 [2] = 7.32; $p < .05$; $V = .24$).

Pairwise comparisons were calculated using Marascuilo contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $_{a, b}$ $p < .0001$ and $_{c, d}$ $p < .05$.

Appendix G

The 2004 Presidential Election:
An Analysis of Visually Comparative Televised Advertisements

Codebook and Code Sheet

This coding protocol is designed to compare the types of impression management and framing techniques between Presidential candidate's political television advertisements during the 2004 general election. The purpose of this project is to determine how a candidate manages his and his opponent's impressions as well as how the candidate frames himself and his opponent. This study will result in differences and similarities between how the candidates portray themselves as well as how they portray each other. Future use of this protocol can be to determine differences and similarities between political parties as well as differences and similarities across time. The following definitions constitute the variables for this study.

Operational Definitions

Visually Comparative Advertisements
For this study, visually comparative advertisements are those that include both the candidate and the candidate's opponent on screen at any time during televised advertisements so that audience members can physically see them.

Impression Management Variables: Nonverbal Behavior Cues
The impression management variables consist of nonverbal behavior cues. Based on impression management theory developed by Jones and Pittman (1982) and numerous nonverbal and political communication studies, the following nonverbal behaviors will be observed and coded:

> Body Movement—frequent dynamic activity, calm movements of arms, legs, or torso, positive head movement; or lethargic behavior, closed body position, tense or nervous movements of arms, legs, or torso, negative head movement
> Eye Gaze—Looking directly at camera/viewer, eye contact between candidate and someone else in shot; or looking up, down, or away from viewer and/or others in shot has eyes shut
> Facial Expression—showing happiness, joy, cheerfulness, confidence and/or pleasure, smiling; or serious/attentive; or frowning, glaring, worried, tired, or angry, showing displeasure fear, sadness, or disgust
> Gestures—use of more hand movements; use of fewer or no hand movements, hands at ones sides or at rest
> Posture—standing or sitting tall/upright, attentively leaning toward a person; or bowed, slumped over, slouched, leaning on a person or object, leaning away from a person
> Dress—business attire, suit and tie; button-up shirt and slacks; casual attire, shirtsleeves, t-shirts, polo shirts and shorts or casual pants

Framing Variables: Production Techniques: The framing variables consist of production techniques that Zettle (1997, 1999) and Mamer (2000) have developed and that political communication scholars (Moriarty & Garramone, 1986; Moriarty & Popovich, 1991; Kaid & Johnston, 2001; Verser & Wicks, 2006) have included in prior studies.

Camera Angle—eye-level shots; shots from above the candidate or shots below the candidate

Camera Shot—Tight (head and shoulders), medium (from waist up) and long (full body)

Light Angle—above and in front of the candidate; or below and/or behind the candidate

Color—full color; or black and white or monochromatic (only shades of a single color)

Motion—normal speed/motion; or slow, fast, reverse, or freeze-frame/still image

Production Style—cinema verite (real life setting); slides with voice-over, head-on (talking head), animation (cartoon)

Setting (Location)—Indoors or outdoors

Setting (Formality)—Informal (e.g., house, farm, field); Formal (e.g., office, speech, rally)

Symbols—patriotic props (flags, bunting, official seals), objects with national colors, the national bird, famous documents, representations of past presidents or other famous figures; or business style charts and graphs

Others in Shot—with running-mate, family, a crowd of supporters, or unknown persons; or the candidate/opponent is portrayed by himself/alone

Shot Length—Recorded in Seconds

Coding Procedures

Coding should meet the following criteria:
1. All ads to be coded should be from the 2004 general election presidential
    campaigns of George W. Bush and John Kerry.
2. All ads to be coded should be visually comparative.
3. The impression management variables and framing variables should be coded
    for shots containing the candidate and/or the opponent.

Use the codebook and coding sheets provided. The following procedures should be
followed:
1. Write the ad title, candidate's name and party affiliation, opponent's name and
    party affiliation, and the election year on the top of the code-sheet.
2. Code each shot individually. A camera change indicates a new shot.
3. Code the variables for each shot. DO NOT code the variables for anyone other
    than the candidate and/or the opponent.
4. Record the length of each shot in seconds.
5. IF YOU HAVE ANY DOUBTS, UNCERTAINTIES, OR QUESTIONS
    about the coding that cannot be resolved by looking carefully at the
    codebook, leave those cells blank on your coding sheet and bring the tape
    to the project leader. We will work together to resolve the issue.
6. When you are finished coding all the ads, bring your data to the project leader
    for an inter-coder reliability check.

Ad Title: _____

Sponsoring Candidate
     1-Bush   (_____)
     2-Kerry

Focus of Shot
     1-Candidate   (_____)
     2-Opponent

Impression Management Variables: Nonverbal Behavior Cues
Body Movement
     1-Calm Movements of Arms, Legs, Torso and/or   (_____)
            Positive Head Movements
     2- Tense or Nervous Movements of Arms, Legs,
            Torso and/or negative head movements
     3-No Movement At All
     9-Unable to Tell

Eye Gaze
     1-With Camera/Viewer   (_____)
     2-With Others in Ad (i.e., opponent, supporter,)
     3-Other (e.g., looking away, outside, eyes closed)
     9-Unable to Tell

Facial Expression
     1-Smiling (e.g., happy, joyous, or pleasure)   (_____)
     2-Serious (e.g., deep thought, intense listening)
     3-Frowing/Glaring (e.g., sad, upset, angry, disgusted)
     9-Unable to Tell

Gestures
     1-Hand movements (i.e. shaking hands, waving)   (_____)
     2-No Hand Movements (i.e. hands at rest, in lap,
            on desk)
     9-Unable to Tell

Posture
     1-Upright   (_____)
     2-Slouched, Slumped, Shoulders Hunched
     3-Leaning Toward a Person
     4-Leaning Away from a Person
     9-Unable to Tell

Dress
        1-Formal (i.e. suit & tie)   (_____)
        2-Informal (i.e. polo shirt & khakis)
        3-Varied (i.e. khakis & button-up shirt with tie)
        4-Other (e.g., uniform): _____
        9-Unable to Tell

Framing Variables: Production Techniques
Color
        1-Full Color   (_____)
        2-Monochromatic (e.g., shade of one color)
        3-Black and White

Production Style
        1-Cinema Verite (e.g., real life setting)   (_____)
        2-Slides w/ Voice Over (e.g., still images)
        3-Head-on (e.g., Eisenhower Answers America)
        4-Animation (e.g., cartoons)
        5-Other: _____

Setting (Location)
        1-Indoors   (_____)
        2-Outdoors
        9-Unable to Tell

Setting (Formality)
        1-Informal (e.g., house, farm, field)   (_____)
        2-Formal (e.g., office, speech, rally)
        3-Unable to tell

Symbols
        1-American Flag   (_____)
        2-National Colors (red, white, and blue)
        3-National Bird (bald eagle)
        4-Famous American Landscapes (e.g., Mt.
                Rushmore or Statue of Liberty)
        5-Famous American Documents (e.g.,
                Declaration of Independence)
        6-Famous Figures/Past Presidents (e.g., TV,
                film, and sports celebrities)
        7-Other/Unknown: _____
        8-No Symbols Present
        9-Combination: _____
        99: Unable to Tell

Camera Angle
        1-High (e.g., looking down on candidate/opponent)   (_____)
        2-Straight-On (e.g., level with candidate/opponent)
        3-Low (e.g., looking up at candidate/opponent)

Camera Shot
        1-Tight (e.g., head and shoulders only)   (_____)
        2-Medium (e.g., from waist up, includes
            arms and hands)
        3-Long (e.g., full body length of
            candidate/opponent)

Light Angle
        1-High (e.g., shining down on   (_____)
            candidate/opponent)
        2-Straight-On (e.g., shining from directly in
            front of the candidate/opponent)
        3-Low (shining up on candidate/opponent)
        4-Behind (e.g., shining on the back of
            candidate/opponent)

Motion
        1-Normal Speed   (_____)
        2-Slow Motion (e.g., walking through water)
        3-Faster than Normal Speed
        4-Reverse Motion (e.g., moving backward)
        5-Freeze-Frame/Still Image (e.g., no motion,
            photograph)
        6-Other: _____
        9-Unable to Tell

Others in Shot
        1-Running Mate   (_____)
        2-Family (e.g., candidate's or someone else's)
        3-Crowd of Supporters
        4-Other: _____
        5-Alone

Shot Length (Record in Seconds)   (_____)

153

Codebook References

Jones, E.E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-

   presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp.

   231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kaid, L. L., & Johnston, A. (2001). *Videostyle in presidential campaigns: Style and

   content of televised political advertising*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Mamer, B. (2000). *Film production technique: Creating the accomplished image* (2nd

   ed.). Australia: Wadsworth.

Moriarty, S. E., & Garramone, G. M. (1986). A study of newsmagazine photographs of

   the 1984 presidential campaign. *Journalism Quarterly, 68*, 371-380.

Moriarty, S. E., & Popovich, M. N. (1991). Newsmagazine visual and the 1988

   Presidential election. *Journalism Quarterly, 101*, 205-214.

Verser, R. M., & Wicks, R. H. (2006). Managing voter impressions: The use of images

   on presidential candidate web sites during the 2000 campaign. *Journal of

   Communication, 56* [1], 178-197.

References

Bakeman, R. (2000). Behavioral observation and coding. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judge

(Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp.

138-159). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barbatisis, G. S. (2002). "Look, and I will show you something you will want to see":

Pictoral engagement in negative political campaign commercials. *Argumentation*

and Advocacy, *33*, 69-80.

Barber, J. D. (1972). *The presidential character*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barrett, A. W., & Barrington, L. W. (2005). Is a picture worth a thousand words?

Newspaper photographs and voter evaluations of political candidates.

Press/Politics, 10(4), 98-113.

Bayes, M. A. (1970). *An investigation of the behavioral cues of interpersonal warmth*.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Miami.

Benoit, W. L., (1999). *Seeing spots: A functional analysis of presidential television*

advertisements, 1952-1996. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. (1998). *Functions of campaign '96:*

Acclaiming, attacking, and defending discourse. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., Pier, P. M., & Blaneky, J. R. (1997). A functional analysis of presidential

television spots: Acclaiming, attacking, and defending. *Communication*

Quarterly, 45, 1-20.

Birdwhistell, R. L. (1983). Body motion: Research and interviewing. In A. M. Katz &

V. T. Katz (eds.), *Foundations of nonverbal ccommunication: Readings,*

exercises, and commentary (pp. 222- 230). Carbondale: Southern Illinois

155

University Press.

Bond, M. H., & Shiraishi, D. (1974). The effect of interviewer's body lean and status on the nonverbal behavior of interviewees. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13*, 11-21.

Brians, C. L., & Wattenberg, M. P. (1996). Campaign issue knowledge and salience: Comparing reception from TV commercials, TV news, and newspapers. *American Journal of Political Science, 40,* 172-193.

Bromley, D. B. (1977). *Personality description in ordinary language.* Chichester: John Wiley.

Burgoon, J. K. (1980). Nonverbal communication research in the 1970s: An overview. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 4* (pp. 179-197). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1989). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue.* New York: Harper & Row.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1996). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hoobler, G. D. (2002). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 240 – 299). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlsbaum Associates, Publishers.

Crigler, A. N., Just, M., & Neuman, W. R. (1994). Interpreting visual versus audio messages in television news. *Journal of Communication, 44*, 4, 132-150.

D'Angelo, P. (2002) News framing as a multiparadigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication, 52*(4), 870-888.

Davis, M. (1995). Presidential body politics: Movement analysis of debates and press conferences. *Semiotica, 106*, 205-244.

Devlin, L. P. (2005). Contrasts in Presidential campaign commercials of 2004. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*, 2, 279-313.

Devlin, L. P. (2001). Contrasts in Presidential campaign commercials of 2000. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44,* 12, 2338-2369.

Devlin, L. P. (1997). Contrasts in Presidential campaign commercials of 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 1058-1084.

Devlin, L. P. (1993). Contrasts in Presidential campaign commercials of 1992. *American Behavioral Scientist, 37,* 272-290.

Dewey, M. E. (1983). Coefficients of agreement. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 143,* 487-489.

Diamond, E., & Bates, S. (1992). *The spot: The rise of political advertising on television* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica, 1*, 49-98.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43* (4), 51-58.

Erickson, K. (2000). Presidential rhetoric's visual turn: Performance fragments and the politics of illusionism. *Communication Monographs, 67*, 138-157.

Exline, R. V., Gray, D., & Schuette, D. (1965). Visual behavior in a dyad as affected by

interview content and sex of respondent. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 256-266.

Fast, J. (1970). *Body language: The essential secrets of non-verbal communication*. New York: MJF Books.

Fenno, R. E. (1978) *Home style: House members in their districts.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Fleming, J. (1998). Winning graphics. *Campaigns and Elections, 19,* 50.

Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action. In R. G. Braungart & M. M. Braungart (Eds.), *Research in political sociology* (Vol. 3, pp. 137-177). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Graber, D. A. (1986). Portraying presidential candidates on television: An audiovisual analysis. *Campaigns and Elections, 7,* 14-21.

Graber, D. A. (1988). *Processing the news: How people tame the information tide.* New York: Longman.

Graber, D. A. (1996). The "new" media and politics: What does the future hold? *Political*

Science & Politics, 29(10), 33-36.

Hale, J. F., Fox, J. C., & Farmer, R. (1996). Negative advertisements in U. S. Senate

campaigns: The influence of campaign content. *Social Science Quarterly, 77,*

329-343.

Henley, N. M. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication.*

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Heslin, R., & Boss, D. (1980). Nonverbal intimacy in airport arrival and departure.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6, 248- 252.

Holbert, R. L., Benoit, W. L., Hansen, G. J., Wei-Chun, W. (2002). The role of

communication in the formation of an issue-based citizenry. *Communication*

Monographs, 69, 296-311.

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues.*

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, S., & Kinder, D. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion.*

Chicago: University of Chicago.

Iyengar, S., & Simon, A. (1993). News coverage of the gulf crisis and public opinion: A

study of agenda-setting, priming, and framing. *Communication Research*, *20*,

365-383.

James, K. E., & Hensel, P. J. (1991). Negative advertising: The malicious strain of

comparative advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *20*, 53-69.

Jamieson, K. H. (1996). *Packaging the Presidency: A history and criticism of*

Presidential campaign advertising (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnson-Cartee, K. S., & Copeland, G. (1989). Southern voters' reaction to negative

political ads in 1986 election. *Journalism Quarterly, 66*, 888-896.

Johnson-Cartee, K. S., & Copeland, G. (1993*). Negative political advertising: Coming of Age.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johnston, A., & Kaid, L. L. (2002). Image ads and issue ads in U. S. Presidential advertising: Using videostyle to explore stylistic differences in television political ads from 1952-2000. *Journal of Communication, 52*, 281-300.

Jones, E.E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Joslyn, R. A. (1980). The content of political spot ads. *Journalism Quarterly, 57*, 92-98.

Kaid, L. L. (2004). Political advertising. In L. L. Kaid (ed.), *Handbook of political communication research* (pp. 155 – 202). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kaid, L. L., & Davidson, D. K. (1986). Elements of videostyle: Candidate presentation through television advertising. In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), *New perspectives on political advertising* (pp. 184-209). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kaid, L. L., & Johnston, A. (2001). *Videostyle in presidential campaigns: Style and content of televised political advertising*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Kaid, L. L., & Wadsworth, A. J. (1989). Content analysis. In P. Emmert & L. L. Baker (Eds.), *Measurement of communication behavior* (pp. 197-217). New York: Longman.

Keppel, G., & Wickens, T. D. (2004*). Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (4th

ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Kepplinger, H., & Donsbach, W. (1986). The influence of camera perspectives on the

perception of a politician by supporters, opponents, and neutral viewers. In D.

Paletz (Ed.), *Political Communication Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kinder, D. R. (1986). Presidential character revisited. In R. R. Lau & D. O. Sears (Eds.),

Political cognition: The nineteenth Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition.

Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kiousis, S., Bantimaroudis, P., & Ban, H. (1999). Candidate image attributes.

Communication Research, 26, 414-428.

Knapp, M. L., & Hall, J. A. (1992). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (3rd

ed.). Fort Worth, Texas: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Knapp, M. L., & Hall, J. A. (2002). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (5th

ed.). Australia: Wadsworth.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Newbury

Park, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.).

Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lau, R. R., Sigelman, L., Heldman, C., & Babbitt, P. (1999). The effect of negative

political advertisements: A meta-analytic assessment. *American Political Science

Review, 93,* 851-875.

Leathers, D. G. (1986). *Successful nonverbal communication: Principles and

applications.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Maarek, P.J. (1995). *Political marketing and communication*. London: John Libbey.

Mamer, B. (2000). *Film production technique: Creating the accomplished image* (2nd ed.). Australia: Wadsworth.

Mandell, L. M., & Shaw, D. L. (1973). Judging people in the news—unconsciously: Effects on camera angle and bodily activity. *Journal of Broadcasting, 17*, 353-365.

McGinniss, J. (1969). *The selling of the president 1968*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

McGraw, K. M. (2003). Political impressions: Formation and management. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 394-432). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mehrabian, A. (1967). Orientation behaviors and nonverbal attitude communication. *Journal of Communication, 17*, 324-332.

Mehrabian, A. (1969). Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*, 359-372.

Mehrabian, A. (1970). A semantic space for nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 35*, 248-257.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth.

Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Chicago: Aldine/Atherton.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and attitudes* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Messaris, P. (1994). *Visual literacy: Image, mind, and reality*. Boston: Westview Press.

Messaris, P. (1997). *Visual persuasion: The role of images in advertising*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Metallinos, N. (1996). *Television aesthetics: Perceptual, cognitive, and compositional*

bases. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Miga, A. (2004, January 21). Fiery Dean chills. *The Boston Globe,* p. 1.

Miller, M. M., Andsager, J. L., & Riechert, B. P. (1998). Framing the candidates in

   presidential primaries: Issues and images in press releases and news coverage.

   Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 75 (2), 312-324.

Millerson, G. (1972). *The technique of television production* (12th ed.). Boston, MA:

   Focal Press.

Moriarty, S. E., & Garramone, G. M. (1986). A study of newsmagazine photographs of

   the 1984 presidential campaign. *Journalism Quarterly, 68*, 371-380.

Moriarty, S. E., & Popovich, M. N. (1991). Newsmagazine visual and the 1988

   presidential election. *Journalism Quarterly, 101*, 205-214.

Morris, V. (2004, January 21). Howard subdued a day after his "passion" play. *New York

   ost*, p. 8.

Mullen, J. J. (1963). Newspaper advertising in the Kennedy-Nixon campaign. *Journalism

   Quarterly, 40*, 3-11.

Nachshon, I., & Wapner, S. (1967). Effect of eye contact and physiognomy on perceived

   location of other person. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*, 82-89.

Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge: News and

   the construction of political meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nimmo, D. (1974). *Popular images of politics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nimmo, D., & Savage, R. (1976). *Candidates and their images*. Santa Monica: Goodyear

   Publishing.

Noggle, G., & Kaid, L. L. (2000). The effects of visual images in political ads:

Experimental testing of distortions and visual literacy. *Social Science Quarterly, 81*, 913-927.

Nolen, W. E., (1995). Reading people. *The Internal Auditor, 52*, 48-52.

Nordhielm, C. L., (2003). A levels-of-processing model of advertising repetition effects. In L. M. Scott & R. Batra (eds.) *Persuasive imagery: A consumer response perspective* (pp. 91-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Page, B. I. (1978). *Choices and echoes in presidential elections*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Patterson, M. L. (1977). Interpersonal distance, affect, and equilibrium theory. *Journal of Social Psychology, 101*, 205-214.

Patterson, M. L., Churchill, M. E., Burger, G. K., & Powell, J. L. (1992). Verbal and nonverbal modality effects on impressions of political candidates: Analysis from the 1984 presidential debates. *Communication Monographs, 59*, 231-242.

Patterson, T. E., & McClure, R. D. (1976). *The unseeing eye: The myth of television power in national politics.* New York: Putnam.

Price, V., & Tewksbury, D. (1997). News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing. In G. Barnett & F. J. Boster (Eds.), *Progress in the communication sciences*, vol. 13, (pp. 172-212). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Raines, R. S., Hechtman, S. B., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). Nonverbal behavior and gender as determinants of physical attractiveness. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 14*, 253-267.

Reed, S. K. (1988). *Congnition: Theory and applications*. Pacific Grove, CA:

Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Payne, S. K. (1991). *Nonverbal behavior in

interpersonal relations* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (2005).*Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative

content analysis in research* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Associates, Publishers.

Ritter, K., & Henry, D. (1990). The 1980 Reagan-Carter presidential debate. In R. V.

Friedenberg (Ed.), *Rhetorical studies of national political debates: 1960-1988*.

New York: Praeger.

Rosenberg, S. W., Bohan, L., McCafferty, P., & Harris, K. (1986). The image and the

vote: The effect of candidate presentation on voter preference. *American Journal

of Political Science, 30*, 108-127.

Savitsky, J. C., & Sim, M. E. (1974). Trading emotions: Equity theory of reward and

punishment. *Journal of Communication, 24*, 140-146.

Sayre, S. (1994). Images of freedom and equality: A values analysis of Hungarian

political commercials. *Journal of Advertising, 23*, 1, 97-110.

Scott, W. A. (1955). Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding.

Public Opinion Quarterly, 17, 321-325.

Sullivan, D. G., & Masters, R. D. (1988). Happy warriors: Leaders' facial displays,

viewers' emotions, and political support. *American Journal of Political Science,

32*, 345-368.

Sybers, R., & Roach, M. E. (1962). Clothing and human behavior. *Journal of Home*

Economics, 54, 184-187.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Norman, N. (1985). Social power, self-presentation, and the self. In B.
R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 293-322). New York: McGraw-
Hill.

Tiemens, R. K. (1978). Television's portrayal of the 1976 presidential debates: An
analysis of visual cues. *Communication Monographs, 45,* 362-370.

Trent, J. S., & Friedenberg, R. V. (2004). *Political campaign communication: Principles
and practices* (5th ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Trent, J. S., Short-Thompson, C. Mongeau, P. A., Nusz, A. K., & Trent, J. D. (2001).
Image, media bias, and voter characteristics: The ideal candidate from 1988-2000.
American Behavioral Scientist, 44, 12, 2109-2112.

Valkenburg, P. M., Semetko, H. A., & De Vreese, C. H. (1999). The effects of new
frames on readers' thoughts and recall. *Communication Research, 26* (5),
550-569.

Verser, R. M., & Wicks, R. H. (2006). Managing voter impressions: The use of images
on presidential candidate web sites during the 2000 campaign. *Journal of
Communication, 56* [1], 178-197.

Waldman, P., & Devitt, J. (1998). Newspaper photographs and the 1996 presidential
election: The question of bias. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly,
75*, 2, 302-311.

Warnecke, A. M., Masters, R. D., & Kempter, G. (1992). The roots of nationalism:
Nonverbal behavior and xenophobia. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 13*, 267-282.

West, D. M. (1997). *Air wars: Television advertising in election campaigns, 1952-1996*

(2nd ed.). Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2003). *Mass media research: An introduction* (7th

   ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zettl, H. (1997). *Television production handbook* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

   Publishing.

Zettle, H. (1999). *Sight sound motion: Applied media aesthetics* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA:

   Wadsworth Publishing.

VITA

Rebecca Mae Verser was born in November, 1974 in Rogers, Arkansas and raised in

Bentonville, Arkansas. She attended Henderson State University from 1993 to 1997, and

graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in communication. She earned her Master of

Arts degree in communication at the University of Arkansas in 2003. Rebecca has

worked in advertising and public relations in Texas and Arkansas. She has worked on

advertising campaigns for clients such as Subway, Marble Slab Creamery, the Houston

Rockets and the Houston Comets. She has taught as a teaching assistant and as a visiting

instructor in communication at the University of Missouri—Columbia, as an adjunct

instructor at Columbia College, and as a teaching assistant at the University of Arkansas.

Rebecca received the Frank and Lila Gilman Fellowship in 2004 from the Department of

Communication at the University of Missouri—Columbia. She was awarded the top

paper (with Rob Wicks, Ph.D.) in the Political Communication Division of the National

Communication Association in 2002. She was appointed assistant professor in

communication studies at New Mexico State University (Las Cruces, New Mexico) in

2007.