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ABSTRACT

Brown, Susan Kay Stoeckig, M.A., September 1981, Interpersonal Communication

Candidate Images and the 1976 Presidential Debates

Director: Wesley N. Shellen

The purpose of this study was to examine the images of political candidates in the setting of the presidential debates in order to determine the relationship between various campaign variables and candidates images. A questionnaire was distributed to seniors in selected government classes in two different high schools four times, once prior to the debates and once immediately following each of the debates. A semantic differential scale with twenty bi-polar adjectives was used to measure the images of Carter and Ford as well as an "ideal" President at each testing.

When submitted to factor analysis, the data did not collapse into meaningful categories. Factors differed both in number and in content between the various candidates and across the four testings. The image concept was not a stable one for Ford, Carter or the "ideal" President. Party preference was a distinguishing factor on the philosophy item of the "ideal" and was a key to image ratings of the candidates. The Independents rated the candidates between the ratings given by the partisans, with parties rating their own candidate the highest. Party preference was not a predictor of the vote at the last two testings. Subjects rated the candidate they preferred higher than the opposition candidate in most cases. Knowledge of the issues was not closely related to images. Winners of the debates received higher image scores than losers of the debates. Sources of information used for learning about the candidates did not appear to be closely related to images.

The results of this study confirmed results of previous studies in finding that both party preference and candidate preference were closely related to candidate images. Research that suggested the factors of images were stable was not confirmed by this study. Likewise, the factors of the "ideal" President's image were found to be less stable across time than previous research had indicated. The perceptual stability hypothesis that suggested changes in the image of one candidate would be mirrored by changes in the image of his opponent was not confirmed by this study. The selective perception hypothesis was confirmed by this study in that those viewing the debates rated the candidate whom they saw winning the debates more positively than the candidate whom they perceived as losing the debates. Overall, this study suggested that refinements in the instruments of measurement would be useful in providing more manageable questionnaires for future studies.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The future of this country is ritualistically put on the line every four years in a process Americans fondly and, at the same time, contemptuously refer to as presidential campaigns and elections. Such a serious matter as the election of the President in recent years has been taken out of the hands of the treacherous, but normally capable party bosses, and has been turned over to the fickle, whimsical American voter. The rise in prominence of the electronic media as the primary vehicle of influence on the American electorate added new dimensions to this process of campaigning. Researchers scurried to keep pace with the rapid changes and innovations that found their ways into campaign strategy books. Attempts were made to understand the why's of voter actions. The emphasis of current research has been the campaign process as it is seen by and as it affects the American voter. This represented a somewhat radical shift in focus for some researchers, most notably the political communication researcher.

Communication research about the campaign and election process traditionally focused on a rhetorical analysis of various campaign speeches. The overall strategies and effects of the campaign for a long time were ignored in communication research. Swanson (1972) suggested that:
Campaign communication study might yield more knowledge about both campaigns and communication if it were based on an expanded view of its subject, drew its critical standards from the voters themselves, and adopted a more sophisticated, functional perspective in the analysis of specimens of campaign persuasion (40).

One such "functional perspective" that has begun to receive research attention in the communication field is that of the political image. Images have long been recognized as important factors in the campaign. Ashmore (1962) suggested that all politicians really seek an enhanced public image when they campaign.

It is probably true that every man who has mounted a stump in pursuit of elective office has employed the means at hand in an effort to build a beguiling image of himself. It may also be true that the projected personality of the candidates has always had more to do with the outcome of an election than the issues they raised or avoided (1).

Hughes (1960) echoed the importance of personality in campaigns when he reviewed the historical significance of personality politics. Lubell (1962) suggested that party leaders perceived image-making and personality as the predominant forces in electoral politics. Hahn (1970) argued that issues were even part of images when he stated that "the focus of campaigns has always been upon image or upon image as a manifestation of the issues" (14). Hahn and Gonchar (1972) later justified this focus on image as a valid means of judging the capabilities of a presidential contender:

Images are based primarily upon personality and thus can be important clues to those Presidential behaviors which are determined by personality rather than ideology - and we would contend that such behaviors comprise the vast majority of a President's duties (62).

Others have supported this idea that images were the preponderant element in contemporary campaigning (Kissel, 1960; Wycoff, 1968;

The famed Great Debates of the 1960 Kennedy-Nixon race focused the attention of the candidates and the voters even more toward the appearances of Kennedy and Nixon and their image projections. Most researchers and political pundits agreed that image was very important in the 1960 debates. Kraus (1964) lamented the significance of images in lieu of issues:

One cannot really be particularly proud of the fact the image-making was of more significance in the 1960 debates than was the understanding of issues, that personality was more powerful than ideas, and that what a man 'looks like' was more important than what he 'thinks-like' (22).

Nimmo & Savage (1976) upheld this view of the debates as "not arguments on issues, but confrontations of images" (159). It was most probably this emphasis on style and appearances in the 1960 debates that provided the edge of victory for Kennedy (Harding, 1960; Kissel, 1960; Miller, 1960; White, 1960; Kelley, 1962; Middleton, 1962).

The simultaneous rise in importance of the electronic media and candidate images in campaigns caused candidates to turn to "image merchants" in an attempt to present a "good image" to the voters. The public has been made aware of candidate images through popular books and network news coverage of the use of media specialists by the candidates. Along with the increased awareness of the public has come an increased attention to images on the part of students of political campaigns.

Much of the early image research was of a descriptive rather than a quantitative nature. Wycoff (1968), McGinniss (1969) and
Nimmo (1970), to name a few, provided much information to the field as well as to the general public through their descriptive analyses of the use of images in recent campaigns. With the descriptive research as a theoretical base, the communication researcher turned to a quantitative study of the image phenomena.

It was the goal of this study to examine the images of political candidates in the setting of presidential debates. This study should help to clarify the image concept and to further identify relationships between the image of candidates and other variables in a political election. The remainder of this chapter shall review the accumulated literature concerning candidate images that was reported prior to the collection of this data. An explanation of the methods used in this study and the results that were obtained shall be explored in subsequent chapters. Finally, a discussion of the results along with reports of selected research in this field that were published after the collection of data for this study shall be covered as applicable in the final chapter.

Defining the Image Concept

The most formidable theoretical perspective of the image was provided in the work of Kenneth Boulding (1956). In his treatise on the nature of knowledge, Boulding identified behavior as being dependent on image. Although he never offered a succinct definition of the image concept, Boulding did describe the image as being "built up as a result of all past experiences of the possessor of the image" (6). Boulding also carefully distinguished "between the image and the
messages that reach it. The messages consist of information in the sense that they are structured experiences. The meaning of a message is the change which it produces in the image" (7).

Building on Boulding's theoretical base, Alexander (1971) provided clarification through his definition of image as "the organization of subjective knowledge into useful units or categories" (171). In a similar way Douglas (1972) advanced the idea that such an organization of information would be the "verbal image". He defined the "verbal image" as "the structure of cognitive and affective dimensions appearing in verbal responses to stimulus symbols which identify a perceptually distinct category of persons, issues, groups, or events, etc." (2). It was this verbal image that seemed to be the underlying focus of much of the research on political images.

Definitions of image in the context of political campaigns are many and varied. Anderson (1973) suggested a "characterization model of image campaigning, which stresses that images are perceptual phenomena allocated by members of an electorate as means of assigning order and meaning to a complex and ambiguous political environment" (75). Hahn and Gonchar (1972) further refined the concept by defining it as being composed of at least five elements: "personality orientation, views of leadership, political and personal ideology, epistemology, and axiology" (61). They cited the interrelationship between credibility and charisma as clues to the importance of images in campaigns because of the need of leaders to be trusted, believed and respected in order to be effective.

With a thorough review of these and other definitions of
image, Nimmo and Savage (1976) clarified and refined the concept:

We shall begin by defining an image as a human construct imposed on an array of perceived attributes projected by an object, event, or person. Such a definition summarizes our view that an image is (1) a subjective, mental construct (2) affecting how things are perceived but also (3) influenced by projected messages (8).

Contradicting the Boulding definition of the image as separate and distinct from messages, Nimmo and Savage continued their clarification:

Thus, our focus is largely on the message-image relationship; that is, jointly on what attributes a candidate publicizes to appeal to the voter and the attributes the voter sees in the candidates, which comprise the voter's image of the candidate. For our purposes, therefore, the candidate's image consists of how he is perceived by voters, based on both the subjective knowledge possessed by voters and the messages projected by the candidate (8-9).

Thus, each voter would possess a somewhat distinct image of a candidate. Douglas (1972) suggested that "it may be assumed that each subject held his own unique image of each candidate but that these were structured in part along common dimensions" (11). It was the common dimension of images that most interested the communication researchers whose work is reviewed here.

**Changes in Images**

Research has confirmed the idea that images are not fixed, but rather change as a result of, or at least in relation to, various stimuli. In summarizing published voting studies, Nimmo and Savage (1976) indicated that campaigns have an effect on the images of the candidates.

Published voting studies, then, indicate that campaigns do make a difference, at least in marginal ways, by activating, reinforcing, or changing voter intentions and by
effecting shifts in the perceptions of specific traits comprising a candidate's image (19).

Perhaps the most extensive research exploring candidate images was that conducted by Nimmo and Savage (1976). The conclusions reached by these researchers not only confirmed previous studies, but also suggested the nature of the relationships between images and the campaign itself.

The images of political candidates change. They are not, as much early research suggested, fixed in all voters' minds before, or early in, the campaign. We have seen that changes take place in candidate images during and between election campaigns, although sometimes the change is slight or confined to only a few perceived traits. The relationship between candidate images and campaign changes is probably a function of the candidate's campaign style in transaction with the voters' preferences at any given moment for certain types of appeals, campaign messages, and media - the various elements of campaign style (206).

Acceptance of the idea that images shift in campaigns led researchers to attempt to discover the effects that isolated campaign activities had on the images of the candidates. The usual procedure employed in these studies was to measure the candidate images prior to a particular campaign event and again just after that event. Comparisons were then made between these pre- and post-event images. Conclusions drawn from the results usually attributed the change in the images to the specific campaign event.

One campaign event that has received a great deal of attention from researchers is the phenomenon of the presidential debate. An example of this kind of research is that conducted during the 1960 presidential debates by Lang and Lang (1962). These researchers concentrated on the changes in the images of Kennedy and Nixon as a result of the debates. They found image changes that were rather
dramatic. They noted, however, that "voting intentions changed much less" (328).

Perceptual Stability Hypothesis

Based on the conclusion that images change it seemed logical for the researcher to move one step further to attempt to explain changes in candidate image. The perceptual stability or maintenance hypothesis was advanced to explain image changes. Anderson and Avery (1978) explained the hypothesis thusly: "If change in the perception of one candidate should occur, similar changes should occur with the other" (355). In other words, if the image is changed as a result of campaign events for one candidate, it should also be changed, in an opposite or compensating direction, for the other candidate. After all, the election is a win-lose proposition in which often the candidates seem to ask the voters to reject their opponents rather than to simply ask the voters to accept them as candidates.

Even if one did not accept the perceptual stability hypothesis for the campaign as a whole, it would at least seem natural to accept it for the campaign confrontations that came to be known as debates. Swanson and Swanson (1978) provided justification for this type of outlook with this observation:

The frame of reference in which the press covered the debate, and in which most voters apparently evaluated the debate, was as an adversary confrontation in which there would be a winner and a loser (347).

Therefore, if the perceptual stability hypothesis was applied to the images of the candidates during the presidential debates, it seemed likely that it would be confirmed.
Indeed, research dealing with images during presidential debates generally supported the perceptual stability hypothesis. Tannenbaum, Greenberg and Silverman (1962) found perceptual stability in the images of Kennedy and Nixon in the 1960 debates.

... the presidential images show a strikingly reciprocal change from $T_1$ to $T_2$; the small but consistent positive changes for Kennedy across the various scales are matched -- in almost mirror-image fashion -- by equally small but negative shifts for Nixon (287).

Although several studies have supported the perceptual stability hypothesis, not all image studies have reached similar conclusions. Roberts (1973), in a study of the 1970 off-year congressional election, found that a positive change in the attitude toward one candidate was not necessarily accompanied by a corresponding negative change in attitude toward his opponent. Roberts also found that in off-year congressional elections there seemed to be less need to justify one's position and thus more inconsistencies in one's position may have existed than during presidential election years. Although Roberts' study did not focus on either a presidential election or campaign debates, his conclusions nevertheless must be considered.

It was clear from research studies that images were changeable concepts in the voters' minds. However, confirmation of the idea that a reciprocal relationship existed between the images of opposing candidates had not been consistently established. Further research was needed to determine what types of images or image factors were most likely to change during presidential debates and in what direction those changes were likely to occur for various groups of voters. The relationship between the image a voter held of one candidate and the
image the voter held of his opponent needed to be explored in greater depth. Finally, the perceptual stability hypothesis needed to be tested further to determine under what circumstances and to which groups of voters the hypothesis could be successfully applied.

**Party Preference and Images**

Most research involving party preference and candidate image has viewed these two voting influences as separate and distinct influences. Both of these types of research have been reviewed in this section.

For many years party preference has been considered the single greatest determinant of voting decisions. Boyd (1969) found that issues in the long run had an important effect on party preference. In terms of voter choices, however, party preference was more consistently the single greatest determinant of the voters' choices.

Consistent with the Boyd findings was research conducted by Miller and Levitin (1976). Party preference was found to be a very constant, unchanging identification.

Party identification is remarkably constant. A sense of party affiliation is one of the most stable of social or economic group memberships in this complex, everchanging society. It is more stable than occupation or residence. Along with religion, it is an identification that, however strong, persists throughout the entire adult life of most persons (35).

Party preference, once expressed, tended to remain throughout the adult life of the voter.

Current research, however, has tended to contradict the Miller and Levitin study as well as Boyd's findings. The strength of party
Identification seems to have declined in recent years. Kirkpatrick, Lyons and Fitzgerald (1975) in a twenty-year study of voting trends found that party images showed a decrease in influencing voting decisions while candidate images showed an increase over the same period of time. Nie, Verba and Petrocik (1976) provided further support of this position in their extensive analysis of the Michigan voting studies from 1939 to 1974. They concluded that voters do not identify as strongly now with political parties as they once did.

The study of the role of the Independent voter further substantiated the decreased role of the party in voting decisions. Miller and Levitin (1976) through the use of the statistics and voting studies available through the University of Michigan Center for Political Studies observed that there has been a continual increase in the numbers of voters who identify themselves as Independents. They also noted that "in addition to the increase in the proportion of Independents in the electorate, there has been an increase in the rate at which party identifiers defect and vote against their party" (35).

Correspondingly, research has shown a decrease in the accuracy of using party preference as a predictor of voting intentions. Although Miller and Levitin (1976) noted that congressional elections provided consistent evidence that voters used party identification as the basis for deciding how to vote, they also found that presidential elections did not illustrate the same kind of simple relationship between party identification and voting patterns. Mendelsohn and O'Keefe (1976) in studying the 1972 presidential elections, found that "... the main predictors of actual vote were perceived image attri-
butes especially as applied to Richard Nixon. . . . Political party appears relatively low on the list [of predictors of actual vote]" (122).

Party preference, viewed as a separate and distinct voting influence, for a long time had been seen as the most important influence on voting decisions. More recent literature, because of increased sophistication of measurement techniques or because of actual changes occurring in the voting population, has concluded that party preference has decreased in importance to the voting population. An examination of the interaction between candidate image and party preference, however, provided more realistic explanations of the function of party identification in recent elections.

Studies that have specifically tried to find the relationship between party identification and candidate images have been few. McGrath and McGrath (1962) in studying the 1960 presidential election suggested that two theoretical views needed to be considered in order to study the interaction of image and party.

The image hypothesis holds that the two candidates can be characterized by different patterns of attributes which are related to the words and deeds of the candidates and their agents during the campaign. In short, the image point of view holds that political perceptions are stimulus-determined. In contrast, perceptual balance theory would predict that perceptions of the attributes of political figures are determined by the perceiver's attitudes toward the candidates, rather than by the objective characteristics of the candidate as a stimulus object (239).

Party preference would be perceiver-determined and according to this theory could affect the voter's view of a candidate.

McGrath and McGrath (1962) indicated in a report of their study of images in the 1960 presidential election that
... we should expect that in the heat of a presidential campaign a devoted Democrat will see his party's candidate as more or less "all white" and the Republican candidate as more or less "all black." This polarization would hold not only for the candidates' stands on issues, but also for a wide range of personal characteristics (237).

Thus, according to current theory, perceptions of political figures were perceiver-determined and political party affiliation could be directly related to the candidate's image.

McGrath and McGrath (1962) found that both theories were in evidence during the 1960 election. They reported that the activity kinds of attributes were largely stimulus-determined. In this case the images of the candidates were similar for both parties. However, potency attributes were clearly perceiver-determined. Here each party had polarized views of the candidates and party preference interacted with the images.

Wycoff (1968) referred to a study conducted in 1958 by the Cunningham and Walsh advertising agency during the gubernatorial campaign in New York. In referring to this study, Wycoff noted that "regardless of political affiliation, [voters] tend to see similar television images of the candidates" (217). The 1960 McGrath and McGrath study clarified the findings reported in 1958 by qualifying the kinds of attributes that were perceived similarly regardless of party identification.

More recently, however, party identification has been considered in terms of its interaction with the actual candidate preference of the voter. This analysis further clarified the kinds of circumstances that affect the interaction of party and image. Nimmo and Savage (1976) found that
... among party identifiers loyal to their party's candidate, the proportion of positive comments about their choice is high... party identifiers who defect generally have more positive images of the opposition's candidate than of their own party's... the voting of Independents is congruent with their overall images of competing candidates (187).

Thus, the candidate preference of a voter may be a stronger influence on the image of the candidate than party preference, especially among the growing numbers who defect from their party or vote independent of party affiliation.

It appears then that the role of images and their relationship to party preference is not clear at this time. Research to date is conflicting. It may be impossible to consider the relationship between images and party preference without also considering candidate preference, especially in light of the current trend of voters to be less strongly identified with parties. Images may function differently with party preference in different campaigns. Analysis of the image and its interaction with party preference should be clarified further with more study similar to that provided by both the McGrath and McGrath research and the research of Nimmo and Savage.

**Candidate Preference and Images**

Since the end result and the ultimate goal of any campaign is the election itself, most of the studies concerning image have focused primarily upon the relationship between candidate preference and candidate images. As Tannenbaum, Greenberg and Silverman (1962) put it, "implicit in this approach [to studying elections] is the assumption that the voter's image of the candidates is intimately related to his voting behavior" (271). Perhaps the most comprehensive analysis of
this implicit assumption, conducted by Nimmo and Savage (1976), came to the conclusion that the assumption was a valid one. Using data from the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan as well as data collected during the course of several campaigns, Nimmo and Savage concluded that images were still the most important determinant of voter preference. Of twenty-three image measures used in their study of the 1972 presidential election they found that most of the image measures exhibited direct relationships to the actual vote cast. Further statistical analysis revealed that images were "the most important explanation of the 1972 vote" (204).

While political parties became less reliable predictors of voting behavior, candidate images became more reliable predictors of the vote. Nimmo and Savage (1976) summarized a study comparing candidate and party images in this way:

Kirkpatrick, Lyons, and Fitzgerald attempted to weigh the relative impact of candidate and party images on the vote. Restricting themselves to measuring candidate and party images by relying solely on the standard SRC [Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan] survey question about likes and dislikes of the candidates and parties [1952 - 1972], they note 'a consistent linear decrease over the twenty-year period in the relative influence of total party images on the vote' and a 'uniform linear increase in the role of candidate images' (204).

This conclusion was consistent with other research concerning the decrease in the role of the traditional parties and the increasing numbers of people referring to themselves as independents who "vote for the man, not the party."

Some research has also been conducted concerning the role of images in campaigns other than presidential campaigns. Hinckley, Hofstetter and Kissel (1974) found that the lower the level of the
campaign and the less the voter seemed to know about the candidates, the more the voter tended to base his voting decision on image. They found that in gubernatorial campaigns 69 percent of the variance was explained by candidate image as compared to 59 percent in senatorial contests and 57 percent in presidential elections.

Patterson and McClure (1976) reported that candidate images differed between decided voters and undecided voters. Referring to the effects of television advertising on candidate images, they noted that:

> Even undecided voters are not influenced by advertising image-making. Just like partisans, the candidate images of undecided voters fluctuate with vote choice, not advertising exposure. In 1972, undecided voters' images changed very little and fit no definite pattern until after they had picked their candidate (115).

Although Patterson and McClure drew different conclusions from their study, they tended to support the idea that candidate images were related to candidate preferences as expressed by the voters in their study.

Roberts (1973) in his study of the changes in the images of candidates across time also found that the images perceived by the supporters of one candidate were not the same images that were perceived by the supporters of his opponent. Voters seemed to be able to see the good characteristics of both candidates, but the supporters of a candidate overall gave their candidate higher image ratings than were given to his opponent. Roberts also found that the constant supporters of a candidate tended to have the most favorable attitudes toward that preferred candidate at the first testing. Crystallizers (those who moved from undecided to support a candidate), on the other
hand, were moderate in their feelings the first testing and had a more favorable attitude toward the preferred candidate at the second testing. This further confirmed the findings of the Patterson and McClure study concerning the undecided voter and his tendency to form more definite image patterns once he had selected a candidate as his preference in the election.

Although research tended to support the idea that candidate preference had an effect on the images voters formed of the candidates, the relationship between these two variables was not clearly defined. Studies that reported a relationship between candidate preference and candidate images tended with some exceptions, to be one-shot studies that could not follow changes across time in the relationship. Additionally, only Roberts reported on the candidate images of voters according to whether they changed voting preference during the course of the study. Further research was needed to more clearly define the relationship between candidate preference and the formation of candidate images. This research needed to cover a longer period of time during which the voters were interviewed in depth about their perception of the candidate images at frequent intervals. Finally, it would be important for this research to take into account both trends in voting patterns and trends in the patterns of candidate images that occurred across time.

**Issues and Images**

Most of the earlier research on candidate images tended to separate issues and images. The research usually proceeded to attempt
to discover which had the greatest influence on voting decisions. Some of the more recent studies, however, began to treat images and issues concurrently, viewing issues as a part of the overall image of a candidate.

In order to discover the relationship between perceived image and voter decisions on candidate preference, O'Keefe and Sheinkopf (1974) studied the reliance of the voter on knowledge of the candidate's stand on the issues. They assumed that issues and images were separate variables. These researchers hypothesized that "the majority of voters base their voting decisions on a candidate's image rather than on knowledge about a candidate's stance on specific issues" (404). They found that to a limited extent, the largest group of voters did base their support of a Presidential candidate on "general likeability and trustworthiness". This was the case, however, only in the group of people able to identify only one issue of the campaign. Those identifying two or three issues did not report basing their decisions on image related factors. Thus, those with a limited knowledge of the issues tended to base their voting decisions on image factors rather than issues.

In a study comparing the influence of issues and images on voting decisions, Natchez and Bupp (1968) found that even though voters seemed to be more aware of the issues, candidate images still seemed to have more influence on voting decisions than issues did. Nie, Verba and Petrocik (1976), in their extensive study of the Michigan voting data, noted a shift in basing decisions on party preference to basing decisions on issues. Issues seemed to be growing in
importance, but their relative effect on voting decisions seemed to be secondary to image concerns.

The issue-image dilemma was carried one step further in a study of voting defection conducted by Boyd (1969). He concluded that:

... the impact of a candidate is substantial but of short duration. The impact of issues, while rarely great at any single moment, accumulates over a period of time. Overall, issues may out-weigh candidates in affecting the outcome of elections, for issues have the capacity to alter the greatest single determinant of a vote, party identification (510).

Boyd appeared to be entangled in the party identification influence whereas Nie, et. al. had determined that issues were overcoming party as a dominant influence on the outcome of elections. The effect that time had on the influence of these factors added new dimensions to the dilemma.

More recent studies seemed to confirm the findings of Boyd, at least in so far as issues had long-term effects. Nimmo and Savage (1976) summarized these studies:

... studies of more recent presidential elections indicate that issues are growing more crucial in shaping voting behavior, yet those studies also note that candidate image remains a principal short-term force... Although issues were clearly important in 1968, a key component of the voting decision was thus the voters' images of the candidates' issue stances (correct or incorrect), along with their perceptions of other candidate qualities. And an analysis of the 1972 presidential election also revealed that how warm or cold voters felt toward the candidates... and voters' perceptions of the candidates' issue stands compared with their own positions were major factors in helping people make up their minds (189).

These studies came close to analyzing the relationship between issues and images.

Patterson and McClure (1976) came to somewhat different conclusions. They supported the view that issues were the basis of more
decisions made by voters than images were. They chose an analysis of television and the role of television in presidential elections as the setting for this conclusion. Survey results and extensive interviews led them to the conclusion that voters were too sophisticated to be manipulated by the image techniques used by campaign experts.

In a specific analysis of the effects that television advertising had on the voter, Patterson and McClure concluded that political advertising was not viewed in the same way that product advertising was viewed:

"... television viewers judge product commercials more on how they communicate their message than on what they say about a product. ... People judge presidential ads, on the other hand, primarily on what they say, not how they say it" (110).

Referring to a study conducted by the American Association of Advertising Agencies, Patterson and McClure noted that "46 percent of viewer reactions to product ads related to the information communicated, 74 percent of viewer reactions to presidential commercials shown in 1972 centered on the information contained in the message" (110). Perhaps the campaign was not so much a "selling" of the candidates to the voters as it was a process of making the voters aware of the issue positions of the candidates.

The 1960 presidential debates provided an ideal setting for the study of the interrelationship between images and issues. Lubell (1962) suggested that because many voters were unable to handle the issues of the Kennedy-Nixon debates they turned to a judgment of the candidates based on their images. Perhaps because of the highly technical nature of the issues covered in the first debate, even though
more issues were presented in this initial confrontation, voters tended
to enjoy the later personality clash debates more than the first debate
(Carter, 1962). However, the debates did help to increase the level of
awareness of the issues even if they were not the basis for voting de-
cisions. Carter (1962) noted that respondents in his survey "credited
the debates with helping them to learn about candidates and issues - in
that order - and with increasing their interest and information" (255).

Several conclusions can be drawn from the literature just re-
viewed. First, issues did play a role in voter decisions, but the na-
ture of the role was not clearly nor consistently defined. Second,
images and issues were interrelated, but the nature of their relation-
ship was not clearly established. Finally, the presidential debates
provided an issues forum for the candidates to which the voters reacted
predictably by basing their voting decisions not on the complicated is-
sues of the debates, but upon the personalities and images of the can-
didates that the debates revealed.

As issues become more important as a basis for voting (a con-
clusion not universally accepted by researchers) the relationship be-
tween issues and images in campaigns must be further analyzed. Even if
issues are not the primary basis reported by voters for making deci-
sions in elections, the effect that knowledge of the issues has on the
formation of images (which are then used for making voting decisions)
has not been carefully examined. A systematic examination of the
differences in candidate images reported by groups of voters with dif-
different levels of knowledge of the issues could be helpful in more
fully understanding the total campaign process.
Sources of Information About the Campaign and Images

As television became one of the prime means of campaign advertising the role of images in campaigns came to the attention of voters as well as journalists. Dan Hahn (1970) challenged the idea that television was the cause of the emphasis on images and offered evidence that images have always played a prominent role in American presidential politics. If images were not exclusively within the domain of the electronic media, then political communication researchers needed to study the differences in candidate images among those who relied on electronic media and those who did not.

Much research has been done in the past decade to discover what the primary sources of information and particularly campaign information have become. A 1973 Roper poll indicated that 66 percent of those interviewed became best acquainted with candidates for national office through television. Nimmo (1970, 113) noted that 80 percent of the population surveyed obtained their information about candidates from media sources as opposed to personal sources. One theory widely accepted in the mass media field claimed that people obtained information from the media in a two-step flow process, i.e. opinion leaders learned information directly from the media and then passed that information down personally to the general public. (Lazarfeld, Berelson and Gaudet, 1948). The recent Nimmo findings tended to demonstrate the diminishing importance of opinion leaders in the process of obtaining information about campaigns.

Swanson (1973) reported that 69 percent of the respondents
to a survey indicated that they received more information from the mass media, 8 percent received more information from friends and acquaintances and 18 percent received an equal amount of information from both sources concerning the 1972 presidential election. The same study found that for 53.8 percent of the respondents television provided most of the mass media information while 23 percent indicated newspapers provided most of their information.

Nimmo (1970) cited a similar study conducted by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. The study indicated that between the 1952 and the 1964 presidential elections television has increased in importance as the source of most campaign information from 32 percent in 1952 to 58 percent in 1964. During that same period radio decreased as the most important source of information from 28 percent to 4 percent. Newspapers remained fairly constant with 23 percent of the respondents in 1952 and 25 percent in 1964 relying on them as their primary source of information about the campaign.

Patterson and McClure (1976), in their study of the difference in content between television and newspapers, found that newspapers contained a much greater in-depth analysis of campaign issues. They also found that, correspondingly, those who read newspapers regularly had a much greater increase in issue awareness over the course of the campaign than those who only watched television news. Significantly, however, there was no difference in images of the candidates between the two categories of media users.

The third feature of McGovern's image is that the extent to which voters used the media did not influence their evaluation of him. Those people who relied mainly on television, and those relying mainly on the newspaper,
had nearly identical impressions of McGovern. This was as true for their judgments of his personal qualities as it was for their feelings about his leadership qualities. The medium was not the message. It is that simple (72).

Evidence to the contrary was also reported, however. Blumer and McQuail (1969) noted that both image and issue perceptions, and changes in those perceptions over the campaign, were related to differences in media exposure.

More research is obviously needed in this area to determine the relationship of the medium to the image. O'Keefe described this need for further research in the following way:

Closer inspection of relationships between change in issue and image perceptions, and exposure and attention to broadcast versus print media, needs to be carried out. Are changes in images more associated with television news and commercial exposure than with newspaper content exposure, as many writers have assumed? Such a linkage has yet to be established empirically (1975, 148).

Presidential Debates and Images

The presidential debates of the 1960 election were quickly titled the Great Debates. After they were held, it was assumed by many that they would become part of the institution of American elections. But it was not until the 1976 election that they were to be tried for a second time in modern political history. Uniquely, the 1976 presidential debates were the first debates to see an incumbent President face a challenger on national network prime time television. Even after the 1960 debates, most political analysts declared the event to be so detrimental to any incumbent and so favorable to the challenger as to prohibit such debates from being practical in many elections (see Salant, 1962; Kraus, 1964; Hahn, 1970).
There was little disagreement following the debates as to which candidate benefitted the most from the encounters. Freely (1961) demonstrated the extent of this belief when he quoted from Stanton in the *New York Times Magazine* and the results of a Roper poll: "Elmo Roper reports that six percent of the voters, over four million people, ascribed their final decision to the debates alone. Of these four million, seventy-two percent voted for Kennedy" (26). With the final outcome of the election so close, it is no wonder that many have attributed Kennedy's narrow victory to the debates.

Harding (1960) aptly described the consensus as to which candidate the debates benefitted the most:

The four 'great debates' aided Kennedy. They made him far better known, they broke down the charge of immaturity, they established him as a quick-witted ready speaker. ... The chances are good that many believed Kennedy possessed more of the attractive elements than the serious-looking, heavy-jowled, often scowling Nixon (363).

The President-elect's campaign manager, himself a later aspirant to the same office, also saw the importance of the debates to the Kennedy victory:

Robert Kennedy, Senator Kennedy's campaign manager, asserted after the election that the Kennedy performance in the debates was a major factor in his victory. He also indicated that the President-elect would probably be reluctant to engage in a similar debate four years from now, on the theory that the debates provide an advantage to the lesser-known of the two candidates (Miller, 1960, 356).

Thus, it was generally accepted that Kennedy was the benefactor from the debates. It was also generally assumed that Kennedy benefitted not so much from out-debating Nixon as from the overall image that he projected.
If it was the image-making power of the presidential debates that was so powerful in swaying the minds and votes of the electorate, then it was most important that an understanding of the role of images in the debates be more clearly examined. Tannenbaum, Greenberg and Silverman (1962), in a study of images in the 1960 presidential campaign, used a semantic differential measure to test the changes in images following the debates. One testing occurred before the debates, one after the first debate, with the third testing just before the election. In comparing the images of the two candidates following the first debate, Tannanbaum, et. al. found that Kennedy's image moved more toward the ideal than Nixon's did. The third testing revealed that both Kennedy and Nixon regressed away from the ideal but Nixon moved more in that direction than did Kennedy.

With these changes in images taking place during the campaign and corresponding with the debates, it was important for the political communication researcher to consider the effects that these kinds of campaign messages had on the candidate's image. Basing his analysis of the effect of messages on images on Boulding's theoretical construct, Alexander (1971) outlined these effects:

When messages reach an image, one of four things may happen. First, a message may not alter the image at all. If no change in the image occurs, then it may be said that the message had no meaning for the individual. The second possible effect of a message is for a change to occur in some regular or well-defined way. A regular change in an image will add to the image already held. The third effect of a message upon an image is to clarify a vague image. Here, the boundaries of the image are more clearly defined, but nothing essentially new is added. The fourth effect of messages is a revolutionary change. One does not simply clarify or extend an image, but re-evaluates it totally, and gains a different conceptual frame (172).
In light of this theoretical explanation of the possible outcomes of messages on images, the political communication researcher must now look at the effects of debate messages on images and determine which of the above outlined outcomes is most likely to occur and under what circumstances. Debates have clearly affected candidate images in the past. With the possibility existing of presidential debates determining the outcome of elections, a further study of the relationship between the debates and candidate images seemed appropriate.

Research on the relationships between images and other campaign influences must continue to focus on the voter and his reaction to the candidate's image. Synthesis of this research is necessary to achieve a better understanding of the interaction of the image with voter decisions, predispositions, the voter's perceptions of the other candidates, and ultimately the voter's behavior. Swanson stressed the necessity of focusing on such interactions:

If voting behavior is structured by how citizens perceive and transact with their environment, it seems to follow that an investigation of the bases of those perceptions and judgments may provide important insights into why voters respond to campaign persuasion as they do (1973, 132).

It was such an insight into voter responses to presidential debates that this study attempted to uncover.
Research Questions

It was the goal of this study to examine the images of presidential candidates in the setting of the presidential debates in order to clarify the image concept and to further identify relationships between the images of candidates and other election variables as perceived by the subjects surveyed. This goal was clarified in the development of the following research questions:

1. How do the images of the "ideal" President and the presidential candidates change over time?

2. What is the relationship between changes in the image of one candidate and changes in the image of his opponent?

3. What is the relationship between subjects' party preference and candidate images?

4. What is the relationship between candidate preference and candidate images?

5. What is the relationship between subjects' knowledge of issues in the campaign and candidate images?

6. What is the relationship between the subjects' primary sources of information about the campaign and candidate images?

7. What is the relationship between perceptions of the winners of the presidential debates and candidate images?

The variables that were analyzed included image of the candidates, changes in the image of the candidates, party preference, candidate preference, knowledge of the issues of the campaign, primary sources of information about the campaign, and the perceived winners of the presidential debates.

Although definitions of candidate images were offered earlier in this chapter, an operational definition of image would be helpful. Douglas (1972) suggested that "operationally, the verbal image becomes
the pattern of correlation clusters derived from verbal responses to a set of experimental stimulus symbols" (2). Douglas utilized semantic differential scales in his research. Likewise, Roberts (1973) operationalized image using seven-point semantic differential scales consisting of eighteen bi-polar adjectives. Other researchers that have used the semantic differential as a measure of image include Alexander (1971), Tannenbaum, et al. (1961) and Nimmo and Savage (1976).

The use of the semantic differential seemed justifiable in the present study for several reasons:

1) Anderson (1973) indicated that "images are perceptual phenomena" used as a "means of assigning order and meaning..." (75). As such, the concepts or meanings involved in the image of the candidate could be measured successfully on a bi-polar adjective scale.

2) Kerlinger (1973) indicated that "the semantic differential is a method of observing and measuring the psychological meaning of concepts" (566). The present study attempted to measure the meaning of concepts related to the perception of a candidate in a political campaign.

3) Douglas (1972) noted that "since the image cannot be directly observed, those measurable behaviors must be selected from which the internal set of affairs can best be inferred" (5). Verbal responses to lists of bi-polar adjectives are measurable behaviors. Moreover, "linguistic data seem by far the richest source of such information" (Douglas, 1972, 5).

4) Alexander (1971) cited Kelly as indicating that "man views his constructs (sets of ideas or images) in dichotomies" (173). Alex-
ander reasoned then, that an "individual's reality can be tested if the appropriate dichotomies are available and choice is allowed" (173). The semantic differential uses dichotomies (bi-polar adjectives) to measure semantic meaning.

5) Other research in the communication field shared theoretical constructs with images and also made use of the semantic differential in research studies. Douglas (1972) noted the antecedents of the image studies as "studies of ethos and source credibility, group and social structure, person perception, and the measurement of meaning" (2). Using a similar historical development of the use of the semantic differential, Tannenbaum, et al. (1962) further justified the use of the semantic differential:

Since its development, the semantic differential has been applied to a wide variety of behavioral research problems, particularly in the field of communications, and has proved to be a reliable and sensitive instrument. It is also particularly well suited to the study of political images (273).

Thus, the operational definition of image used in this study was the semantic differential scores obtained by individuals and groups when rating various political candidates.

Changes in the perceived image of the candidates over time was operationalized as the differences in subjects' mean scores on particular semantic differential scale ratings across four measurements in time.

Party preference was operationalized as the response given by the subjects to a question concerning which political party was preferred by the subjects.

Candidate preference was operationalized as the response given
by the subject to a question concerning for whom the subject would vote
if the election were held on the day of the testing.

The subject's knowledge of the issues of the campaign was opera-
tionalized as the subject's response to an open-ended question asking
him to identify the issues of the presidential campaign.

Perceived sources of information about the candidates were oper-
tionalized as the responses given to a question asking the subjects to
rank the sources of information in the order of their importance to the
subject in gaining information about the campaign. Six choices were
provided which included two sources of electronic media, two sources of
print media and two sources of personal information.

The winners of the presidential debates were operationalized as
the subjects' responses to a question asking them, if they watched or
listened to the debates, who they thought won the debates.

With these operational definitions established for the vari-
bles found in the research questions, the next chapter will describe
the methods and procedures employed in this study.
As a pilot to this study, the questionnaire described later in this chapter was tested on randomly selected registered voters. The researcher discovered that surveying these subjects was quite time consuming. When the presidential debates were announced in mid-August the use of a bunched, readily accessible population became important. As a result, it was decided that the use of randomly selected registered voters would be abandoned in order to obtain the results as quickly as possible after each of the debates.

The subjects selected for this study were high school seniors in selected government classes in Kalispell and Whitefish, Montana. Research indicated that high school students tended to represent closely the views and voting behaviors of their families. Chaffee (1975) supported the idea that because families are the main instruments of political socialization, the voting patterns within families share great similarities. Flanigan (1972) indicated that "all available evidence indicates that families and groups of friends are very likely to be politically homogeneous" (57). He quantified this tendency to follow family tradition this way: "Among these new members of the electorate, only 7 percent report that they have switched away from the
party of their fathers to the other party; 68 percent are identified with the same party and 24 percent have switched to or continued an independent status" (26). More recently, Anderson and Avery (1978) confirmed this voting pattern for the 1976 election and indicated that "family membership is highly predictive of an expressed choice of candidate" (361). So the use of seventeen and eighteen-year-olds for this study affected its generalizability very little.

Permission for the use of the high school seniors was granted by the supervising teachers of five government classes at Flathead High School in Kalispell and two government classes at Whitefish High School. The subjects were tested at four time periods, once before the 1976 presidential debates and once after each of the three debates. The total number of subjects for this study was 172 with 148 participating in the first testing, 144 in the second testing, 151 in the third testing and 129 in the final testing. Ninety-two subjects completed all four testings; 46 completed three testings; 22 completed two testings; and 12 completed one testing only.

Description of the Subjects

The subjects used in this study were seniors in American government classes. As a result, it can be assumed that their attention was focussed on the 1976 campaign and the presidential debates as part of their course work. The subjects were fairly typical of the population in the area; 28.5 percent of the subjects classified themselves as conservatives, 42.1 percent as moderates and 29.2 percent as liberals. Similarly, the party identification provided an even distribution with 34.3 percent calling themselves Democrats, 34.3 percent
Independents and 31.3 percent Republicans.

When asked to identify political affiliations of their parents, the subjects could not respond in as many cases. In identifying the party of their fathers, the subjects said that 40 percent were Democrats, 20 percent Independents and 40 percent Republicans. Fewer responded by listing the party of their mothers as responded to the question about their fathers' party identifications. Of those that responded, 46.8 percent called their mothers Democrats, 17 percent Independents and 36.2 percent Republicans. When asked to indicate the amount of education that each of their parents had obtained, 123 responded about their fathers and only 93 about their mothers. Of those responding, 17.1 percent of the fathers and 9.7 percent of the mothers had between zero and eight years of formal education; 39 percent of the fathers and 6.5 percent of the mothers received nine to eleven years of education; 18.7 percent of the fathers and 57 percent of the mothers had graduated from high school; 4.9 percent of the fathers and 6.5 percent of the mothers had some college education; 5.7 percent of the fathers and 6.5 percent of the mothers had a college degree; 6.5 percent of the fathers and 5.4 percent of the mothers had a graduate degree; and 8.1 percent of the responses concerning the father and 8.6 percent of the responses concerning the mother said that they did not know the amount of education they had received.

When asked to list their preferences for the presidential candidates at each of the four testings, fewer responded at the final testing than at any of the previous testings. Ford received 27.7 percent of the vote at the first testing, 35 percent at the second
testing, 31 percent at the third testing, and 50 percent at the final
testing. Carter received 38 percent of the vote at the first testing,
35.8 percent at the second testing, 34.5 percent at the third testing,
and 27.1 percent at the final testing. The undecided vote fluctuated
from 34.7 percent at the first testing to 29.3 percent at the second
testing, to 34.5 percent at the third testing, to 22.9 percent at the
final testing.

Ninety-four subjects reported that they had watched the first
debate. This figure dropped to 50 for the second debate and to 11 at
the final debate. Those reporting that they did not watch the debate
the first time numbered 49, the second time 14 and the final time 39.
Clearly, many subjects simply did not respond to this question.

In deciding who won the debates, again fewer subjects participated
in answering the question at the final testing. Of those responding,
31.3 percent said they thought Ford won the first debate; 17.6 percent
thought Carter won; and 50.9 percent were unsure about the
winner. After the second debate 16.7 percent thought Ford won; 27.8
percent thought Carter won; and 55.6 percent were unsure. After the
final debate 20 percent thought Ford had won; 15 percent felt Carter
had won; and 65 percent were unsure.

Subjects were also asked to list the issues they thought were
important in the presidential election. At the first testing 28 sub-
jects listed no issues; 18 listed one issue; and 127 listed two or
more issues. At the second testing 51 could list no issues; 17 listed
one issue; and 105 listed two or more issues. At the third testing 52
listed zero issues; 21 listed one issue; and 100 listed two or more
issues. For the final testing 139 listed zero issues; five listed one issue; and 29 listed two or more issues.

Although the subjects of this study seemed to display testing fatigue at the final testing, they were in most ways representative of the voting population they replaced.

Description of the Population

The subjects came from a population reflecting two widely contrasting political climates. In recent elections, Kalispell has tended to vote Republican although that base has begun to erode. Traditionally the local elected officials have been Republican and the representation in the legislature has also been predominantly Republican. In 1974, the first election following the Watergate hearings, only two Republicans were elected at either level in Flathead County, both of those being elected to the Montana State Senate. Since that time there has been a gradual reestablishment of the Republican office holders for the county, with Kalispell providing the bulk of the Republican votes.

Whitefish on the other hand has tended to vote Democratic with a strong union element within the voting population. The rest of the northern part of Flathead County (Columbia Falls, Coram, Hungry Horse, etc.) voted predominantly Democratic, too, and along with Whitefish tended to counterbalance the Republican voting Kalispell.

Thus, the county as a whole has remained a swing county in Montana politics, more often than not playing a key role in determining the outcome of Western Montana Congressional District elections. In presidential elections, however, the county has remained dominated by the Republicans. A review of the last several presidential
elections revealed this pattern. In 1952 the Republican candidate carried the county with 59.09 percent of the votes cast. In 1956 the Republican percent fell to 57.4. The close election of 1960 saw Flathead County voting 52.95 percent Republican. In 1964, a landslide year nationally for the Democratic candidate, Flathead County followed the Democratic trend with a 44.02 percentage vote for the Republican. The closer election of 1968 provided another opportunity for the county to vote Republican with 51.54 percent of the vote. Another landslide year, 1972, but this time for the Republican, showed Flathead County following suit with 60.72 percent of the vote going Republican (Waldron and Wilson, 1978). So in presidential races, the county remained quite loyal to the Republican nominees.

Flathead County had a total population in 1973 of 41,853, up 6.1 percent from 1970; Whitefish had a population of 3,472 in 1973, up 3.7 percent from 1970; and Kalispell had a total population of 10,892, up 3.5 percent from 1970 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1975). The population continued to increase from 1973 to the present, with most of the increases coming in the outlying areas.

The predominant type of employment in Flathead County was manufacturing with lumber and wood products comprising the largest category of manufacturing. Retail trade formed the second largest type of employment, followed by services (U.S. Census Bureau, 1970). The county as a whole was considered a tourist area with many of the services catering to both winter and summer recreationalists.

In Flathead County there were 25,803 registered voters eligible to cast ballots in the 1976 general election. Of these, 19,543
(75.74 percent) actually voted, a figure quite a bit higher than the national average. Carter received 42.73 percent of the vote and Ford received 57.27 percent of the vote when the third party votes were discounted (Official election returns filed with the Office of the Secretary of State, Helena, Montana). When calculating the vote of only the areas in Flathead County that would be included as respondents in this study, it was found that Carter received 41.70 percent of the vote and Ford received 58.30 percent of the vote. (It should be noted that these percentages included only those voters selecting either Ford or Carter and eliminated all alternate choices and non-voters.)

Materials

The research instrument used in this study was a questionnaire (see Appendix A). Included as part of the questionnaire were the following:

Image Scales

Three sets of semantic differential scales were used in each of the four testings. One set of scales was used to measure the image of each of the following presidential candidates: "Ideal President", Carter and Ford.* Twenty bi-polar adjectives describing political candidates were obtained from two previous studies of image characteristics (Douglas, 1972 and Roberts, 1973). (Scales and sources of scales are identified more specifically in Appendix B.) These

*Information similar to the information about the presidential election was also gathered for the 1976 Montana gubernatorial election but is not part of the study reported here.
adjective scales represented the most defined factors that appeared in the Douglas and Roberts studies. Included in these factors were scales to measure achievement, trustworthiness, dynamism, political philosophy, experience and effectiveness. A seven point scale was placed between the adjectives and a scale interpretation was placed at the top of each semantic differential. The interpretation showed each of the seven blank scales with a word underneath describing the level of agreement with the adjectives (extremely, quite, slightly, neutral, slightly, quite, extremely). Using a table of random numbers, the scales were randomly assigned to one of four different orders. These orders were labeled Forms A, B, C and D and were used randomly for each of the candidates in each of the four testings. Bi-polar adjectives on each of the forms were also randomized to differing ends of the scale so that the favorable adjectives and the unfavorable adjectives were mixed on both ends of the scales.

Candidate Preference and Level of Commitment

Each of the questionnaires asked the subject to indicate for which candidate he would vote if the election were held at that time. The subject was allowed to circle either of the major parties' nominees for president and governor, "undecided", or "other" with a blank space in which to write the name of the alternate candidate. Following this was a question asking what level of commitment the subject felt toward the preferred candidate. The subject was allowed to circle one of three responses: "strongly committed", "quite committed" or "slightly committed".
Identification of Campaign Issues

During each testing the subjects were asked to identify the issues (if any) that were the major issues of the presidential campaign. The question was open-ended, with three and one-half to five inches of space provided for response.

Presidential Debate Questions

Each of the last three testings included a question asking the subjects if they had seen or listened to the presidential debate of the specified date. The subjects were allowed to circle "yes" or "no". If the debate had been witnessed, the subjects were instructed to indicate who they thought won the debate. Again the subjects were asked to circle Ford, Carter or Undecided. The subjects were also asked why they answered the previous question as they did.

Ranking of Image Factors

The first testing questionnaire contained a listing of six factors that were reported in the Douglas and Roberts studies. These factors (achievement, trustworthiness, dynamism, political philosophy, experience, effectiveness) were randomly ordered. Subjects were asked to rank the factors in the perceived order of importance in making voting decisions.

Ranking of Sources of Campaign Information

On the first testing questionnaire the subjects were asked to rank a randomly ordered list of sources of information in the order in which they were relied upon for information about the candidates for president. The list included two personal sources of information
(parents and school), two sources of print media (newspapers and magazines) and two sources of electronic media (radio and television).

**Conservative-Liberal Classifications**

On the first test questionnaire the subjects were asked to indicate how they would classify themselves on a conservative-liberal continuum (extremely conservative, quite conservative, slightly conservative, moderate, slightly liberal, quite liberal, extremely liberal). The subjects were also asked to classify their mothers and fathers on similar, separate continuums.

**Party Preference and Level of Commitment**

On the first test questionnaire the subjects were asked to indicate their party preference and commitment to that party (strong Democrat, moderate Democrat, weak Democrat, Independent, weak Republican, moderate Republican, strong Republican, other [specify], and don't know.) The subjects were also asked to classify both parents on similar but separate scales.

**Demographic Questions**

The first questionnaire contained certain demographic questions that all subjects were asked to complete. These questions included: age, year in school, male/female, intention to attend college, presently registered voter, intention to register when eligible and why, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's formal schooling and mother's formal schooling.
Procedures

Questionnaire Administration

After permission was secured to enter the classrooms to administer the tests, the subjects were contacted immediately prior to the administration of the first testing questionnaire. After providing some background information about the test administrator, the subjects were told that the purpose of this study was to find out some of the attitudes and feelings of those just about to enter the voting population. Subjects were informed that the information they would be providing would add much information to the field, as not much research had been done with this age group. The subjects were assured that the responses they gave would be kept confidential and would be used for statistical purposes only. Names were required in order to match questionnaires completed at a later date. The test administrator then distributed the questionnaire to the subjects and worked the cover example of a semantic differential scale with the subjects, using the blackboard for illustration. (The example dealt with the concept "weather" and provided a "good-bad" bi-polar scale similar to that used in the questionnaire.) At each of the subsequent testings no instructions were given to the group as a whole, but individual explanations were given to those not in attendance previously.

The tests were administered to the same groups of subjects four different times. The first administration took place prior to the first of the presidential debates on September 20 in Flathead High School and September 21 in Whitefish High School. The second administration followed the first presidential debate of September 23, taking
place on September 24 in Flathead High School and on September 28 in Whitefish. The third administration followed the second presidential debate of Wednesday October 6, being conducted in Flathead High School on October 7 and in Whitefish High School on October 8. The final administration followed the last presidential debate of Friday October 22 and took place at both Flathead and Whitefish High Schools on October 25.

After the final administration of the questionnaire, a debriefing was given to the subjects explaining in more detail the purpose of the study. Some tabulated information, concerning who the subjects felt won the debates and who they preferred as the next President was revealed during the debriefing at the request of the instructors of the classes.

Following the collection of data in the method described above, the data were submitted to a series of analyses. The statistical procedures used in this study will be described as appropriate prior to the presentation of related results in the chapter which follows.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

The results of a series of analyses to which the data were submitted is presented in this chapter. The reporting of results follows a similar organization as that presented in the review of literature and the research questions sections of the first chapter. Initially, however, it seemed appropriate to consider the results of the factor analyses of the images of the "ideal" President, Carter and Ford.

Image Factors

In order to determine the underlying factors of the image concept, the semantic differential scale data were submitted to factor analysis. Principal factoring using oblique rotation extracted the number of factors present in the data. Separate analyses were conducted for each of the candidates at each of the four testings.

The initial factor analysis yielded different factors for the various candidates as well as different factors across time for a single candidate. For example, six factors emerged for the "ideal" President for the first and second testings, whereas only four factors emerged for the third testing and five for the final testing. Ford appeared to have five factors for both the first and second testings, but only four for the final two testings. Carter surfaced as the least
complex of the candidates with four factors the first and third test-
ings and three factors the second and fourth testings. The results of
this initial factor analysis are presented in Appendix C with only the
items having high factor loadings reported.

Due to the poorly defined nature of several of the factors, the
data were submitted to further factor analyses. The factor analyses
proceeded until the matrix was reduced to a number of factors which
were considered to be a "good" fit by the researcher. The number of
factors was reduced until each of the factors had at least one item
with a loading that met the .50/.30 criterion (i.e. primary loadings of
at least .50 and no secondary loadings of more than .30). It should be
noted here that in two cases -- Ford Time 4 and Carter Time 3 -- the
factor solution was not satisfactory even when reduced to two factors.

Once again, the number of factors that emerged differed across
time and candidates. The "ideal" President offered four factors for
the first two testings and two factors for the last two testings. Sim-
ilarly, Ford offered four factors the first testing and only two or one
factors the remaining three testings. Carter, on the other hand,
yielded two or one factors the initial three testings and three factors
on the final testing. Appendix D reports the results of this final
factor analysis with only the items with high factor loadings indicated.

Even though the factor analyses did not produce "clean" and
easily interpretable results, nevertheless, several interesting pat-
terns occurred. Subjects appeared to start the testing period with
complex dimensions on judging images of the "ideal" and Ford as Presi-
dent. As the testings proceeded following each of the debates,
the subjects used less complex dimensions of judgment of the image of both the "ideal" President and Ford. Not only did the number of factors decrease, the factors that did emerge contained large numbers of items. Carter's image, however, increased in complexity as the debates ended. It must be realized, though, that the second and third factors for Carter contained one loading each, whereas the first factor contained thirteen of the items.

Even when the number of factors did not change appreciably for a candidate, the factors did not contain the same items each time for any given candidate. A good example was found in the image of Carter across the four testings. Although factor 1 had between eight and fourteen items throughout the course of this study, only five of those items appeared in that factor each of the four times. Those items included "straightforward", "trustworthy", "real", "reliable" and "effective".

A similar example was found in Ford's image factors. Factor 1 in this case contained between five and fifteen items during the study. Only four items appeared on all four of the testings. Those items were "trustworthy", "real", "reliable" and "sincere". Thus, the factors that appeared most consistently for both Ford and Carter clearly could be related. However, the items that contributed to that factor were not consistent between the two candidates or among the testing periods.

The "ideal" President showed even greater variations in the first factor than did Ford and Carter. The final two testings produced the same items in factor 1 as did the first testing even though the last two testings added a number of other items to the factor. The second testing, however, contained none of the three factors common to
the other testings. "Admired", "straightforward" and "ambitious" appeared on factor 1 during the second, third and fourth testings. Again, similarities across time could be observed on factor 1 for the "ideal", but the consistency was once more missing.

It should be noted that the results of the factor analysis were such that even though the factors measured similar meaning when applied to the candidate, the difficulty in interpreting that similarity seemed insurmountable. When Appendices C & D are studied, description of the major factors is difficult. When a single factor has so many items defining it, the difficulty in understanding the underlying concept in common is expected. Therefore, to conclude that even when factors did emerge the resulting factors were relatively meaningless would seem warranted.

It should also be noted that in many instances the loadings of a number of items were quite low. Levels in the .50's were common, indicating that the relationship between the items was not very high.

The lack of meaning in the factor analysis results was not totally unexpected. Roberts (1973) noted differing numbers of factors in an Iowa Congressional election between the two candidates. He also noted that the items that loaded on a factor for one candidate did not necessarily load high for his opponent on the same factor. The association that existed between items did not always exist for both of the candidates studied. This study confirmed the suggestion that Roberts made for the age item in the 1972 congressional race and extended that suggestion to a number of items in the 1976 presidential election.

A further examination of the kinds of changes that occurred in
the images of the presidential candidates will rely on the results of
the factor analyses to more firmly establish the idea that images were
not stable concepts.

Changes in Images

Mean Image Scores

The mean image scores were calculated for the "ideal" President,
Ford and Carter for each of the four testings. Means were compared
across time and the patterns that emerged were then compared among the
candidates. (Appendix G offers the reader the opportunity to compare
the mean scores graphically.)

The image of the "ideal" President demonstrated movement across
time. Appendix G, chart 1 indicates that when all the subjects were
considered together, there was a shift in the mean image scores for the
"ideal" over the times measured. Although the image of the "ideal"
was more stable than that of the two candidates (as would be expected),
movement in scale means were readily apparent. Moreover, the changes
detected in the scale means formed a directional pattern for four of
the items. Over the four testing periods the items "trustworthy" and
"bright" moved each time further away from the positive end of the
scale. At the same time "sophisticated" and "persuasive" moved closer
to the positive extreme each testing. As it became less important
that the "ideal" President be trustworthy and bright, it became more
important that he be sophisticated and persuasive. For the other
items used to measure the image of the "ideal" similar movement existed,
but it was not consistently in one direction over the four testings.
Carter's image scales showed greater movement than the "ideal" image, but most of the items moved both positively and negatively with no consistent trend across time periods. Two items did show consistent movement. Carter was perceived as becoming more liberal and more sophisticated as the campaign progressed.

The changes in the image of Ford were the most dramatic both in terms of the magnitude and the consistent direction of the changes (as Appendix E, chart 3 indicates). Fully half of the items indicated movement across the four time periods toward the positive end of the scale. Ford became more admired, straightforward, real, reliable, sincere, liberal, experienced, interesting, effective and persuasive. The remainder of the items displayed little consistency but instead fluctuated toward both the positive and the negative ends of the scale at different times.

Although the changes in the mean image scores of the entire group of subjects were not dramatic, an examination of the changes in image scores among party members yielded equally interesting results. The Ford images tended to move in a positive direction more consistently than either the "ideal" or Carter images among Democrats and Independents only. Interestingly, the Republican ratings of Ford fluctuated both positively and negatively at different times and showed no consistent direction of movement. The Democrats, on the other hand, saw Ford as becoming more real, more reliable, younger, more experienced, more interesting and more effective at each successive testing. Similarly, the Independents found Ford to be more admirable, more real, more reliable, more interesting, more effective and more persuasive
each time.

As for Carter, the Democrats perceived him as increasingly more sophisticated and effective even though they also saw him as less sincere each successive testing. For the Independents Carter became less and less interesting as the campaign neared an end. The Republican views of Carter that were consistent in movement were also consistently negative in the direction of the change. Carter became less sincere, less ambitious and less interesting at each of the testings.

Just as the Democrats perceived Carter as more sophisticated throughout the campaign, they also pictured the "ideal" president as moving consistently in the direction of being more sophisticated. Likewise, the Independents envisioned the "ideal" as becoming more sophisticated but less real and reliable than they had earlier. So for the Independents as Ford became more real and reliable the "ideal" president moved in an opposite direction to approach the image of Ford on those items. Only one item in the image of the "ideal" president changed in a consistent direction for the Republicans. As time passed they perceived the "ideal" as more and more conservative.

It was clear from this examination of the images of the "ideal" president and the two presidential candidates that the images were not stable concepts. Not only were the images of the candidates changing, perhaps as a result of the debates or other campaign events, the images held by the subjects of the "ideal" president were also changing. With this in mind, the data were subjected to further analyses in which the components of the candidates' images were examined by factor analysis.
Changing Factors of Candidate Images

As was described previously, the semantic differential data were subjected to principal factoring with oblique rotations. The results that were obtained offered further support for the idea that images were not stable. It should be remembered that the number of factors was reduced until each factor contained at least one item with a loading that met previously established criteria.

Even when the number of factors was reduced, the number of factors found to be present for each of the candidates and each of the testings varied considerably. The concept "image" was apparently not given meaning by the same items each time. Thus, comparisons among candidates or across time periods became quite difficult.

An example of the great variability of the factors that compose the image of a candidate was found in the "ideal" president. The first and second testings produced four factors. However, the factors were not composed of the same items in each case. Figure 1 demonstrates the differences among the factors for Time 1 and Time 2. It should be noted that in no case were the factors similar in composition and in some cases items that appeared with one factor at Time 1 were in different factors at Time 2.

The factors that emerged for Time 3 and Time 4 bore greater resemblance to each other than did the factors for Time 1 and Time 2. Interestingly, only two factors emerged during both Time 3 and Time 4. Eight of the items were shared in common on the first factor and two of the three items on the second factor were shared. Figure 2 shows the relationship between the factors that emerged on Time 3 and Time 4.
### FACTORS IN THE IMAGE OF THE "IDEAL" PRESIDENT AT TIME 1 AND TIME 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

### FACTORS IN THE IMAGE OF THE "IDEAL" PRESIDENT AT TIME 3 AND TIME 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**
Even though the factors that emerged on Time 3 and Time 4 were similar in composition, there was little similarity between the factor structure of either Time 1 or Time 2 and the factor structure of the last two testings. Because of the lack of stability in the concept of the "ideal" President that was found through the factor analysis, the use of the "ideal" candidate as a point from which measurement of the actual candidates' images could be made was not deemed to be very useful. Hence, most of the remaining analyses did not consider the role of the "ideal" candidate's image.

In addition, it seemed clear from the factor analyses of the two candidates' images that the factors were not consistent in either number or composition. Although some similarities existed, the diversified nature of the image factors further supported the theory that images are situational, periodic and idiosyncratic. Therefore, for most of the remaining analyses the factor structure was not a useful means of comparing candidate images and their relationships to other campaign variables. Because of the difficulty in using the results of the factor analyses to collapse the data into meaningful, similar concept patterns for both candidates and the "ideal", most of the remainder of the analyses in this study relied upon comparisons of scale items instead of concept factors.

One question remained concerning the changes that occurred in the images of the candidates. That question concerned the relationship between the changes in the image of one candidate and the changes in the image of his opponent.
Perceptual Stability and Changes in Candidate Images

In order to answer the research question that sought to find out the relationship between the changes in the image of one candidate and the changes in the image of his opponent, changes in the image scores of the subjects were submitted to further analysis. It should be recalled that the perceptual stability hypothesis maintains that "if change in the perception of one candidate should occur, similar changes should occur with the other" (Anderson and Avery, 1978, 355). To test the data to determine if the perceptual stability hypothesis held true for this set of subjects a chi square test was used as a means of determining the relationship between changes in the image scores of one candidate and changes in the image scores of his opponent. Using individual image scores on each adjective item, the score for Ford at Time 1 was subtracted from the score for Ford at Time 4 for each subject. The figure that resulted indicated whether the image became more positive, more negative or stayed the same on that particular item. The same procedure was followed for the Carter image scores. Comparisons were then made between the individuals' scores for Ford and Carter. The subjects were thus divided into nine groups such as those represented in Table 1. The numbers in each square identified the number of subjects who fit into that specific category. This 3 x 3 matrix was then used for the chi square analysis.

Table 2 shows the results of the chi square analysis. With four degrees of freedom chi square was significant at the .05 level with a score of 9.49 or greater. Only four items proved significant according to the criteria. The items "young", "ambitious", "competent"
### TABLE 1

**COMPARISONS OF CHANGES IN IMAGE SCORES TIME 1 - TIME 4**

FOR FORD AND CARTER ON THE ITEM "AMBITIOUS"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambitious T1 - T4</th>
<th>Carter Increase in Score</th>
<th>Carter Decrease in Score</th>
<th>Carter No change in Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGES IN IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER ON ALL IMAGE SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>$C$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.328</td>
<td>.1501</td>
<td>.00033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>1.3784</td>
<td>.1153</td>
<td>.00498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.2567</td>
<td>.1742</td>
<td>.00026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>11.3210*</td>
<td>.1035</td>
<td>.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.8047</td>
<td>.1878</td>
<td>.00365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.9326</td>
<td>.2108</td>
<td>.00069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>4.3282</td>
<td>.2017</td>
<td>-.02719*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>4.0985</td>
<td>.1895</td>
<td>.02048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>9.8735*</td>
<td>.3083</td>
<td>.04711*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.3954</td>
<td>.1473</td>
<td>.02017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>5.3628</td>
<td>.2277</td>
<td>.01334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>7.2146</td>
<td>.2535</td>
<td>.01418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>1.8190</td>
<td>.1336</td>
<td>.00244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td>4.1800</td>
<td>.1905</td>
<td>.00779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>4.0322</td>
<td>.2038</td>
<td>.02814*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>13.5556*</td>
<td>.3485</td>
<td>.07250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>10.9954*</td>
<td>.3119</td>
<td>.00086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>4.4098</td>
<td>.2065</td>
<td>.00051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.2280</td>
<td>.1428</td>
<td>.01652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.8666</td>
<td>.0420</td>
<td>.00135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items showing levels of significance .05
and "bright" demonstrated that a dependence existed between the Ford and Carter image changes. The remainder of the items did not show a significant relationship existing between the changes of the two candidates.

The type of relationship between the changes was not revealed by the chi square analysis. It was possible that the relationship that existed could be explained by the perceptual stability hypothesis; however, the chi square analysis did not prove that this sort of inverse relationship between the direction of changes in candidate image scores did exist. In fact, a closer examination of the information provided in Table 1 suggested that perhaps the relationship was predictive only in that an increase in the image score of one candidate would indicate a similar increase in the image score of his opponent. Tables 3, 4 and 5 are provided to allow the reader the opportunity to more closely examine the other three items that proved significant in the chi square tests. It was obvious that a more sensitive test of correlation was needed to determine the type of relationship that existed between the changes in image scores.

**TABLE 3**

**COMPARISONS OF CHANGES IN IMAGE SCORES TIME 1 - TIME 4**

**FOR FORD AND CARTER ON THE ITEM "YOUNG"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young T&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; - T&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Carter Decrease in Score</th>
<th>Ford Increase in Score</th>
<th>Decrease in Score</th>
<th>No change in Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease in Score</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in Score</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change in Score</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**Comparisons of Changes in Image Scores Time 1 - Time 4**  
For Ford and Carter on the Item "Competent"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Increase in Score</th>
<th>Decrease in Score</th>
<th>No change in Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 - T4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

**Comparisons of Changes in Image Scores Time 1 - Time 4**  
For Ford and Carter on the Item "Bright"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bright</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Increase in Score</th>
<th>Decrease in Score</th>
<th>No change in Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 - T4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation of Changes in Image Scores**

Because it was clear that the chi square tests did not fully describe the relationship between the changes in images scores of the two candidates, the data were submitted to a further test of correla-
tion. A scattergram was produced to graphically demonstrate the relationships that existed between the changes in image scores of the two candidates. The changes for each subject between Time 1 and Time 4 for Carter and Ford were determined and the $r^2$ value for the group as a whole was evaluated with significance defined at the .05 level. If the perceptual stability hypothesis was true for this group of subjects, a negative correlation between the changes in image scores of the candidates should be revealed by this test of correlation. The $r^2$ values were presented in Figure 4 along with the $x^2$ values.

Interestingly, the tests of correlation and the chi square tests did not provide similar results in all cases. Although "ambitious" and "competent" were significant by both analyses, two new items appeared as significant in the test of correlation. Both "persuasive" and "sophisticated" demonstrated that a relationship existed between the changes in one candidate's score on that item and the changes in the score of his opponent. Because the test of correlation considered both the direction of a change and the magnitude of the change, it was not surprising that the same items as appeared on the chi square test did not appear here in all cases.

Both the test of correlation and the chi square test indicated that the assumed relationship between the changes in the image of one candidate and the changes in the image of his opponent was not present in this study. Although some relationship did exist for four items on the chi square test and four items on the test of correlation, the relationship was not a strong one for those sets of items. Furthermore, the relationship that did exist for those items was often the opposite
of what had been predicted. Instead of having a relationship in which a positive change for one candidate would be mirrored by a negative change for his opponent, the relationship that appeared was just the opposite for the items "competent", "sophisticated", and "ambitious". In other words, the only item that displayed the predicted relationship was "persuasive". The other three items moved in similar directions for both candidates, thus creating a positive correlation instead of the predicted negative correlation. The conclusion to be drawn from this study was that not only were images different for the different candidates, the changes that did occur in the image of one candidate over time occurred independent of the image of the opposition candidate.

Party Preference and Images

In order to examine the relationship between expressed party preference and the image of the "ideal" president, the mean scores of the twenty adjective items from the semantic differential scales were tabulated separately for raters who classified themselves as Democrats, Republicans and Independents. This analysis included forty-three Democrats, forty-one Republicans and fifty-three Independents. Each of the four testings was treated separately. Comparisons were made between the "ideal" president image scores given by raters of the three party classifications. (See Appendix F, Charts 1, 2, 3 and 4.)

The mean image scores of the "ideal" president did not differ appreciably among the party identifiers. Only one item displayed any perceptible difference in the scoring among the Democrats, Republicans
and Independents. On the image scale "liberal-conservative" a difference could be detected among the various party identifiers. At Time 1 the "ideal" president for the Republicans averaged a 4.61 score on a scale of one to seven. Thus the Republicans saw the "ideal" president as "slightly" conservative. The Democrats, as might be expected, viewed the "ideal" president as "slightly" liberal with an average score of 3.70. The Independents approached a neutral or moderate score with a 4.06 average.

The "liberal-conservative" item continued to be a distinguishing item among the party identifiers at all testing periods. At the second testing the Republicans moved to a 4.68 average score, a movement in the direction of seeing a slightly more conservative "ideal" president. The Independents moved to a more definite conservative score of 4.34 while the Democrats, too, shifted into the "slightly" conservative column with an average score of 4.13. The shift towards viewing the "ideal" president as increasingly more conservative continued at the third testing for the Republicans only. They averaged 4.71 at the third testing. At the same time the Independents and the Democrats moved toward the liberal end of the spectrum. The Independents averaged 4.15 and the Democrats shifted to 3.68. The trends continued for the Republicans, Democrats and Independents alike for the final testing. The Republicans continued to view the "ideal" president as progressively more conservative scoring an average of 4.75 on the philosophy item. The Democrats and Independents continued to move toward the liberal end, the Democrats scoring an average of 3.50. The Independents approached the moderate midpoint they had previously occupied with an
average of 4.05.

Political philosophy then was a distinguishing characteristic of the "ideal" president for the various party identifiers. As might be expected, the Republicans desired a "slightly" conservative president, the Democrats preferred a "slightly" liberal president and the Independents wanted the President to be between the traditional parties' choices on the philosophy spectrum. It should be noted, however, that each of the three party means hovered in the moderate range, confirming the belief that a candidate for President must be moderate in philosophy in order to be elected.

An observation about the pattern of movement for the "ideal" president among the partisans at the various testings was helpful in establishing the relationship between party preference and candidate images. Generally speaking, the patterns of movement in the "ideal" scores marked the direction of movement in image scores of that party's candidate for the Democrats only. With the Democrats, the image movement of the "ideal" president across time more approximated the image movement of Carter than that of Ford on most items. Although the Independents generally scored Ford higher at the last testing than at previous times and Carter lower at the final testing than previously, there did not appear to be any relationship between the image movement of the candidates and that of the "ideal" president. Even less pattern emerged for the Republicans. The image movement for the "ideal" president shared similarities with the image movement of both Ford and Carter. Thus, the study did not provide evidence that indicated strong commonalities between the movement of the "ideal" president image
scores and the movement of the image scores for either candidate among partisans. The researcher therefore turned to a study of the candidate images as they related to party preference.

Party Preference and Candidate Images

To more closely examine the relationship between party preference and the image scores of the presidential candidates, the mean scores of Carter and Ford were compared across time according to party groups. The means of the twenty image items were tabulated according to party preference. This analysis included the same number of Republicans, Democrats and Independents as reported earlier. The mean scores were graphed for each of the time periods to facilitate examination and are presented in Appendix G as Charts 1-8.

Not surprisingly, the Independents remained between the Democrats and the Republicans in judging both Ford and Carter on most of the image scales. In rating Carter the Democrats' ratings were between the ratings of the Republicans and Independents 7.5 percent of the time; the Republicans' ratings were between the ratings of the Democrats and Independents 27.5 percent of the time; and the Independents' ratings were between the ratings of the two parties for Carter the remaining 65 percent of the time. The judgments of Ford displayed even more partisanship. In rating Ford the Republicans' ratings were between the ratings of the Democrats and Independents only 1.25 percent of the time; the Democrats' ratings of Ford were between the ratings of the Republicans and Independents 18.75 percent of the time; and the Independents' ratings were between the ratings of the major parties for Ford 80 percent of the time.
As would be expected, it was found that raters belonging to the party of a presidential candidate tended to view him most positively. Likewise, the raters belonging to the party in opposition to a presidential candidate generally viewed him most negatively. The Independents a large portion of the time took the middle position on the image scales between the two parties. Although this analysis revealed that Independents tended to maintain a middle ground in their image ratings of the two presidential candidates, the changes in image scores as they related to partisanship had still not been considered.

Party Preference and Image Changes

Examination of the relationship between party preference and the changes in the image scores across time utilized the "ideal" president image scores as reported by the partisans. The means of the twenty image items were tabulated according to the party preference of the subjects. The same numbers of subjects in each category of partisanship were used as reported earlier. Changes in the mean image scores were noted as moving away from or toward the "ideal" president image means for that party at the same testing time. The percentage of image scales that moved away from the "ideal" president were calculated for four different intervals. Changes were recorded between Time 1 and Time 2, Time 2 and Time 3, Time 3 and Time 4, and overall between Time 1 and Time 4.

Tables 6 and 7 report the results of this analysis. The chi square analysis of the number of items that moved away from the "ideal" for Carter revealed that a significant relationship did not exist between party preference and change. The chi square value was 7.145 with
TABLE 6
PERCENT OF IMAGE ITEMS MOVING AWAY FROM THE "IDEAL"
FOR CARTER BY PARTY PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Preference</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>$T_1 - T_2$</th>
<th>$T_2 - T_3$</th>
<th>$T_3 - T_4$</th>
<th>$T_1 - T_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

six degrees of freedom and significance only at the .50 level. The contingency coefficient was .2203, clearly indicating the lack of a significant relationship between these variables. The chi square analysis for Ford when relating party preference and change in image scores was 8.978 with six degrees of freedom and a level of significance of .20. The contingency coefficient for this analysis was .3507.

TABLE 7
PERCENT OF IMAGE ITEMS MOVING AWAY FROM THE "IDEAL"
FOR FORD BY PARTY PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Preference</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>$T_1 - T_2$</th>
<th>$T_2 - T_3$</th>
<th>$T_3 - T_4$</th>
<th>$T_1 - T_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, half of the cells for this chi square analysis had expected frequencies of less than five, thereby invalidating the results. Siegel (1956) noted that the chi square test could be used "if fewer than 20 percent of the cells have an expected frequency of less than 5 and if no cell has an expected frequency of less than 1" (110). He further warned that "when they [expected frequencies] are smaller than minimal, the test may not be properly or meaningfully used" (110). Hence the relationship between party preference and image changes had to be examined by different means.

Tabulations showed that the Independents, instead of maintaining an unbiased middle role, tended to play the role of the "loyal opposition" to both Ford and Carter. The Independents' image changes when rating Ford moved closer to the "ideal" on most of the image items each time. However, the Independents' image shifts away from the "ideal" in rating Ford very closely resembled the Democrat image shifts away from the "ideal" in rating Ford. Generally, the Independent image shifts in rating Ford were not quite as harsh as the Democrats' ratings of Ford, but were more similar to the Democrat shifts than to the Republican shifts. The exception followed the second debate when the Independents' image ratings of Ford shifted further from the "ideal" than the Democrats' did.

The Independents seemed to play the role of the "loyal opposition" when rating Carter, too, but only on the first and second measurements. The third interval found the Independents' Carter image shifts moving away from the "ideal" at the same rate as the Republicans. The overall changes ($T_1 - T_4$) found the Independents equidistant between
the Republicans and the Democrats in terms of Carter image score shifts.

Generally speaking, the Independent subjects saw the image of the candidates shift away from the "ideal" president at a more moderate rate than the opposition party, but not quite as moderately as the candidates' own parties. Interestingly, though, the Democrats' image of Ford did not move away from the "ideal" on as many items at any one interval as did the Democrats' image of Carter. The same did not hold true for the Republicans. To the contrary, the Republicans' image of Ford shifted toward the "ideal" on the majority of image scales while shifting away from the "ideal" on most items for Carter. The exception occurred after the second debate. At that time the Republicans shifted further from the "ideal" in rating Ford on 75 percent of the items.

Several conclusions could be reached based on the analyses of the relationship between party preference and images. First, under most circumstances the Independents shifted away from the "ideal" president in rating the major parties' candidates at nearly the same rate as the opposition party. Second, the Democrats shifted further from the "ideal" when rating Carter than they did when rating Ford. Third, the Republicans generally shifted further from the "Ideal" on the majority of ratings of Carter while moving closer to the "ideal" in rating Ford. Finally, the Independents seemed to be harsher in their judgments of Carter than of Ford. When rating Carter the Independents tended to move away from the "ideal" while they moved toward the "ideal" when rating Ford.

It seems clear that party preference was an important factor in
determining the images subjects formed of the presidential candidates. However, party preference did not explain all of the variations and changes that occurred in the candidates' images. Hence, the researcher analyzed the relationship between candidate preference and images to account for more of the variances in the images subjects held of the candidates.

**Candidate Preference and Images**

In order to answer the research question concerning the relationship between candidate preference and candidate images, the data were subjected to several different analyses. The first analysis attempted to discern the relationship between candidate preference and party preference (i.e., whether subjects were partisan in the choice of candidates). A second analysis considered the mean image item scores according to expressed candidate preference at each of the testings. The final analysis studied the changes in candidate preference over the four testings, dividing the subjects into groups according to whether they preferred Ford, Carter, or were undecided in voting intentions, and then calculating the mean image scores based on those groupings.

**Candidate Preference and Party Preference**

Working on the assumption that party was the strongest determinant of candidate preference, the researcher analyzed the correlation between candidate preference at each of the four testings and party preference. If the correlation between these two variables was significant, separate analyses of candidate preference and images would
have been unnecessary. A cross-tabulation of party and candidate preference was run to establish this correlation. Results did not support the assumption that party and candidate preferences were highly correlated at all of the testing times.

Table 8 demonstrates the strong relationship between party and candidate preference at the first testing. The strength of the correlation between these two variables was evident in the statistically significant chi square value of 52.834 with four degrees of freedom. Furthermore, the contingency coefficient was .539, confirming the chi square finding of a significant correlation between party and candidate preference.

**TABLE 8**

CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND PARTY AFFILIATION
OF SUBJECTS AT TIME 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Preference</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the second testing produced similar results. Table 9 produced a chi square value of 44.539 with four degrees of freedom which was significant well beyond the .001 level. The contingency coefficient was similar to the first testing at .531. A strong
relationship between party and candidate preference was again demonstrated. Further analysis, however, did not confirm the high correlation at subsequent testings.

The deterioration of the strength of the relationship between party and candidate preference began to appear with the analysis of the third testing data. Table 10 shows that although a significant correlation between the two variables still existed at the third testing, the strength of the relationship had declined over the first two testings. The chi square value was 11.332 with four degrees of freedom which was significant at the .023 level. The contingency coefficient had dropped to .313. Although the relationships were still significant, the shift at this testing is obvious. The percentage of subjects shifting to the undecided category was noticeable as well as the shifts that occurred among the party identifiers to the different candidates. This shift was even more pronounced at the last testing.
TABLE 10
CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND PARTY AFFILIATION
OF SUBJECTS AT TIME 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Party Preference</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the correlation between party and candidate preference at the final testing proved most interesting. Table 11 shows the distribution of the partisans between the candidates. The chi square value dropped to 9.917 with four degrees of freedom for a level of significance of 0.0418. The contingency coefficient value fell to .300. Clearly the relationship was not as strong as it had been at the first and second testings. Moreover, closer analysis of Table 11 revealed that the expected relationship had not appeared, and in fact, the opposite relationship emerged. The Democrats favored Ford and the Republicans favored Carter.

Since the predicted relationship between party and candidate preference did not appear at all four of the testings, the researcher proceeded to analyze the image scores according to the candidate preferences expressed at each of the testings. The question regarding the relationship between image and candidate preference had not been
TABLE 11
CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND PARTY AFFILIATION
OF SUBJECTS AT TIME 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Party Preference</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reliably answered by the analysis of the image according to party preference.

Candidate Preference and Image Means

In order to determine the relationship between candidate preference and candidate images the subjects were divided each testing into three groups: those who indicated a preference for Ford, those who indicated a preference for Carter, and those who were undecided. The mean image item scores were then calculated for each of the three groups at each testing. Appendix H provides the tables of the mean image scores according to candidate preference. Comparisons were made between the different groups of subjects and how they rated the various candidates on the twenty image items. Analysis revealed that there was a relationship between candidate preference and image scores.

As might be expected, the most positive image scores were found among subjects when rating the candidate of their choice. The
image scores for Carter as rated by those indicating a preference for Carter were the most positive of all the scores. The image scores for Ford as indicated by Ford supporters moved the most consistently toward a more positive extreme. While fourteen of the items shifted to a more positive level for Carter as judged by Carter supporters between the first and the second testings, that number dropped to seven and eight during the subsequent intervals. For Ford as rated by Ford supporters, seventeen items became more positive between the first and the second testings, twelve between the second and third testings and sixteen between the third and fourth testings. Both the Ford (as judged by Ford supporters) scores and the Carter (as judged by Carter supporters) scores were very stable across time with no major jumps in item scores occurring at any of the testings.

The subjects also demonstrated a predictable tendency to rate the opposition's candidate more negatively than the candidate they chose to support. The Carter supporters viewed Ford increasingly more positively on seventeen of the image items between the first and second testings, fifteen items between the second and third testings and only two items between the third and fourth testings. The Ford supporters' image of Carter did not become increasingly positive as often as the Carter supporters' image of Ford, but a similar pattern of movement could be found. The Ford supporters saw Carter increasingly more positively on fourteen of the items between the first and the second testings, two items between the second and third testings and only one item between the third and fourth testings. Clearly, the images of the oppositions' candidates became increasingly negative, especially at the
last testings. In addition, the images of the opposition candidates tended to demonstrate some dramatic changes in the item scores over time. The image item scores became significantly more negative at the final testing, exhibiting jumps of more than one scale point average between the third and fourth testings.

The changes in the images of the two candidates as expressed by the undecided subjects were not as predictable as the results reported thus far. The image scores for Carter tended to be more positive overall than the image scores for Ford, although the shifts toward the positive over time were not as consistent for Carter as they were for Ford. Carter received increasingly positive image ratings on fourteen items at the second testing, three items at the third testing and two items at the final testing. The undecided subjects rated Ford increasingly positive on fifteen items the second testing, sixteen items the third testing and nine items the final testing. So although Carter's scores tended to be more positive overall than Ford's, it appeared that they were becoming increasingly negative at the same time Ford's became increasingly positive. The undecided subjects also appeared to be more consistent in their ratings of Ford than they were in their ratings of Carter. There was evidence of wild fluctuations in the image scores of Carter, while the image scores of Ford remained quite consistent over time.

One caution must be offered in regards to this analysis. Although the predicted relationship existed between the candidate image and the expressed candidate preference (except for the undecided subjects), there is no evidence that the same subjects composed each of
the groups at successive testings. In order to determine if differences existed in the image ratings in relation to different types of voting patterns across time, another analysis of image means was undertaken.

Candidate Preference Patterns
and Image Scores

In order to analyze the image scores of the candidates as they related to the candidate preference patterns that appeared over time, the subjects were divided into five categories according to the choices for President that they had expressed over time. The categories were adapted from voting subgroups reported by Lang and Lang (1962). The categories included: constants — those subjects who expressed a consistent choice for President; crystallizers — those subjects who moved from the undecided column to a choice of one of the candidate; shifters — those voters who switched from one candidate to the other; waverers — those subjects who switched from one candidate to the other and then back again; and disenchanted — those subjects who moved from a choice of one of the candidates to the undecided category. Since a subject was required to have completed the candidate preference questions at least three of the four times, the number used in this analysis was far less than previous analyses and some of the categories were quite small. The image mean scores were calculated according to the five groups of subjects. Appendix I provides tables of the mean image scores for these groups.

Constants. This group represented the largest category of subjects with a peak of 34 subjects. For both the Carter and Ford image scores there was little movement across time. The scores remained
relatively constant. There were generally fewer shifts to the positive extreme at each successive testing. Although Ford tended to be viewed more positively by this group than Carter, there was little difference in the item scores for the two candidates. This category appeared to be the most stable of the five groups.

**Crystallizers.** This group contained as many as 9 subjects and tended to shift more perceptibly than other groups of subjects. Ford was seen successively more positively than Carter as time passed. The middle testings tended to provide a great deal of fluctuation in image scores for both Ford and Carter. Both candidates were rated approximately equal at the first testing, but Ford was seen in a more favorable light in the last testings than Carter. This tended to confirm other findings that the undecideds shifted into the Ford column before the final testing.

**Shifters.** This category produced only one subject meeting the criteria of definition. Still, a shift in vote was observable in the image ratings for the two candidates. Ford was seen more positively than Carter at the first testing, but Carter surpassed Ford in terms of positive scores for the second, third and fourth testings. Although little polarization existed between the candidates, some fluctuation occurred at the middle testings. Little change was noted between the third and fourth testings on the ratings of either candidate.

**Waverers.** This group represented the second largest group with as high as 13 subjects and contained those who switched from one candidate to undecided before switching to the other candidate. Again, the name for the group seemed to aptly describe the shifts that occurred.
The trends for the two candidates tended to fluctuate greatly. For example, Ford was seen as increasingly more positive on fifteen, ten and fifteen of the items at the second, third and fourth testings respectively. In addition, when shifts occurred on the items, nearly half of the items demonstrated a fluctuation that did not move in the same direction two times in succession. The pattern of wavering was also demonstrated in that Carter was more positive than Ford at the first testing on seventeen items. At the second testing, Ford was more positive than Carter on eleven items. The third testing found the two candidates even and the fourth testing favored Ford on fifteen of the items. Fluctuation marked the image patterns of this group.

**Disenchanted.** The final group of 5 subjects were those who switched from one candidate or the other to undecided. This group provided the least consistent movement between the two candidates. Ford's image became increasingly more positive over time, but Carter's image also fluctuated greatly in changes in image scores. Ford became increasingly more positive on three, ten and thirteen items respectively while Carter became increasingly more positive on ten, three and eleven items respectively. Carter was seen generally in a more favorable light than Ford, but the degree slackened as each testing passed. Carter was more positive than Ford on ten items, fifteen items, seven items and six items at each of the successive testings. By the last testing, Ford was seen by this group with more positive an image than Carter. Polarization was not great between the two candidates with this group and no wild fluctuations in image scores occurred.

In summary, since the correlation between party preference and
candidate preference did not remain consistent across time, an analysis of the candidate images as they related to the candidate preferences expressed by the subjects was undertaken. Generally, the candidate preference did make a difference in the image scores given to the two candidates, as would be expected. In further analyzing the patterns of candidate preference over time as they related to the image scores, it was found that all but the disenchanted group demonstrated a relationship between the changes in image scores and the changes in candidate preference.

**Issues and Images**

To investigate the research questions as to whether there was a relationship between candidate images and the subjects' ability to list issues related to the campaign, the researcher subjected the data to a series of analyses. The first analysis included a cross-tabulation of the number of issues listed by the subjects and their candidate preferences. The second type of analysis examined the image mean scores according to the number of issues listed by the subjects at each of the testings.

**Issues and Candidate Preference**

Four separate cross-tabulations were run on the data to determine if there was a correlation between the number of issues that the subjects were able to list and their expressed preference for one of the two candidates. Table 12 presents the results of the cross-tabulation for the first testing. With one of the nine cells having an
TABLE 12
CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND NUMBER OF ISSUES
LISTED BY SUBJECTS AT TIME 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Preference</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Issues</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Issue</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Issues</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expected frequency of less than 5, the chi square value was non-significant at 2.464 with four degrees of freedom. The contingency coefficient for this testing was .1412. Clearly, the relationship between candidate preference and the number of issues that a subject could list was not a strong one at the first testing.

Analysis of the candidate preferences and the number of issues listed for the second testing is presented in Table 13. It should be noted that although the total number of subjects analyzed for the second testing was slightly greater than at the first testing, in the current analysis three of the nine cells had an expected frequency of less than 5. The chi square value at this testing was 13.091 with four degrees of freedom and a level of significance at .0108. The contingency coefficient was .3101. Although there appeared to be a relationship between these two variables, the researcher was reluctant to attribute any significant meaning to the results in light of the number of cells
### TABLE 13
CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND NUMBER OF ISSUES
LISTED BY SUBJECTS AT TIME 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Preference</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Issues</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Issue</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Issues</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with expected frequencies of less than five which would tend to skew the relationship that emerged. It should be noted, however, that a higher percentage of subjects listed two or more issues at this testing, perhaps as a result of the first presidential debate. In addition, fewer subjects were unable or unwilling to list any issues. Carter continued to lead in terms of the number of subjects who supported him who were able to list two or more issues. Ford received a greater percentage of the voters who were unable to list any issues at this testing. Interestingly, the undecided subjects were quite knowledgeable, a condition that did not support research findings from other campaigns.

At the third testing the number of subjects participating dropped slightly. The results of this comparison for the third testing are provided in Table 14. The chi square value this time was 8.269 with four degrees of freedom and a level of significance of .0822. The contingency coefficient was .2611. Even though the
TABLE 14
CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND NUMBER OF ISSUES
LISTED BY SUBJECTS AT TIME 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Preference</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Issues</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Issue</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Issues</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

relationship was not a significant one, the distribution of subjects into the various groupings was quite a bit more even. A slight shift occurred with the number of subjects who were able to list two or more issues. This number declined slightly over the second testing, approaching the same number of subjects who were able to list two or more issues at the first testing. The shift in this category seemed to indicate that more of those undecided subjects were able to list this greater number of issues than either of the candidate supporters. Those listing zero issues were also more evenly distributed in the candidate preference categories.

Analysis of the final testing period was difficult because of the decrease in the number of students participating. Less than half of the number of subjects were included in this testing than at any of the other testings. Table 15 presents the analysis. At this testing five of the nine cells had expected frequencies of less than five.
TABLE 15
CANDIDATE PREFERENCE AND NUMBER OF ISSUES
LISTED BY SUBJECTS AT TIME 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Preference</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Issues</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Issue</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Issues</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi square value was 1.157 with four degrees of freedom and a level of significance at .885. The contingency coefficient was .1534. Obviously, with so few participating and more than half of the cells with less than the allowable expected frequency, this final testing analysis was invalid. There did appear to be a shift toward an unwillingness to list issues. A greater number of undecided subjects listed zero issues than in previous testings. However, the disappointing response at this testing could be used neither to confirm nor to reject the expected relationship.

Overall, this analysis indicated that there was not a strong relationship that existed between candidate preferences and the number of issues that subjects listed. Subjects tended to be able to list several issues as important to the campaign. The undecided subject was no less able than the candidate supporters to list issues, a finding that will be discussed at a later time. The lack of a relationship
between candidate preference and the subjects' ability to list issues led the researcher to an analysis of the images in relation to issues.

**Issues and Candidate Images**

In order to determine whether the ability of a subject to list issues had any effect on his perception of the images of the candidates, the image mean scores were calculated for Ford and Carter according to the subjects' listing of issues at each of the testings. The same three groups of subjects were used in this analysis as were used in the analysis just reported. Comparisons were made between groups and candidates with changes in the image scores also noted. Tables in Appendix J list the mean scores for the two candidates by these groupings.

Among those subjects unable to list any issues, Carter's image scores were very stable. There was a fluctuation in the direction of change that was noted, however. Between the first and the second testings these subjects viewed Carter more favorably than before on all but one item. Between the second and third testings, however, these subjects gave more favorable ratings than previously on only six of the twenty items. The trend toward viewing Carter more negatively did not continue between the third and fourth testings. At the final testing the Carter image as rated by those listing zero issues improved on all but three items.

Those listing zero issues also gave quite consistent scores to Ford on the image items. Unlike the Carter image, however, the Ford image tended to become increasingly more negative. Between the first and the second testing Ford improved on thirteen of the image items as
compared with twelve of the items between the second and third testings. At the final testing, however, Ford improved on only seven of the twenty items when rated by this group.

Among those subjects listing one issue at each of the testings, fairly significant fluctuations in scoring could be observed in the Carter image. The Ford image was a bit more stable among these subjects, but was still not as stable as the image scores given by the subjects listing zero issues. The Carter image improved on all but one of the image items between the first and the second testings. A trend toward the negative pole occurred in the Carter image following the second debate with only one item improving between the second and third testings. Twelve items showed improvement for Carter at the final testing. For Ford the group of subjects able to list one issue was even more favorable than they were toward Carter. Between the first and second testings only eight items were seen more positively than before. However, at the third testing eighteen items showed improvement. The trend toward an increasingly more positive image of Ford continued for these voters with seventeen items improving at the last testing. Overall this group of subjects appeared to have less stable ideas of the images of the two candidates but tended to see them both increasingly more favorably as the debates progressed.

For the group of subjects that were able to list two or more issues at each testing more differences appeared. In rating Carter's image this group displayed fairly stable scores until the last testing when fairly dramatic shifts in the scores occurred. The scores were more stable for Ford than for Carter at all of the testings. Ford's
image improved on nineteen of the twenty items between the first and the second testing, improved on twelve items following the second debate, and improved on nine items after the last debate. For Carter none of the items showed improvement among this set of subjects between the first and the second testings even though the change in actual score was very slight. Between the second and third debates Carter's image improved on fourteen of the items. By the last testing, however, Carter's image scores dropped dramatically on all but one of the image items. This most knowledgeable group of subjects provided the most variety in image responses over the course of the four testings.

When comparisons were made between the two candidates as rated by those subjects listing zero issues, some of the same trends could be observed. When rating Carter and Ford this group favored Carter on nine items and Ford on ten items with one item tied at the first testing. Carter was favored on eighteen of the items at the second testing and seventeen of the items at the third testing. Ford was favored on all but one of the items at the last testing, however, indicating a fairly significant shift between the candidates among this group of subjects.

Among those voters listing one issue fluctuations were again apparent. At the first testing Ford was seen more positively than Carter on eleven of the items with one additional item scoring the two candidates evenly. At the second testing Carter surpassed Ford on all but one of the image scales. At the third testing Ford bested Carter on all but four items and Ford had more favorable scores than Carter at the final testing on all but three items. With the exception of
the second testing, this group seemed clear in their preferred images.

Those subjects who listed two or more issues at each of the testings appeared to favor Carter on all but the final testing. Carter was favored over Ford on all but one item the first testing, all but two items the second testing, and all but one item again the third testing. At the final testing, however, with the significant changes occurring in the Carter scores, Ford was favored over Carter on fifteen of the image items.

One last comparison was made possible by this analysis. In comparing the scores given by the various groups at each of the testings an attempt was made to determine which group tended to give the most favorable ratings on the image items as a whole to the two candidates at each of the testing periods. Carter was favored most at the first testing by those who could list two or more issues, second by those listing zero issues and last by those listing one issue. At the second testing those listing one issue gave Carter the most positive ratings, those listing two or more issues the next most positive scores and those listing zero issues the least positive scores. The same pattern that emerged at the first testing appeared at the third testing. At the final testing those listing zero issues gave Carter the best scores with a tie between the one issue and two or more issues groups for the second most favorable. Overall, the differences in the scores given by the three groups to Carter were so minimal that it could safely be said that knowledge of issues were not a determining factor in Carter's image.

When rating Ford the first time those listing zero issues
tended to rate him the most favorably, those listing two or more issues the next most favorably and those listing one issue the least favorably. On the second testing those listing two or more issues favored Ford the most, those listing zero issues the next and those listing one issue the least again. The pattern for the last two testings was the same: those listing one issue rated Ford the most positively, those listing two or more issues the next most positively and those listing zero issues the least positively. As with Carter, however, the scores were so close among the three groups that to conclude that knowledge of issues was not a determining factor in Ford's image seemed warranted.

The relationship between knowledge of the issues and images of the candidates did not appear to be a clearly defined relationship at the end of the analysis of the data. To conclude that no relationship existed would ignore some of the results that were reported in this analysis. Carter seemed to be favored most by those listing two or more issues and those listing zero issues at the third testing. Ford was clearly favored by all groups, however, at the final testing. The least stable scores given to either candidate were those given by the group that could list one issue. Trends seemed fairly consistent among the three groups with the exception again of those listing only one issue. Most interesting, however, was the similarity in scores given to the two different candidates by all three of the groups. Whatever the relationship between knowledge of the issues and images of the candidates, it did not appear to be either clear or strong in this election for the group of subjects used in this study.
Sources of Information About the Campaign and Images

To answer the research question that sought to ascertain the relationship between the source of subjects' information about the campaign and the images subjects formed of the candidates, subjects were divided into two groups based on the source of information they relied upon most for news about the candidates. Although subjects were asked to rank a list of sources of information about presidential elections, television was identified as the first choice of information by such a large number of the subjects that the remaining categories of information had few choosing them as the primary sources of news about the campaign. Table 16 presents the mean ranking scores for the various sources. Since several of the categories had few choosing them as the primary source of information it was decided that the most fruitful examination of the data could be done by dividing the subjects into groups based on those who relied on television as their primary source

### Table 16

Mean Ranking Scores of Sources of Information About the Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of information about the campaign and those who relied primarily on
other sources of information about the campaign. At the first testing
this placed seventy-nine subjects in the TV category and fifty-nine sub-
jects in the other sources category. At the second testing seventy-one
relied on TV and sixty-two on other sources. At the third testing
sixty-eight relied on TV and sixty-three on other sources. For the
final testing the breakdown was fifty-seven and fifty-six respectively.
The mean image scores for the candidates were calculated at each test-
ing for these two groups. Comparisons were then made between the two
groups. Appendix K, Tables 1-4 provide the Ford and Carter image mean
scores for these two groups.

Changes in Image Scores

The first analysis for this research question compared the
changes that occurred across time in the image scores awarded the two
candidates by those who relied on TV and those who relied on other
sources of information. The changes that did occur in the image scores
across time were very minor for both candidates as judged by the other
sources of information group and for Carter as judged by the TV reliant
group. Although the changes that occurred in the Ford image scores for
those relying on TV were somewhat greater than any other changes, they
were by no means extreme changes. The trends that existed for the two
candidates as judged by the two groups varied slightly, but not enough
to claim that the sources of information used by the subjects made a
difference in whether the image scores changed toward the positive or
the negative poles for a candidate.

Those who relied on TV tended to give Ford more positive
scores in the earlier testings and comparatively more negative scores as the debates progressed. Eighteen items showed more positive scores at the second testing than at the first; thirteen items improved at the third testing; and only two items improved the last testing. Similarly those who relied on other sources of information judged Ford somewhat more favorably the second and third testings and less favorably the final testing. For this group eighteen items improved the second and third testings and only seven items improved the last testing.

For Carter's image there was also some fluctuation between the two groups across the four testings. Those relying on TV gave Carter somewhat more positive scores on twelve items the second testing, eight items the third testing and seven items the fourth testing. The subjects using other sources of information conferred more positive scores on Carter on sixteen items the second testing, four items the third testing and ten items the final testing. Overall, examination of the changes in image scores disclosed no major differences between those who relied most heavily on TV and those who relied most heavily on other sources of information about the campaign.

Comparisons Between Carter and Ford

In contrasting the scores given to the two candidates by those relying on TV and those relying on other sources of information, no great differences were observed between the two groups. For example, no differences were detected at the first testing, with both groups giving Carter better scores than Ford on all but one item. At the second testing Carter was more positive than Ford with the TV group on all but one item and with the other sources of information group on
all but two items. The third testing displayed the greatest difference with the TV group ranking Carter more positively on all but two items and the other sources of information group ranking Carter more favorably on all but five items. At the final testing Carter continued to be rated more favorably by the TV group on all but two items and by the other sources of information group on all but four items. Consequently, it seemed reasonable to conclude that the source of information used most by the subjects was not a factor in determining which candidate was rated most favorably on the image scales.

Comparisons of Image Scores Given to Candidates Between TV Users and Users of Other Sources of Information

The only analysis concerning the source of information used by the subjects and the image scores that disclosed any differences between TV users and those relying on other sources of information was the comparison of the image scores given to each candidate by the two groups. Although the differences in the scores given by these two groups to both Carter and Ford were slight on most items, some clear disparities between the two groups appeared.

Carter was consistently judged more favorably by those relying on TV than by those relying on other sources of information. At the first testing eighteen items displayed this tendency. At the second and third testings the TV group rated Carter higher than the other sources of information group did on sixteen of the items. At the final testing the TV group rated Carter more positively than the other sources group on fifteen of the items. Even though this tendency was clear and consistent, very slight differences between the two groups were
observed. In fact, only two items at the first testing exhibited a difference greater than half a scale. These two items were "straightforward" and "experienced". At no other testing were any scores more than half a scale different between the two groups.

The differences in scoring between the TV and other sources of information groups were even more dramatic for Ford. At the first testing the other sources of information group favored Ford on all but one item. By the second testing the number of items increased to seventeen. At the third testing the other sources of information group favored Ford on all but one item. The final testing found the other sources of information group favoring Ford on all of the items. In addition, the differences in the scores between the two groups, while slight in the beginning, grew increasingly further apart. At the first testing no items displayed differences of greater than half a scale. At the second testing one item, "active", showed that great a difference between the group relying on TV and those relying on other sources of information. At the third testing the item "bright" showed a significant difference between the two groups. By the final testing, however, nearly half of the items manifested a difference between the TV users and those using other sources of information in excess of half a scale point. These items included "bright", "admired", "straightforward", "reliable", "interesting", "effective", "persuasive", and "clear".

In summary, although analysis showed there was no difference between image ratings of Ford and Carter and no difference in changes in image scores based on the source of information used most by a subject, further analysis demonstrated that there were differences between
users of TV and those using other sources of information to gain knowledge about the campaign in the ways that they viewed each of the candidates. TV users rated Carter more favorably than users of other sources of information, while with Ford this latter group gave him the more favorable scores. Furthermore, with Ford, the distance between the image ratings offered by the two groups increased, especially at the last testing. While distinctions between subjects' image ratings based on the sources of information they relied upon most for campaign information were small, nonetheless, the source of information did appear to make some difference in the image scores given to the two presidential contenders.

**Debate Winners and Images**

This research project has focused on candidate images as they related to other variables of the campaign. The 1976 presidential debates were the nucleus events around which the gathering of the data was planned. Attention thus far has been paid to the debates as if they were any time point in the campaign. A more focused study of the debates as major campaign events may help to explain some of the results reported previously.

In order to answer the research question concerning the attitudes of the subjects toward the candidates as debaters and the changes that resulted in the candidate images, two separate analyses were employed. The first analysis was used to determine the correlation between the candidate preferences of the subjects and their perceptions of the winners of the debates. The second analysis examined
the image scores of the candidates in relation to the perceived winners of the debates.

**Debate Winners and Candidate Preference**

Communication theory would suggest that because of the tendency to selectively perceive events according to predetermined attitudes the voter would tend to perceive the candidate whom he favored most as the winner of a debate between the presidential contenders (Larson, 1973). In order to determine if this theory held true with the subjects employed in this study, the data were subjected to a cross-tabulation analysis in which the candidate preference at each of the testings was compared to the debate winner at the same testing. Table 17 presents the results of that analysis for the first debate.

**TABLE 17**

**DEBATE WINNER AND CANDIDATE PREFERENCE**

**FIRST DEBATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Winner Preference</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi square analysis of the first debate and candidate preference indicated that a strong relationship did exist between the two
variables. The chi square value was 35.429 with four degrees of freedom and a level of significance well beyond .0001. The contingency coefficient value was .5232.

In addition to the correlation between candidate preference and debate winners, two other observations about this distribution of preference and winners were important. The distribution of the undecided preference among the two candidates was equal with the largest percentage of the undecided preference subjects being undecided about the winner of the first debate. This tendency of the undecided subject to be undecided about the outcome of the debate would be predictable, as would the even distribution of subjects between the two candidates when the subjects did pick winners. The second observation was not as predictable, however. The reader will notice that among those who were undecided about the outcome of the debate, a significant portion were committed in their candidate preference to Ford. With perhaps this exception, the results of the correlation between the winners of the debate and the candidate preferences at the first debate supported the selective perception theory.

The analysis of the second debate was equally predictable. Table 18 presents the cross-tabulation of the second debate winners and the candidate preferences expressed at that same time. The chi square value for this analysis was 51.599 with four degrees of freedom and a level of significance again well beyond .0001. The contingency coefficient also showed the strength of the relationship with a value of .5932. Again the relationship between candidate preference and the perception of winners of the debate was a strong one.
At this second debate the undecided subjects became increasingly undecided about the winner of the second debate. The Ford supporters became somewhat less sure about Ford in this debate with a few defecting and indicating that they felt Carter won the debate. Interestingly though, the undecided subjects at the same time deserted Carter as a winner in this debate. Some shift in the overall candidate preference occurred at this testing. This shift favored Carter and came at Ford's expense. The distribution of the undecided winners among the candidates was more even at this testing, with a slight advantage remaining there for Ford. Overall once again, however, the relationship that was demonstrated here was quite predictable according to the selective perception theory.

Analysis of the third debate proved more difficult because of the decrease in the numbers of subjects who watched the debate and indicated a winner. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 19. It should be noted that five of the cells had expected frequencies
TABLE 19

DEBATE WINNER AND CANDIDATE PREFERENCE
THIRD DEBATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Winner Preference</th>
<th>Ford</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of less than 5, invalidating the results of the chi square analysis. At this testing, the chi square value was 11.984 with four degrees of freedom for a level of significance of 0.017. The contingency coefficient fell to .4668.

Among the subjects who are represented in Table 19 there was a shift in the expressed candidate preference back to Ford, this time mainly at the expense of Carter. In addition, of the subjects expressing a preference for Carter there was a shift from declaring Carter the winner of the debate to being undecided about the outcome of the third debate. A similar shift occurred among the Ford supporters with fewer indicating that they felt Ford won the debate and more indicating that they were undecided about the outcome of the debate. The subjects who were still undecided in their candidate preference shifted in their perceptions of who won the debate with the largest percentage of them still in the undecided winner's column. When picking a winner, these subjects appeared to be quite unstable. Although still somewhat
predictable, this analysis provided the least support for the selective perception theory.

As previous research suggested, the subjects tended to see the candidate whom they supported as winning the various debates. A significant and successively growing proportion of the subjects were reluctant to choose a winner as the debates progressed. Although this analysis was valuable in describing the relationship between the candidate preferences of the subjects and their perception of the winners of the debates, this analysis did not shed light on the nature of the relationship between the perception of the winners of the debates and the images of those candidates.

Debate Winners and Candidate Images

In answering the research question that sought to describe the relationship between the image of the candidates and the subjects' perceptions of the candidates in the debates, the subjects were divided into groups according to their selection of a winner in each of the debates. Each of the three groups were then utilized in calculating the mean image scores of Carter and Ford. This resulted in six sets of image scores which were compared in this analysis. The number of subjects in each of the groupings differed greatly among the four testing periods with the undecided winner category being consistently the largest and the Carter and Ford winner categories varying from twenty-six subjects all the way down to three subjects within a category. Although the variations in the number of subjects had an impact on the results of this analysis, the impact will not be discussed until the next chapter. Appendix L presents the image mean scores of Ford and
Carter as calculated for these groups.

Analysis of the image scores of Ford and Carter revealed that differences did exist among the ratings given by those who thought Ford won the debates, those who thought Carter won the debates and those who were undecided about the winners. The subjects who saw Carter as the winner of the first contest rated Carter more positively on all of the image items but one during both the first and second testings. Interestingly, the one item on which Ford was rated more positively was the liberal-conservative item, with Ford being perceived as more liberal than Carter on all four of the testings. For the third testing Carter was viewed by those who thought he won the debate more positively than Ford on all but four of the image items. In addition to being more liberal, Ford was viewed by this group as more sincere, known and experienced. At the final testing those who thought Carter won the debate rated him more positively than Ford on every item except liberal. The relationship between seeing Carter as the winner of the debates and rating him favorably on the image items was obviously a strong one.

The speculation that the first debate helped Ford was supported by an analysis of the image ratings given to Ford by those who thought he won the debates. When the image means were calculated for the first testing according to those subjects who thought he won the first debate (as reported at the second testing), an interesting comparison of the scores given by this group on the first and second testings could be made. Like those who thought Carter won the first debate, those who thought Ford won the first debate rated Carter more positively just prior to that debate. Ford was rated more favorably than Carter at the
first testing on only two items—liberal and experienced. If the first 
debate had an effect on the subjects' view of Ford, the image scales at 
the second testing should reveal that effect.

Substantiating the idea that the first debate was helpful to 
Ford, at the second testing this same group of subjects rated Ford more 
positively than Carter on twelve of the twenty image items. At the 
third testing, even with the Ford gaffe concerning the lack of Soviet 
domination in Eastern Europe, those who thought Ford won the debate, 
even though they were fewer in number, rated Ford more favorably than 
Carter on all of the image scales. The same condition existed after 
the final debate. Thus, the relationship between choosing a candidate 
as the winner of a debate and rating him most positively was confirmed 
with both those who thought Ford won the debate and those who thought 
Carter won. With Ford it appeared that this favorable image was not a 
precondition that existed with those who thought he won the first de­
bate prior to that debate.

Examination of the image mean scores for the four testings for 
those who were undecided as to the winners of the debates confirmed 
other findings reported previously that indicated the undecideds shift­
ed toward Ford at the later testings. Prior to the debates this group 
of subjects favored Carter over Ford on all of the image items. A de­
terioration of this support began to occur following the first debate 
when Ford was favored on six of the twenty items. Among the items for 
which Ford received the more positive ratings were the items "liberal" 
and "active". At the third testing the trend toward viewing Ford more 
more positively continued with Ford besting Carter on all but four
items. Interestingly, these items included "young", "active" and "liberal". Thus, a change had occurred in the perceptions of the two candidates as to their activity and philosophy. At the final testing Ford was rated more positively on all but three of the items, including "young" and "liberal". The changes that occurred with this undecided group supported the view of the undecided voter as less stable than a committed voter in terms of perceptions of the images of the candidates. Further analysis would rank these three groups in relation to each other as they rated the two candidates.

In comparing the subjects as they chose winners of the debates, patterns emerged that revealed the differences among the groups. For example, the image ratings of Ford for the first testing were interestingly most positive among those who chose Carter as the winner of the first debate, second most positive among the undecided group and least positive among those who thought Ford won the first debate. A shift occurred following that first debate which showed those who thought Ford won the debate as the most positive toward him, the Carter winners second most positive and the undecideds the least positive. At the final two testings those who saw Ford as the winner rated him most favorably with the undecideds in the middle position and those who thought Carter won occupying the most negative position.

The image of Carter among these groups was more stable. On the first testing Carter was viewed the most positively by those who thought he won the debate, the next most positively by those who thought Ford won and the least positively by those who were undecided about the outcome of the first debate. All of the other testings
revealed that those who thought Carter won rated him most positively, with the undecideds next most favorably and those who thought Ford won as the least positive.

The pattern that emerged most consistently, i.e., 87.5 percent of the time, confirmed the notion that the image of the candidate is viewed most favorably by those who saw him as the winner of one of the presidential debates. Additionally, in 62.5 percent of the cases those who were undecided about the outcome of the debates occupied the least polarized position — in the middle. In the same number of cases those who judged the candidate the loser of the debate rated him the least favorably. Clearly, the relationship between the candidate's image and the choice of winners of the debates was a strong one.

A final analysis sought to determine the types of changes that each of the candidate images underwent over the course of the four testings according to the groups of subjects as they perceived the outcome of the debates. Each of the three groups' image ratings of Ford and Carter were compared and changes were noted across the four testings. The results of this analysis tended to confirm the results just reported.

Those who thought Carter won each of the debates tended to view Carter increasingly more positively as the debates progressed. Between the first and second testings his image scores moved in a favorable direction on eleven of the twenty items. Between the second and third testings the number of items changing toward the positive dropped to three. After the third debate sixteen of the image items moved in a positive direction. Overall, ten, or half, of the image items
received more positive ratings at the final testing over the initial testing scores. Not unexpectedly, the scores given at each testing for Carter by those who thought he won the debate were quite stable showing no great fluctuation at any point during the study.

Those who thought Carter won the debates judged Ford on the image items in a somewhat less stable manner. Three items in particular showed great variation in the scores given by this group. Ford was seen by those who thought Carter won the debates as increasingly insincere, increasingly older, and increasingly less competent. Between the first and the second testings there was a general improvement in the ratings given to Ford by those who thought Carter won the debate. Only two items demonstrated a movement toward the negative pole. Between the second and third testings only five of the items showed movement toward the positive. At the final testing only one item improved over the third testing scores. Overall, only five items improved when comparing the fourth and first testings. Although Ford enjoyed an improvement in image scores following the first debate, that improvement was a temporary one and his image deteriorated more and more after each of the next two debates.

Among those who thought that Ford won the debate, the improvement in the image scores for Ford was more permanent. The greatest improvement in the image scores occurred following the first debate. At that time, those who thought Ford won the debate judged him more positively on all but three of the items. Interestingly, those who thought Ford won the second debate, even though the media judged it to be such a disaster for Ford, the improvement in image scores occurred
on every single item. After the final debate the improvement in scores occurred on only nine of the twenty items. Overall, improvement occurred on every item when comparing the final testing with the initial testing. Most of the items were stable with five items showing higher fluctuations. These items included "straightforward", "trustworthy", "known", "experienced", and "effective". Like the scores for Carter among those who thought Carter won the debates, there was great stability and increasingly positive scores given to Ford by those who thought that Ford won the debates.

Among those who thought Ford won the debates, the ratings of Carter were much more positive prior to the debates than they were at the finish of the debates. Generally the rating scores tended to fluctuate a great deal as they became increasingly more negative. Between the first and the second testings only two image items showed improvement. There were also only two items that improved for Carter between the second and third testings and only one item between the third and final testings. Hence, similarities could be found in the ways in which those who thought Carter won the debates judged Ford and the ways in which those who thought Ford won the debates judged Carter.

Those who were undecided as to the outcome of the debates rated both Carter and Ford in quite similar ways. Both of the candidates were given stable scores across time by this group. After the first debate those who were undecided about the outcome of the debate rated both candidates as improving. Carter improved on fourteen image scales and Ford improved on nineteen items. After the second debate, however, Ford improved on only ten of the image items while Carter improved on
just one item. At the final testing Carter improved on five items and Ford improved on twelve items. In juxtaposition to each other, comparisons between the first and last testings revealed that Carter's image became more negative on all items but one, while Ford's image became more positive on all items but two. While the subjects who were unable to choose winners in the debates became more disenchanted with Carter, they tended to look upon Ford more favorably as time passed.

A review of the findings presented in this section concerning the relationship between the subjects' views of the debates and their images of the candidates suggested that the relationship is a strong one. Although evidence did not emerge that showed the image of a candidate tended to determine the choice of winners in the debates in all cases, evidence was presented that suggested that the choice of winners in the debates tended to have an effect on the perceived image of the candidates. Whether the debates changed the subjects' perception of the candidates only as personalities or whether the debates changed the perception of the candidates because of issue positions that were clarified was not revealed by this analysis, however.

**Summary of Results**

This chapter has presented the results of the analyses of the data for each of the research questions. Although factor analysis did not allow the researcher to collapse the data into meaningful categories, an item by item analysis of the data did provide some valuable information about the nature of candidate images in relation to other campaign variables. It was found that images of the "ideal" President,
as well as the images of Ford and Carter, were not stable and tended to change greatly over the four testings of this study. Changes, however, did not generally support the perceptual stability hypothesis which suggested that changes in the image of one candidate would be mirrored by changes in the image of his opponent (except for the item "persuasive" in which this inverse relationship was observed).

Party preference of the subjects made little difference in the perceptions of the "ideal" President except on the philosophy item. Subjects preferred a slightly liberal candidate if they were Democrats, a more moderate candidate if they were Independents and a slightly conservative candidate if they were Republicans. When rating Ford and Carter the Independents tended to rate the candidates between the scores given by the two parties, while party identifiers rated their party's candidate most favorably and the opposition party's candidate most negatively. Independents changed their perceptions of the images of Ford and Carter in a way that closely resembled the movement observed in the image scores given by the opposition party to a candidate.

It was also discovered that party preference was not a predictor of candidate preference at the last two testings. Shifts occurred into the undecided column at the third testing, followed by a tendency at the fourth testing for a higher percentage of Democrats to favor Ford than Carter and a higher percentage of Republicans to favor Carter than Ford. The images of preferred candidates were generally perceived more favorably by subjects than the candidate whom they did not prefer for President. Opposition candidates' images were also less stable across time than the images of preferred candidates. Undecided voters
appeared to rate Carter more favorably than Ford on the image scales, but a trend toward rating Ford more favorably than Carter was detected at the later testings. When subjects were separated according to voting intention changes, their shifts in image ratings matched their shifts in voting intentions.

Knowledge of the issues was not closely related to candidate images. Similar image scores appeared for both candidates among subjects able to list zero, one, or two or more issues. Furthermore, whether a subject relied most heavily on TV or other sources of information about the campaign did not appear to be a factor in image ratings overall. However, the subjects relying most heavily on TV rated Carter more positively than the subjects relying most on other sources of information about the campaign. The converse was true in Ford's case with those relying most on other sources of information rating him more favorably than those relying primarily on TV.

This study confirmed the role of selective perception in the subjects' viewing of the debates with candidate preference observed as closely related to selection of winners of the debates for these subjects. A large proportion of the subjects were unable to select winners of the debates and it was these subjects whose images of the candidates tended to be the least stable over time. The image scores given by subjects were more positive for the candidate they chose as the winner of the debates than it was for the perceived loser. Those who chose Ford as the winner of the first debate, however, switched from more favorable image ratings of Carter at the first testing to more favorable image ratings of Ford after the first debate. The
first debate did apparently improve Ford's image considerably with those who chose him as the winner of that debate.

The next chapter shall briefly discuss these results and suggest implications for further study.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the images of political candidates in the setting of the presidential debates in order to determine the relationships between various campaign variables and candidate images. The research questions that were posed were answered in the analysis and results section of this study. This chapter will once again consider the results that were obtained, relating back to the review of literature and an update of that review in order to determine which of the results were expected and which were unexpected according to the theoretical background that was established prior to engaging in this research. The chapter is organized by research questions with results of the various analyses presented along with the initial research question in order to refresh the reader's mind.

Changes in Images

The first research question asked how the images of the "ideal" President and the presidential candidates changed over time. Factor analysis of the data indicated that the factors used in judging the images of the candidates and of the "ideal" President were not the same. Additionally, the factors that emerged for any one of the candidates or for the "ideal" President were not stable over time. Although
the "ideal" President's image factors shifted less than the image factors of either Ford or Carter, the different factor structures that appeared made the use of factor analysis to collapse the data into more manageable concepts unworkable. The changes in image means also indicated that the images of Ford and Carter were not constant, but tended to shift over time. The shifts noted in Ford's image scores were moving in a consistently more positive direction and also represented the greatest shifts that occurred in any candidate's image scores. Interestingly, the Democrats and Independents gave Ford consistently more positive ratings than did the Republicans. The results of this study revealed that images were situational, periodic and idiosyncratic for this group of subjects during the 1976 election.

The idea that the factors of images were not the same for different candidates had been predicted most notably in the research of Roberts (1973). Tannenbaum, et al., (1962) had suggested that the image of the "ideal" President was stable, contrary to the findings of this study. Most of the researchers that had used images ratings for an "ideal" candidate as a way to measure the images of the actual candidates did not ask subjects to provide image ratings for the "ideal" more than once. They based their research on the assumption that the image of the "ideal" would not change over time. In addition, several researchers did not specify "ideal" what. Hellweg (1979) for example asked her subjects to rate the "ideal" candidate instead of the "ideal" President or "ideal" Governor. As a result of the more specific nature of the "ideal" President in this study as well as the fact that measurements were taken of the "ideal" President at each of four testings, it
was not surprising that this study produced results that differed from previous research.

If it is assumed that voters change in terms of the ways in which they judge candidates and in terms of the candidate whom they prefer for an office, it seems only logical to conclude that their dimensions of judgement also change over time. Likewise, to assume that voters would judge an "ideal" President along the same dimensions at several testings would ignore the many outside influences that cause voters to change their minds over time. After all, it is usually not the candidates who change, but the voters' perceptions of them and the voters' own attitudes toward what a President should really be like.

The use of the semantic differential and factor analysis to measure the image concept was based on well established justifications and was preceded by similar measurements in respected research. However, such measures may not have been the most useful measures for this type of research. Wakshlay and Edison (1979) suggested the inadequacy of factor analysis:

Thus, factor analysis of preselected bipolar adjectives is inadequate for testing the validity of a multidimensional construct. The judgement is based on two grounds: (1) scales generated to measure a dimension are likely to co-vary and may cause a factor to be generated in part as an artifact of the scales employed, (2) subjects are not free to choose the criteria upon which sources are judged. They are constrained by the nature of the items employed to measure their perception of message sources (28).

Carter, Ruggels and Chaffee (1968-9) supported this view when they suggested that allowing a subject to determine the dimensions that he uses in judging objects allows for a more accurate assessment of his judgements. Using adjective pairs that came from previous research
allowed the researcher to determine if factors that emerged in similar studies of image were constant in other elections, but it did not allow the subjects to use their own dimensions of judgement and may in fact have caused the factors to appear to be so unstable across candidates and time.

Other researchers during the 1976 election found that few factors emerged for the candidates. Roberts (1981) found "that only one factor had fairly consistent loadings across time and candidates" (64). Roberts' major factor was similar to the factor that produced the greatest number of items with high loadings in this study, i.e. a factor related to trustworthiness. Perhaps because of the significance of the Watergate hearings in the months that preceded the 1976 election, the voters tended to have only one factor that was important to them in judging the candidates -- honesty. Certainly this trait received a great deal of press coverage prior to and during the campaign.

The fact that the images of the candidates changed during the course of this study was less surprising. Prominent among the researchers who had previously found images to change over time were Lang and Lang (1962) and Nimmo and Savage (1976). In the research conducted during the 1976 campaign, Patton (1978) also confirmed this hypothesis. If the images of the candidates were related to the candidate preferences of the voters, then it would be expected that the candidate images would change at least in relation to the changes in candidate preference.
Perceptual Stability and Changes in Images

The second research question inquired about the relationship between the changes in the image of one candidate and the changes in the image of his opponent. The results of this study indicated that there was little relationship between the changes in one candidate's image and the changes in his opponent's image over time. The perceptual stability hypothesis had predicted that changes in the image of one candidate would be mirrored by changes in the image of his opponent that were the inverse of the changes in the first candidate. In this study the only item of the images of the candidates that demonstrated this relationship was the item "persuasive". With this item there was a statistically significant negative correlation between the changes in the image scores of one candidate and the image scores of his opponent.

Although the debates were a win-lose proposition, especially in the eyes of the media, the subjects did not tend to polarize the images of the candidates after watching the debates. McGrath and McGrath (1962) had suggested that this polarization was the strongest during the 1960 debates for partisan voters. Similar analysis of the images of partisans in the 1976 debates did not produce similar results. Cherwitz, King, Kruse and Martin (1977) found "while one would expect those committed to a candidate to express polarized views of their candidate and the opponent(s), this did not occur to any significant degree" (260) in the 1976 campaign. Anderson and Avery (1978), on the other hand, found that those voters whose views of the candidates did become polarized were the largest category of voters in their study.
Even though studies appeared to come to different conclusions in their analysis of the results of elections with regard to the perceptual stability hypothesis, a closer examination of the studies revealed that support for or rejection of the perceptual stability hypothesis were being determined in ways that were not consistent across studies. If one were to define support for the perceptual stability hypothesis as a general tendency on the part of the subjects to view one candidate more favorably while at the same time viewing his opponent less favorably over time, then it would not be difficult to confirm the hypothesis. This study examined such tendencies among various groups of subjects and found that some groups displayed such tendencies and other groups did not. If one were to define support for the perceptual stability hypothesis as a clear relationship between the changes in image items of one candidate and the changes in the same image items of his opponent, the perceptual stability hypothesis would be more difficult to confirm. When this study examined the relationship between changes in each item for one candidate and changes in the same items for his opponent, the perceptual stability hypothesis had to be rejected for every item except persuasive. Similarly, when other studies were examined to determine in what way the perceptual stability hypothesis was defined, the results were fairly consistent with the findings of this study.

It was not surprising that the one item that did confirm the item by item analysis of the perceptual stability hypothesis was "persuasive". This item more than any other item suggested that in order for a subject to be consistent he could not be persuaded towards
one candidate at the same time he was persuaded towards his opponent. Persuasion in the debate and campaign setting translated ultimately into a choice between the two candidates. In this study the subjects seemed to be making that choice on the item "persuasive" at each testing.

Although changes in the images of the candidates were recognized at each of the testings, the changes in the image of one candidate were not related to changes in the image of the opposition candidate on a one-to-one basis. Overall, however, there was a polarization that occurred between the images of the two candidates. This general tendency to view one candidate increasingly more positively while at the same time viewing the other candidate increasingly more negatively over time was observed among various groups of subjects and will be discussed in later sections of this chapter. Party preference groups were one of the categories of subjects that tended to confirm this polarization in a general way.

**Party Preference and Images**

The third research question asked what the relationship was between party preference and the images of the candidates. Results of this study indicated that the only difference between Republicans, Independents and Democrats in their views of the "ideal" candidate for President was on the liberal-conservative item. Predictably Republicans preferred a slightly conservative President, Independents preferred a moderate President and Democrats preferred a slightly liberal President. Interestingly, Independents rated the "ideal" President on most of the image items between the ratings of the Democrats and the ratings
of the Republicans. Raters belonging to the party of a presidential candidate tended to view their party's candidate the most favorably while they viewed the candidate of the opposition party least favorably of the partisan groups. In terms of changes in the candidates' images, the Independents played the role of the loyal opposition, most often shifting in ways that were similar to the shifts of the party in opposition to either of the candidates. After the infamous second debate, Republicans moved away from the "ideal" President in their ratings of Ford to a greater extent than did the Democrats or the Independents when rating Ford. Democrats tended to move away from the "ideal" on more items over time for Carter than they did for Ford. Finally, the Independents tended to be more negative in their shifts in image scores over time in their judgements of Carter than they were in their judgements of Ford.

The subjects for this study were fairly evenly split between the Democrats, Republicans and Independents with 34.3 percent calling themselves Democrats, 34.3 percent calling themselves Independents and 31.3 percent calling themselves Republicans. Previous research suggested that the political orientations of children would be like that of their parents (Flanigan, 1972). In order to determine if that was the case with this group of subjects, subjects were asked to list the party of each of their parents. For those who responded there was a high correlation between the party of the students in this study and the party of their parents. When chi square values were determined for the subject's party and the party of the subject's fathers the $x^2$ was 22.071 with four degrees of freedom and a level of significance at
Similar results were obtained when comparing the party of the mothers and the subjects. Here the chi square was 22.294 with four degrees of freedom for a level of significance at .0002. In addition, where differences did exist between the subjects and their parents in party affiliation, the differences were predictable. Crotty and Jacobson (1980) indicated that younger voters tended to exhibit a higher frequency of identifying themselves as Independents than did older voters. In this study where 34.3 percent of the subjects identified themselves as Independents, only 20 percent of the fathers and 17 percent of the mothers were similarly identified as Independents.

In the 1960 election McGrath and McGrath (1962) found that party was strongly related to the images of the candidates with party members rating their party's candidate most favorably and the candidate of the opposition party least favorably. This study confirmed the findings of the earlier studies and similarly found that partisans saw their candidates more favorably than the candidate of the opposition party. Gallup (October 1976), Patton (1978) and Miller and MacKuen (1979) in the 1976 election also found that partisans rated their candidates more positively than they did the candidate of the opposing party.

In this study the Independent subjects tended to rate the two candidates consistently between the ratings given by the two parties. This confirmed the Nimmo and Savage (1976) studies and was further confirmed by Crotty and Jacobson (1980). The tendency for the Independents to rate Carter more harshly than they rated Ford on image items that was discovered in this study did not go unnoticed by the national pollsters either. Gallup (October 1976) noted this tendency among the
Independent voters on at least the interviews following the first debate.

One interesting finding of this study was that the Republicans shifted toward the negative pole on 75 percent of the image items following the second debate while the Democrats and Independents were not nearly so harsh on Ford at that testing. The reader will recall that the second debate was the occasion of the Ford gaffe concerning the lack of Russian domination over Eastern European countries. The media quickly jumped on this as a significant blunder (Congressional Quarterly, October 16 and December 11, 1976) which cost Ford the momentum that he had been building (U.S. News & World Report, October 18, 1976). Ford himself lamented his poor choice of words in that debate (Ford, 1980). For this group of subjects, however, the impact of that mistake in the second debate was felt most strongly by the President's own party members. Perhaps they were reacting to the probable or media-predicted negative impact of that blunder by themselves rating Ford more negatively than previously.

The fact that the subjects of this study who classified themselves as Democrats moved further from the "ideal" President image scores on more items for Carter than they did for Ford was predictive of an unforeseen relationship between candidate preferences and party preferences that will be discussed in the next section.

Candidate Preference and Images

The fourth research question sought to determine what the relationship was between candidate preference and the images of the
candidates. Analysis of the data indicated that party preference was not a predictor of candidate preference at the last two testings. The third testing saw a shift towards undecided voting positions for many of the partisan subjects, and the final testing saw more Democrats favoring Ford than Carter and more Republicans favoring Carter than Ford. Results also indicated that candidate preference was closely related to the image scores assigned to the candidates. The most positive image scores were given to the candidates for whom the subjects indicated preferences. The opposite candidate from the subjects' preferences were given the most negative image ratings and also demonstrated greater fluctuations in image scores over time. Undecided subjects tended to rate Carter more favorably than Ford, but also gave Ford increasingly more positive image scores at each successive testing. Voting groups that were classified as constant, crystallizers, shifters, waverers and disenchanted demonstrated image changes that matched the changes in candidate preferences that were indicated by the subjects in each of the groups.

One of the most interesting findings of this study was the tendency of the Democrats to favor Ford and the Republicans to favor Carter at the final testing. The researcher checked the original questionnaires against the coded data cards to be sure that a mistake had not been made in coding the responses that would have caused this unpredictable finding of the final testing. Since no mistakes in coding were discovered, the search for an explanation for this occurrence began. Several explanations were proposed and will be examined in this discussion.
An analysis of the candidate preference trends of the subjects shed some light on this shifting away from the subjects' own parties' candidates. The rather dramatic fluctuations that were noted in the image scores given by candidate supporters to the opposing candidates suggested that unusual shifts were taking place in the subjects' views of the candidates. The image ratings tended to confirm the shifts in voting preference that occurred at the final testing. In addition, the shift towards the undecided column in candidate preference at the third testing suggested that the expressed candidate preferences were not very stable at that time. Perhaps the shift was beginning to occur, but was stalled by the poor performance of Ford in the second debate.

Analysis of the responses to other questions at the final testing indicated that testing fatigue was occurring among a large number of the subjects. It was possible that the decreased number of subjects choosing to answer several of the questions at the final testing tended to skew the results. It was also possible that the subjects were trying to be helpful to the researcher, thinking that changes were expected and trying to provide those changes. Or it was also possible that the subjects were so tired of responding to similar questionnaires from this study that they rebelled by providing results that were not truly indicative of their attitudes toward the candidates. All of these suggestions are merely speculations that the researcher is unable to prove. Other research, however, did provide clues to this behavior at the final testing.

Nie, Verba and Petrocik (1976), along with other researchers, have suggested that parties have been decreasing in importance as
predictors of the vote over the course of several years. In addition, Gallup (December 1976) reported that 21 percent of the voters in 1976 said that they had previously intended to vote for a candidate other than the one for whom they finally cast their vote. The breakdown of subjects according to their changes in candidate preference in this study would tend to support the idea that candidate preferences did shift for the subjects at a rate that was somewhat greater than for the voting population as a whole.

Patton (1978) indicated a similar switching of votes among Democrats who were college students used in a study of candidate images in 1976. He reported that even though Democrat subjects "gave Carter significantly higher ratings than Ford, only 40 percent indicated that they would vote for Carter" (346). He further suggested that this result was supportive of the idea that party affiliation was weak among college students. When subjects in this study were asked to identify their level of commitment to a party only 14 of the 141 responding indicated a strong commitment to their party. Fifty-three indicated a moderate commitment to their party and 17 indicated a weak commitment. The use of the term "weak" in the questionnaire was unfortunate since few people like to classify themselves as weak anythings. So the response to the level of commitment to a party did support the explanation that was offered by Patton for similar shifts in preferences among college students. It is highly probable that high school students are easily influenced and have low levels of commitment to either party, guessing that they are of the party of their parents. Hence, the shift in candidate preference among partisans at the final testing could be
explained in a number of different and probable ways.

The results of this study confirmed the results of other studies in finding that candidate preference was highly related to image scores given to the two candidates. Image scores were more favorable for the candidate whom the subjects favored than they were for the candidate whom subjects opposed. Powell (1977), in his study of the 1976 election, found that candidate preference was instrumental in determining candidate images. Caffee (1978) found that the image scores improved for the favored candidates and decreased for the candidates who were not favored by the subjects tested. Likewise, Roberts (1981) reported an increased liking for preferred candidates. The results in this study differed little from the results of similar studies of the 1976 election with regard to the relationship between candidate preference and candidate images.

The final area of candidate preference that was examined by this study was the relationship between the changes expressed by the subjects in candidate preferences and the changes they reported in the candidate images. Because of the small size of the five categories, the researcher is reluctant to draw any profound conclusions in this area, but it should be noted that the changes in the image scores given by the various groups tended to correspond quite highly to the changes in candidate preferences that were expressed. Overall, this further supported the strong relationship that seemed to exist between candidate preference and candidate images. Images were generally predictive of candidate preference.
The fifth research question asked what the relationship between knowledge of the issues and candidate images was. Analysis of the data revealed that there was little relationship between the number of issues listed by a subject and the image scores given by the subject to the two candidates. Similar images scores were noted for those listing zero, one, and two or more issues. The undecided subjects appeared to be as knowledgeable about the issues as were the subjects who had already chosen a preferred candidate. Subjects tended to list fewer issues overall at the last testing than they had at previous testings, further indicating that testing fatigue had set in. Although a thorough analysis of the kinds of issues was not conducted, there did appear to be an increased tendency of subjects to list issues following a debate that were subjects of the debate between the candidates.

Studies of the 1976 debates indicated that the debates were more issue oriented than the press that followed the debates (Chaffee, 1978). Furthermore, most of the American voters said that they voted on where the candidates stood on the issues (Gallup, December 1976). Rose (1979) found that the debates were primarily vehicles for learning about issues instead of learning about the personalities of the candidates. Most people who watched the debates said they did so to find out more about the issues (Chaffee, 1978). Swanson and Swanson (1978) reported an agenda-setting function to the first debate similar to the observed tendency of the subjects in this study to list issues from the debates.

In terms of the amount of knowledge conveyed by the debates,
McLeod, Bybee and Durall (1979) reported that the debates did not increase the knowledge of subjects about the issues. In this study, although the subjects tended to list more issues after the first debate than before it, the overall number of issues listed following the debates did not increase greatly. Most important, however, was the finding that image scores did not differ much between the subjects based on the number of issues that they listed. It is likely that the image of a candidate is formed in the voter's mind in conjunction with the voter's perception of the candidate's stand on the issues. It is also possible that ability to list issues of the campaign was unrelated to concern for a candidate's stand on those issues. But most probably the results of this study are indicative of the fact that most high school students are not issue oriented and that they form images of candidates independent of the issues. Whatever the relationship between issues and images, it did not appear to be a strong one in this study.

Sources of Information and Images

The sixth research question sought to find out the relationship between the primary sources of information that subjects used to find out information about the campaign and the images of the candidates. The results of this study indicated that there were no differences in the changes observed in the candidates' images based on whether the subjects relied most on TV or some other source of information about the campaign. It was also discovered that those relying most heavily on TV tended to rate Carter more positively than the subjects relying most on other sources of information and that those relying most
heavily on other sources of information tended to rate Ford more favorably than those subjects who relied most heavily on TV to find out about the campaign.

Because of the large number of subjects relying primarily on TV, this study was not able to analyze the data in a meaningful way according to the traditional groupings of electronic media, print media and personal sources of information. Graber (1976) also found that a large proportion of the population -- 88 percent -- relied primarily on TV to learn about the campaign. This was consistent with Lowry's (1974) report of 66 percent of the population learning about the campaign primarily through TV in 1972, with a sizable increase in the number relying on TV occurring between the two presidential elections. Few studies have attempted to relate the images of candidates with the sources of information used by the subjects, and unfortunately this study was unable to contribute greatly to fill the void.

Interestingly, though, the differences that were observed between the two groups indicated that the greatest differences between the TV and other sources groups when rating Carter's image were on the items "straightforward" and "experienced". Those relying on TV saw Carter as much more straightforward and experienced than those who relied on other sources. Perhaps Carter's TV and debate appearances made him appear more straightforward and experienced than he came across over other forms of the media. The differences observed for Ford left equally intriguing questions.

The greatest differences between the TV and other sources groups when rating Ford's image were on the items "active", "bright", 
"admired", "straightforward", "reliable", "interesting", "effective", "persuasive", and "clear", which the other sources of information group rated Ford considerably more favorably than did the TV group. It was interesting that a greater number of items appeared with large differences between the groups than was the case for Carter. The items seemed to cluster around the idea that Ford appeared more vibrant, competent and trustworthy over other sources of information than TV. In recalling the campaign, it is not surprising that these subjects saw Ford as less persuasive, effective, bright, active, interesting, and clear on TV. His level of activity and effectiveness may have come across to the subjects better in the print media. Again, these results left food for speculation, but did not clearly establish a great difference in images based on the sources of information used by the subjects to gain information about the campaign.

Debate Winners and Images

The final research question asked what the relationship was between the perceptions of the winners of the debates and the images of the candidates. Examination of the data revealed that the subjects tended to view the candidate whom they thought won the debate more positively than the candidate whom they thought lost the debate. Although few subjects watched the last debate and few subjects answered the survey questions concerning the debate, there did appear to be a shift among the subjects in that a greater number indicated that they were undecided as to who won the debate at each successive testing. Similarly, subjects who indicated that they were undecided in candidate
preference in the election saw the first debate as a draw with a sizable
count of the remaining subjects indicating that they thought Ford won
the first debate. After the second debate the undecided subjects in
terms of candidate preference were even more undecided about the out-
come of the debate than they had been following the first debate. No
subjects who were undecided about their candidate preference indicated
that they thought Carter won the second debate. There was also a ten-
dency after the second debate for the Ford supporters to be more unde-
cided about the outcome of the debate. After the final debate subjects
shifted into the undecided column in terms of who they thought won the
debate at an even greater rate than previously. Overall, after each of
the debates there was a tendency for subjects who did choose a winner
of the debate to select the candidate for whom they would have voted
as the winner of the debate. The image scores given by the subjects
were also more positive for the candidate whom they chose as the winner
of the debate than they were for the candidate whom they thought lost
the debate. The image scores given to Ford after the first debate were
markedly more favorable for Ford than they had been just before the
first debate, suggesting that those who saw Ford winning the first de-
bate were not necessarily predisposed to favor him on the image scales
prior to that debate. The first debate, at least, appeared to have a
favorable impact on the image of Ford.

The results of the analysis of the relationship between select-
ion of debate winners and candidate images further supported the popu-
larly held idea that the debates were very important to the 1976 elect-
ion. "More than any other single factor, the debates shaped the
The candidates knew well the importance of the debates (Tiemens, 1978) and attempted to portray a favorable image. The changes that occurred after the first debate, especially in the image scores of those who thought Ford won the first contest, seemed to confirm the idea that the debates were indeed a factor in the way that subjects perceived the two candidates. The idea that Ford was helped by the first contest was one that was held not only by the subjects of this study, but by the public as a whole (Gallup, December 1976, 7).

The role of selective perception in the selection of winners of the debates was also confirmed by this study. Generally speaking, there was a tendency among subjects who supported a candidate to see their candidate as the winner of the debates. Swanson and Swanson (1978) found this tendency among the subjects for a different study during the same election. Selective perception was also found to be a factor in the 1960 debates. However, in this study the tendency for subjects to rate their candidates higher on the image scales or to choose their candidates as winners of the debates did not appear to be a blind tendency. Instead, with the large number of subjects indicating that they did not know who won the debates, the tendency in this study seemed to be for subjects to be quite reluctant to "jump off the deep end" in favor of their candidates. Subjects indicated an unwillingness to choose winners for the debates instead of suggesting that their own candidate won. In addition, they were far more likely to report that they were undecided as to the outcome of the debates rather than reporting that they thought the opposing candidate won the debates. This seemed
particularly the case for the Ford supporters following the second
debate.

The perceptions of the Independent voters with regard to the
winners of the debates was equally interesting. Even though there was
a clear tendency for undecided subjects to be undecided about the out­
come of the debates, when they did select winners of the debates they
tended to select Ford over Carter. Furthermore, the image scores that
this group gave to Ford over the four testings indicated that a shift
in perceptions had occurred as they clearly favored Ford on the image
scales over Carter at the last two testings, whereas they had favored
Carter over Ford on the image ratings at the first two testings.

The debates did appear to have an effect on the images that sub­
jects formed of the candidates. Even though Ford's momentum was slowed
after the second debate, he appeared to be the benefactor of the de­
bates among this group of subjects. This study did not determine what
effect the subjects themselves thought the debate had on their attitudes
and perceptions, however. It was possible that campaign events other
than the debates that just happened to coincide with the administration
of these questionnaires had the effect of changing the subjects' per­
ceptions of the candidates in the ways described above. With the amount
of media and classroom attention paid to the debates, however, even
though few subjects reported seeing the later debates, it is probable
that the 1976 presidential debates did have a strong impact on the
images of the candidates among these high school seniors.
Suggestions for Future Research

In an attempt to clarify the image concept in presidential elections, this study resulted in a confirmation of the idea that images were not stable concepts across time or candidates. Nor was the image of the "ideal" President found to be a stable concept. Although semantic differential scales were useful in research conducted previously, it may be that the nature of the images of political candidates does not allow this instrument to be used in a fruitful way. If factors cannot be compared across time and candidates in the measurement of images, then the semantic differential and the subsequent use of factor analysis to analyze the scale scores are not useful. Therefore, future researchers should use instruments for measuring candidate images that are more functional and manageable than the instrument selected for this study.

In addition, it is recommended that future researchers rely more heavily on subject-generated descriptions of the images of the candidates. This would assure the researcher of truly measuring the meaning that subjects ascribe to the campaign and the candidates instead of risking the measurement of concepts that are not salient for the subjects. Furthermore, this subject generated response would probably be more sensitive to the rapid changes in the issues of the campaign and the voters' perceptions of the campaign.

More frequent testings would be helpful in determining the short and long range effects of various campaign activities, including debates. However, if subjects are tested more frequently than they were in this study the questionnaire should be much shorter to counter the testing fatigue that was evident among the subjects used in this
study. Along with more frequent testings, it is suggested that researchers gather data about party preference at each testing in order to find out how stable that preference remains. Finally, asking subjects to indicate why they prefer one candidate over another would be useful in measuring the relationships between campaign variables. This kind of data would provide more specific, subject-generated reasons for various changes and occurrences.

In conclusion, this study found interesting relationships between candidate images and other campaign variables in the setting of the 1976 presidential debates. This study also made suggestions for future research on candidate images that may expedite and enhance the utility of subsequent research. But more than anything else, this study discovered the true meaning of a statement made by the eminent research team of Gladys and Kurt Lang (1961) following their study of the 1960 presidential debates:

To disentangle the influence of any single campaign event or issue on the outcome of an election is always difficult. In the case of the TV debates, it becomes a logical absurdity (277).
LIST OF REFERENCES


"Debate Viewers Say Ford Won First Meeting with Carter." The Gallup Opinion Index, 135 (October 1976) 1-2.


_____. "Effects of Victory or Defeat upon the Images of Political Candidates." Experimental Study of Politics, 3 (February 1974), 7-10.


"Public Says Candidate's Stand on Issues is Most Important Voting Factor." The Gallup Opinion Index, 135 (October 1976), 9-11.


APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
INSTRUCTIONS

Please rate the candidates named on each page on the scales that are provided. Note that there are seven steps on each scale. A mark at either end of the scale means "extremely." A mark in the position second from the ends means "quite." A check in the position third from the ends means "slightly." A check in the middle position on any scale means that you are neutral or undecided or feel that the scale does not have any meaning for you or for the candidate being rated.

The following is an example to help familiarize you with this type of question:

WEATHER

GOOD __ __ __ __ __ __ __ BAD

An "X" in the space closest to GOOD would indicate that you felt the weather was "extremely good." Likewise, and "X" in the space closest to BAD would mean that you thought that the weather was "extremely bad." If you checked the second space from the GOOD end it would mean that you thought that the weather as "quite good." Second from the BAD end would mean that you thought the weather was "quite bad." The third space from the GOOD end would indicate that the weather was "slightly good." Third from the BAD end would mean that the weather was "slightly bad." If you were not sure how you felt about the weather or if you were neutral toward it you would check the middle space.

Thank you for your participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpersuasive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unconvincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsophisticated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Please rank the following candidate characteristics in their order of importance to YOU in deciding for which candidate to cast your vote for President. Rank the most important characteristic 1, the second most important 2, the third most important 3, the fourth most important 4, the fifth most important 5, and the least important 6.

_____ Trustworthiness
_____ Dynamic Personality
_____ Experience
_____ Political Philosophy
_____ Achievement
_____ Effectiveness

Instructions: Please indicate below which candidate you would vote for, if given the chance, and the level of commitment you feel to that candidate. If you are totally undecided at this time, please indicate by circling UNDECIDED.

Circle ONE
CARTER        FORD        OTHER ______ UNDECIDED

How committed are you to the circled candidate?
Circle ONE
STRONGLY COMMITTED   SOMEWHAT COMMITTED   SLIGHTLY COMMITTED

Instructions: Please rank the following sources of information in the order in which you rely upon them for information about the candidates for President. 1 indicates the most important, 6 the least important.

_____ Radio
_____ Magazines
_____ TV
_____ Newspapers
_____ School
_____ Parents

What, if any, do you see as the ISSUES in this Presidential campaign?
Age _____ Year in School _____ Male _____ Female _____

Do you intend to attend college? (circle one)  
YES   NO   UNDECIDED

Are you now registered to vote? (circle one)  
YES   NO

If you are not now registered, do you intend to register when you reach the eligible voting age? (circle one)  
YES   NO   UNDECIDED

Father's occupation _______________________________________________

Mother's occupation _______________________________________________

My father attended formal schools through (circle one)  
GRADE SCHOOL   HIGH SCHOOL   SOME COLLEGE   COLLEGE DEGREE   GRADUATE DEGREE   DON'T KNOW   OTHER _________

My mother attended formal schools through (circle one)  
GRADE SCHOOL   HIGH SCHOOL   SOME COLLEGE   COLLEGE DEGREE   GRADUATE DEGREE   DON'T KNOW   OTHER _________

How do you classify yourself? (check only one)  
  _____ Extremely Conservative  
  _____ Quite Conservative  
  _____ Moderately Conservative  
  _____ Moderate  
  _____ Moderately Liberal  
  _____ Quite Liberal  
  _____ Extremely Liberal

How would you classify your father? (check only one)  
  _____ Extremely Conservative  
  _____ Quite Conservative  
  _____ Moderately Conservative  
  _____ Moderate  
  _____ Moderately Liberal  
  _____ Quite Liberal  
  _____ Extremely Liberal

How would you classify your mother? (check only one)  
  _____ Extremely Conservative  
  _____ Quite Conservative  
  _____ Moderately Conservative  
  _____ Moderate  
  _____ Moderately Liberal  
  _____ Quite Liberal  
  _____ Extremely Liberal
Please indicate below your party preference and commitment to that party. (check only one)

____ Strong Democrat
____ Moderate Democrat
____ Weak Democrat
____ Independent
____ Weak Republican
____ Moderate Republican
____ Strong Republican
____ Other (specify)

Please indicate the party preference and commitment to that party of your father. (check only one)

____ Strong Democrat
____ Moderate Democrat
____ Weak Democrat
____ Independent
____ Weak Republican
____ Moderate Republican
____ Strong Republican
____ Other (specify)

Please indicate the party preference and commitment to that party of your mother. (check only one)

____ Strong Democrat
____ Moderate Democrat
____ Weak Democrat
____ Independent
____ Weak Republican
____ Moderate Republican
____ Strong Republican
____ Other (specify)

Time 2 Did you watch the Presidential debate of Sept. 23, 1976?

YES  NO

If you watched the debate, who do you think won the debate?

FORD  CARTER  UNDECIDED

Why?

Time 3 Did you watch the Presidential debate of Oct. 6, 1976?

YES  NO

If you watched the debate, who do you think won the debate?

FORD  CARTER  UNDECIDED

Why?

Time 4 Did you watch the Presidential debate of Oct. 22, 1976?

YES  NO

If you watched the debate, who do you think won the debate?

FORD  CARTER  UNDECIDED

Why?
INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY

Hello. I'm Susan Brown, and I'm working on a masters degree at the University of Montana. In connection with my studies, I'm interested in finding out what opinions the high school students in Kalispell have about particular candidates and election issues. This is not a "test" or an "examination." Your teacher will not be able to see any one individual's answers to the questionnaire. All of the questions are just matters of personal opinion on which some people have one idea and other people have a different idea. What I am interested in is just your own honest, personal opinion on these questions, given to the best of your knowledge and understanding.

I can assure you that the answers that you give to these questions will be held in the strictest of confidence. All of the answers will be combined from all of the questionnaires and I will be working only with totals, not any one individual's answers. After you complete the questionnaires I will transfer your answers onto computer cards and will refer to you only by a code number. No one will know who completed the questionnaire.

If you have any questions about this project or about any part of the questionnaire, please don't hesitate to ask. If there are any of you who for moral, legal or personal reasons do not feel you can take part in this survey, please let me know at this time as I will be administering the questionnaire in shorter form again.

If there are no questions now, thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX B

IMAGE SCALES AND SOURCES OF IMAGE SCALES
FACTORs

Achievement*
  Convincing-Unconvincing
  Bright-Dull
  Admired-Rejected

Effectiveness*
  Interesting-Boring
  Effective-Ineffective
  Persuasive-Unpersuasive
  Clear-Vague

Political Philosophy**
  Conservative-Liberal
  Incompetent-Competent
  Unsophisticated-Sophisticated

Trustworthiness**
  Straightforward-Devious
  Trustworthy-Untrustworthy
  Phony-Real
  Reliable-Unreliable
  Sincere-Insincere

Dynamism**
  Ambitious-Unambitious
  Young-Old
  Active-Passive

Experience**
  Known-Unknown
  Experienced-Inexperienced

* Indicates that the scales were taken from Douglas (1972).
** Indicates that the scales were taken from Roberts (1973).
APPENDIX C

IMAGE FACTORS

Numbers represent principal factor loadings.
### Image Factors - "Ideal" President

#### Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admired .516</td>
<td>Bright .654</td>
<td>Sophist. .686</td>
<td>Convincing .839</td>
<td>Known .616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .601</td>
<td>Trustworthy .844</td>
<td>Real .673</td>
<td>Interesting .538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active .582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .540</td>
<td>Known .750</td>
<td>Convincing .748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent .640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .670</td>
<td>Sophist. .629</td>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced .683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustwrthly 1.009</td>
<td>Known .631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious .618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active .525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective .930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear .696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admired .593</td>
<td>Known .912</td>
<td>Convincing .564</td>
<td>Experienced .678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .507</td>
<td>Experienced .678</td>
<td>Persuasive .916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustwrthly .764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective .854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear .653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# IMAGE FACTORS - FORD

**Time 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .656</td>
<td>Ambitious .786</td>
<td>Known .826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .763</td>
<td>Active .577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere .771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .610</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal .573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .732</td>
<td>Known .880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired .549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .751</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent .508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting .517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective .627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear .625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .631</td>
<td>Known .758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .878</td>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced .995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere .689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious .644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent .736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .599</td>
<td>Effective .853</td>
<td>Sophist. .601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired .586</td>
<td>Persuasive .673</td>
<td>Known .605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .745</td>
<td>Clear .740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere .678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IMAGE FACTORS - CARTER

**Time 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd  .580</td>
<td>Experienced .559</td>
<td>Bright .692</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy  .839</td>
<td>Active .582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real       .719</td>
<td>Interesting .578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable   .773</td>
<td>Persuasive .681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent  .551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing  .837</td>
<td>Sophisticated .593</td>
<td></td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd  .691</td>
<td>Experienced .597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy  .715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real       .809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable   .686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting .641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective  .643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive .581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear      .858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing  .862</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy .629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright     .683</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable .603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired    .541</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere .611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting .599</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competent .613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective  .542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive .726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing  .749</td>
<td>Liberal  .536</td>
<td>Sophist. .652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright     .859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired    .619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real       .911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable   .686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere    .762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious  .547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting .796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective  .830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive .619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear      .714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

ADJUSTED IMAGE FACTORS

Numbers represent principal factor loadings.
### ADJUSTED IMAGE FACTORS - "IDEAL" PRESIDENT

#### Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>Known</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admiré</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admiré</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admiré</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ADJUSTED IMAGE FACTORS - CARTER

#### Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .721</td>
<td>Sincere .630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright .740</td>
<td>Active .584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired .599</td>
<td>Competent .551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .589</td>
<td>Interesting .722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .698</td>
<td>Effective .733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .654</td>
<td>Persuasive .643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .805</td>
<td>Interesting .566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .624</td>
<td>Effective .621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .692</td>
<td>Clear .874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .736</td>
<td>Sincere .714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright .794</td>
<td>Competent .708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired .749</td>
<td>Known .522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .685</td>
<td>Experienced .550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .762</td>
<td>Interesting .721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .719</td>
<td>Effective .799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .713</td>
<td>Persuasive .755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing .749</td>
<td>Sincere .762</td>
<td>Liberal .536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright .859</td>
<td>Ambitious .547</td>
<td>Sophist. .652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired .619</td>
<td>Interesting .796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd .746</td>
<td>Effective .830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy .828</td>
<td>Persuasive .619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real .911</td>
<td>Clear .714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable .685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

GRAPHS OF IMAGE SCORES FOR CANDIDATES

AS GIVEN BY ALL SUBJECTS
CANDIDATE IMAGES - TIME 1

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

"Ideal" Ford Carter
CANDIDATE IMAGES - TIME 2

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

"Ideal"  Ford  Carter
CANDIDATE IMAGES - TIME 3

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

"Ideal" Ford Carter
CANDIDATE IMAGES - TIME 4

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

"Ideal"  Ford  Carter
APPENDIX F

GRAPHS OF IMAGE SCORES FOR THE "IDEAL" PRESIDENT

AS GIVEN BY PARTY IDENTIFIERS
"IDEAL" PRESIDENT - TIME 1

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats
Independents
Republicans
"IDEAL" PRESIDENT - TIME 2

V1 Convinging
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats
Independents
Republicans
"IDEAL" PRESIDENT - TIME 3

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats
Independents
Republicans
"IDEAL" PRESIDENT - TIME 4

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats
Independents
Republicans
INDEPENDENTS' IMAGE RATINGS OF THE "IDEAL" PRESIDENT

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

. . . . . Time 1  . . . . . . Time 2  . . . . . . Time 3  . . . . . . Time 4
DEMOCRATS' IMAGE RATINGS OF THE "IDEAL" PRESIDENT

V1 Convincing  
V2 Bright  
V3 Admired  
V4 Straightfwd  
V5 Trustworthy  
V6 Real  
V7 Reliable  
V8 Sincere  
V9 Ambitious  
V10 Young  
V11 Active  
V12 Liberal  
V13 Competent  
V14 Sophisticated  
V15 Known  
V16 Experienced  
V17 Interesting  
V18 Effective  
V19 Persuasive  
V20 Clear

..... Time 1 .......... Time 2 ----- Time 3 Time 4
REPUBLICANS' RATINGS OF THE "IDEAL" PRESIDENT

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

..... Time 1  .......... Time 2  ...... Time 3  ...... Time 4
APPENDIX G

GRAPHS OF IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER

AS GIVEN BY PARTY IDENTIFIERS
CARTER - TIME 1

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats  Independents  Republicans
FORD - TIME 1

V1 Conving
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats  Independents  Republicans
FORD - TIME 2

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats
Independents
Republicans
FORD - TIME 3

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats
Independents
Republicans
FORD - TIME 4

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

Democrats  Independents  Republicans
INDEPENDENTS' RATINGS OF CARTER

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

..... Time 1 .......... Time 2 _____ Time 3 _____ Time 4
INDEPENDENTS' RATINGS OF FORD

V1  Convincing
V2  Bright
V3  Admired
V4  Straightfwd
V5  Trustworthy
V6  Real
V7  Reliable
V8  Sincere
V9  Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

..... Time 1       ....... Time 2        ----- Time 3      Time 4
DEMOCRATS' RATINGS OF CARTER

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

..... Time 1  .......... Time 2  ------ Time 3  ----- Time 4
DEMOCRATS' RATINGS OF FORD

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

1 2 3 4 5 6

..... Time 1  .................. Time 2  ______ Time 3  _____ Time 4
REPUBLICANS' RATINGS OF CARTER

V1 Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

... Time 1 ..., Time 2 ..., Time 3 ..., Time 4 ...
VI Convincing
V2 Bright
V3 Admired
V4 Straightfwd
V5 Trustworthy
V6 Real
V7 Reliable
V8 Sincere
V9 Ambitious
V10 Young
V11 Active
V12 Liberal
V13 Competent
V14 Sophisticated
V15 Known
V16 Experienced
V17 Interesting
V18 Effective
V19 Persuasive
V20 Clear

..... Time 1  .......... Time 2  ....... Time 3  --- Time 4
APPENDIX H

MEAN IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER ACCORDING TO

SUBJECTS' CANDIDATE PREFERENCE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORD IMAGE AS INDICATED BY THOSE PREFERING FORD</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.939</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>2.853</td>
<td>2.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>2.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>2.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>2.707</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>2.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>2.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>2.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.939</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>2.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>4.244</td>
<td>4.412</td>
<td>4.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.970</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>2.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>4.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.707</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>3.146</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>3.146</td>
<td>3.029</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.939</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>2.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>2.853</td>
<td>2.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>2.583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=33 N=41 N=34 N=24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>1.762</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>1.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>2.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>2.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.289</td>
<td>2.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>1.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>3.946</td>
<td>3.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>3.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>4.282</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>4.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>2.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.262</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>3.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>2.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.595</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>2.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>2.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>1.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>2.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=42 N=39 N=38 N=13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>3.073</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.171</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.238</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>3.122</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>4.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.537</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>3.079</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>4.289</td>
<td>4.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>3.634</td>
<td>3.921</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.262</td>
<td>3.098</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>3.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.643</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td>2.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>3.780</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>4.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>2.816</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>3.171</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=42 N=41 N=38 N=12
CARTER IMAGE AS INDICATED BY THOSE PREFERING FORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>3.686</td>
<td>4.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.091</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>4.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>3.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.364</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.371</td>
<td>4.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.697</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>4.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.171</td>
<td>4.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>3.486</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>2.744</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.788</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>3.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.242</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.543</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.788</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>3.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>3.091</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>4.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>4.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>3.371</td>
<td>4.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.939</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>4.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=33  N=39  N=35  N=24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>2.586</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>3.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>2.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>2.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.914</td>
<td>2.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>3.057</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>2.759</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>2.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>2.448</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>4.207</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.718</td>
<td>4.034</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>4.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.795</td>
<td>3.517</td>
<td>3.457</td>
<td>3.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.564</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>1.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>2.629</td>
<td>2.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td>3.414</td>
<td>3.257</td>
<td>3.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.107</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>3.171</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>3.364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=39  N=29  N=35  N=11
## Carter Image by Those Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>2.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>2.818</td>
<td>2.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>3.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>2.519</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>3.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>3.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.282</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>3.887</td>
<td>4.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.282</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>3.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>3.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>2.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>2.556</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>3.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>2.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>2.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>4.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=39  N=27  N=34  N=11
APPENDIX I

MEAN IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER AS INDICATED BY

CONSTANT VOTERS, CRYSTALLIZERS, SHIFTERS, WAVERERS

AND DISENCHANTED VOTERS
### Mean Image Scores of the Candidates

**AS INDICATED BY THE CONSTANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time 1 Ford</th>
<th>Time 1 Carter</th>
<th>Time 2 Ford</th>
<th>Time 2 Carter</th>
<th>Time 3 Ford</th>
<th>Time 3 Carter</th>
<th>Time 4 Ford</th>
<th>Time 4 Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>3.613</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>3.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.029</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>3.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>3.129</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>2.808</td>
<td>3.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>2.613</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>2.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.794</td>
<td>3.853</td>
<td>4.484</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.469</td>
<td>4.258</td>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>4.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td>2.871</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>3.294</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>3.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophist.</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.706</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.423</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.059</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>3.194</td>
<td>1.781</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>3.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>3.647</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>3.613</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>3.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>3.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 34, N = 31, N = 32, N = 26
### Mean Image Scores of the Candidates As Indicated by the Crystallizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time 1 Ford</th>
<th>Time 1 Carter</th>
<th>Time 2 Ford</th>
<th>Time 2 Carter</th>
<th>Time 3 Ford</th>
<th>Time 3 Carter</th>
<th>Time 4 Ford</th>
<th>Time 4 Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>3.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>4.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>4.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>4.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>4.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>2.556</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>4.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>5.429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=9 N=7 N=8 N=7
Mean Image Scores of the Candidates
As Indicated by the Shifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1 Ford</th>
<th>Time 1 Carter</th>
<th>Time 2 Ford</th>
<th>Time 2 Carter</th>
<th>Time 3 Ford</th>
<th>Time 3 Carter</th>
<th>Time 4 Ford</th>
<th>Time 4 Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophist.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1  N = 1  N = 1  N = 1
## Mean Image Scores of the Candidates

As indicated by the waverers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Time 1 Ford</th>
<th>Time 1 Carter</th>
<th>Time 2 Ford</th>
<th>Time 2 Carter</th>
<th>Time 3 Ford</th>
<th>Time 3 Carter</th>
<th>Time 4 Ford</th>
<th>Time 4 Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.769</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>3.692</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>3.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>3.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>2.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>3.769</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>3.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>5.231</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>3.769</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>4.231</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.846</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=13           | N=13         | N=13           | N=11          |
MEAN IMAGE SCORES OF THE CANDIDATES
AS INDICATED BY THE DISENCHANTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1 Ford</th>
<th>Time 1 Carter</th>
<th>Time 2 Ford</th>
<th>Time 2 Carter</th>
<th>Time 3 Ford</th>
<th>Time 3 Carter</th>
<th>Time 4 Ford</th>
<th>Time 4 Carter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophist.</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=5 N=5 N=5 N=4
APPENDIX J

MEAN IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER

ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF ISSUES LISTED BY SUBJECTS
### FORD IMAGE AS INDICATED BY THOSE LISTING ZERO ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.964</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>2.853</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>3.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>3.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.964</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>3.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>2.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>3.029</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>2.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>3.974</td>
<td>3.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td>2.553</td>
<td>2.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>4.235</td>
<td>4.184</td>
<td>3.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>3.216</td>
<td>3.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.393</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>2.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>3.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>3.342</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.971</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td>3.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>2.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>3.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=28  N=34  N=38  N=91
CARTER IMAGE AS INDICATED BY THOSE LISTING ZERO ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>2.893</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>2.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.893</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td>2.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>2.914</td>
<td>2.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>2.393</td>
<td>2.629</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>2.743</td>
<td>2.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>3.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>2.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td>4.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>2.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>3.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>2.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>2.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.743</td>
<td>2.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=28  N=28  N=35  N=96
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>3.105</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.938</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.263</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straigtfwd</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.563</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>4.053</td>
<td>3.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>3.938</td>
<td>4.053</td>
<td>2.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>3.263</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.632</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>3.158</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.263</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16 N=16 N=19 N=5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.632</td>
<td>4.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>3.632</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>4.188</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>3.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.895</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>3.895</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>3.842</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>3.579</td>
<td>4.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>3.316</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>4.562</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16   N=15   N=19   N=5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>3.304</td>
<td>3.120</td>
<td>3.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.019</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td>3.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>2.859</td>
<td>2.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td>2.989</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>2.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>2.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>2.989</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>2.761</td>
<td>2.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>2.685</td>
<td>3.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>3.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.183</td>
<td>4.141</td>
<td>4.141</td>
<td>4.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.894</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>2.315</td>
<td>3.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>3.837</td>
<td>3.696</td>
<td>4.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td>2.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>2.793</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>2.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>3.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.135</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>3.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.962</td>
<td>3.435</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=104  N=92  N=92  N=28
### Carter Image as Indicated by Those Listing Two or More Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.240</td>
<td>2.376</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>3.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>2.198</td>
<td>3.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>2.418</td>
<td>3.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>2.315</td>
<td>3.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>3.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.058</td>
<td>2.459</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>3.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>3.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td>3.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>1.988</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>3.918</td>
<td>3.945</td>
<td>4.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>3.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>4.165</td>
<td>4.174</td>
<td>3.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>3.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>3.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.558</td>
<td>2.694</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>3.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>4.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>2.106</td>
<td>2.435</td>
<td>2.446</td>
<td>3.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>3.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td>3.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2.221</td>
<td>2.553</td>
<td>2.196</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=104  N=85  N=92  N=29
APPENDIX K

MEAN IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER

ACCORDING TO THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF INFORMATION

RELIED UPON BY SUBJECTS

TO GAIN INFORMATION ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Ford TV</th>
<th>Ford Other Sources</th>
<th>Carter TV</th>
<th>Carter Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>2.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>2.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.177</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>2.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>2.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.241</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>2.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.244</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>2.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.165</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>2.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>2.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.608</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>2.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.367</td>
<td>4.508</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td>3.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>2.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td>3.780</td>
<td>4.051</td>
<td>4.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.316</td>
<td>3.254</td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td>2.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>3.847</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>3.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>2.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td>2.633</td>
<td>3.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>3.831</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>2.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.342</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>2.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.241</td>
<td>3.288</td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>2.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.810</td>
<td>3.627</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>2.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=79  N=59  N=79  N=59
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ford TV</th>
<th>Ford Other Sources</th>
<th>Carter TV</th>
<th>Carter Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.352</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>2.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>2.901</td>
<td>2.774</td>
<td>2.171</td>
<td>2.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.085</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>2.586</td>
<td>2.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>3.048</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>2.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.014</td>
<td>2.952</td>
<td>2.171</td>
<td>2.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.070</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>2.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>2.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>2.721</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.817</td>
<td>2.361</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>2.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.225</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td>3.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.887</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>2.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.887</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>4.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.099</td>
<td>2.903</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>2.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>3.314</td>
<td>3.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.535</td>
<td>2.672</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>2.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>2.478</td>
<td>2.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>3.258</td>
<td>2.343</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>2.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.620</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=71       N=62       N=70       N=55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ford TV</th>
<th>Ford Other Sources</th>
<th>Carter TV</th>
<th>Carter Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>2.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.265</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>2.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.029</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>2.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.377</td>
<td>2.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.191</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>2.449</td>
<td>2.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>2.698</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>2.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>2.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>3.812</td>
<td>4.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>2.406</td>
<td>2.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>4.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>2.778</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>2.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.338</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>3.015</td>
<td>3.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>2.435</td>
<td>2.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>2.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>2.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>2.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.221</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>2.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.574</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>2.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68  N = 63  N = 69  N = 62
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Ford TV</th>
<th>Ford Other Sources</th>
<th>Carter TV</th>
<th>Carter Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>2.586</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.579</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>2.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>2.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.596</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>2.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>2.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>2.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>2.431</td>
<td>2.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>2.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.596</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.232</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>3.776</td>
<td>4.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>2.655</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.893</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>4.138</td>
<td>4.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>2.855</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>2.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>3.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>2.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.719</td>
<td>3.091</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>2.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>2.431</td>
<td>2.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>2.673</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>2.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.895</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=57 N=55 N=58 N=56
APPENDIX L

MEAN IMAGE SCORES FOR FORD AND CARTER

ACCORDING TO SUBJECTS' SELECTION OF WINNERS OF THE DEBATES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=13  N=12  N=9  N=4
CARTER IMAGE AS INDICATED BY SUBJECTS WHO THOUGHT CARTER WON THE DEBATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.808</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>4.458</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>1.862</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=26        N=24        N=15        N=3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td>3.423</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>2.280</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.038</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>5.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.577</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>3.692</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.577</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>4.038</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=26  N=26  N=15  N=3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>4.444</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>5.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>4.556</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>5.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.231</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.556</td>
<td>5.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=13  N=12  N=9  N=4
FOR IMAGE AS INDICATED BY SUBJECTS
UNDECIDED ABOUT WINNER OF DEBATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.233</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>3.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.292</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>2.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.979</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.854</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>4.771</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>4.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>3.917</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>2.542</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>2.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.188</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>4.313</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=48  N=48  N=30  N=12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>2.978</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>3.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admired</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>3.621</td>
<td>3.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightfwd</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>2.937</td>
<td>2.804</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>4.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>3.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>4.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>2.804</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>2.391</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td>3.586</td>
<td>3.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>2.689</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>3.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>2.911</td>
<td>3.433</td>
<td>3.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>3.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>3.021</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>4.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>4.385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=48  N=46  N=30  N=13