

ANALYSIS OF AGE-RELATED DIFFERENCES IN POLITICAL MESSAGE  
FRAMING EFFECTS

by

HAYLI MORRISON

B.A., Lee University, 2003

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

A.Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications  
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

2016

Approved by:

Major Professor  
Dr. Louise Benjamin

# **Copyright**

HAYLI MORRISON

2016

## **Abstract**

This experimental research builds upon the health communications study completed by Rustam Haydarov in 2010, with a similar approach to ascertain how an individual's age might influence their reaction to political messages. Using a typology of frames by Levin, Schneider and Gaeth (1998), the study utilizes an older demographic (ages 55-70) and a younger comparison group (ages 18-33) to determine a) if both groups find positive advertising messages more favorable than negative advertising messages and b) if the older demographic is more wary than younger counterparts when discussing current events and the future of America.

The study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to determine reactions to goal-oriented and loss-oriented message framing in four mock print political campaign advertisements focusing on the topics of healthcare and college education financing. There was greater prevalence of strongly negative and strongly positive reactions among the younger demographic, except in the case of the loss-framed healthcare ad. The older group reacted more strongly to that particular ad, concerning an issue which had great relevance to them. Of the two age groups, the older demographic registered a more even-keeled reaction across the four ads. Overall, this study has focused on how message frame, topic and age of the message receiver combine to affect message resonance in the context of political communications.

# Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Dedication .....	vii
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	1
Moderating Factors in Processing of Goal-framed Messages .....	2
Senior Response to Message Framing .....	4
Effectiveness of Fear Appeals .....	6
Chapter 2 - Methodology .....	11
Chapter 3 - Results.....	17
Likeability and Credibility.....	18
Chapter 4 - Discussion .....	24
The Combined Effects of Age and Message Context.....	24
Favorability versus effectiveness.....	25
Levels of wariness among the voting public .....	25
Voter psychology .....	26
Limitations and Future Research .....	28
References.....	30
Appendix A - Survey and responses .....	33
Survey .....	33
Responses, ages 18-33 .....	38
Responses, ages 55-70 .....	59

## List of Tables

Table 2.1: Inter-rater agreement for thought-listing task, ages 55-70 .....	15
Table 2.2: Inter-rater agreement for thought-listing task, ages 18-33 .....	15
Table 3.1: Comparison of means – advertisement likeability.....	19
Table 3.2: Comparison of means – advertisement credibility .....	20
Table 3.3: Rater A/B cross-tabulation for words from thought-listing task, ages 55-70.....	22
Table 3.4: Rater A/B cross-tabulation for words from thought-listing task, ages 18-33.....	23

## **Acknowledgements**

I am grateful for this opportunity for academic and professional growth in the A.Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications. My graduate school cohorts and wonderful professors mentored, supported and encouraged me throughout this experience in ways that at times were profoundly selfless.

I can unequivocally state that Dr. Louise Benjamin is the reason I completed this program. Her persistence, encouragement and wise advice helped me overcome challenges and complete my study. Dr. Steve Smethers was the first professor to encourage me, and I am grateful for the graduate teaching assistantship and professional connections he helped me secure. Dr. Nancy Muturi also offered continual encouragement and reassurance through challenging life circumstances. I am grateful to Dr. Sam Mwangi and Dr. Bill Schenck-Hamlin for their service on my committee and helping me stretch my understanding of research questions and data presentation.

I am grateful to Douglas and Lucinda Anstaett for investing in scholarship for journalism and mass communications students. I am also grateful to the U.S. Army and Kansas State University for helping to make my graduate education financially possible.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the sacrifice of my husband, Tim Morrison, and children, Michael and William, as I took time away from family to attend class, write and study. They continually supported and encouraged me. I am proud my children will see me graduate and know what it means to persist and accomplish a goal, with help from so many.

## **Dedication**

I wish to dedicate this thesis to the memory of Dr. Todd Simon, who originally encouraged my interest in political communications. As an expert in this arena, his enthusiasm and insight drove the focus of my study. His untimely passing left a mark on the entire Kansas State University community, and I am grateful for his influence in my life.

## Chapter 1 - Introduction

The way in which choices are presented can have a dramatic impact on the decisions people make (Choi 2006). Thus, it is critically important to carefully consider how to present, or “frame,” an issue. Audiences evaluate messages against individual points of reference and perceived level of risk. While individual perspective and point of reference are uncontrollable, a message creator *can* help sway outcomes through the use of a positive or negative message tone. Part of that consideration includes whether to use gain-oriented positive language, known as “gain frame,” or loss-oriented negative language, known as “loss frame” (Tversky and Kahneman 1981).

Application of loss framing within political communication might include messages of negativity that evoke fear and doubt, such as overt attacks on an opponent’s character, abilities, professional record or policy stances. More subtle negative overtones may be used, such as ominous music, stark images and a general sense of impending doom for all who dare disregard the message.

With roots in the field of psychology, message framing presents “the same critical information with objectively the same outcomes in a positive or negative light” (Haydarov 2010). According to Prospect Theory, a Nobel Prize-winning behavioral economic theory established in 1979 by Ian Tversky and Daniel Kahneman, individual judgments change based on a complex web of variables including message presentation. Prospect Theory focuses on risky choice framing, which requires subjects to weigh the likelihood of particular outcomes. For instance, Tversky and Kahneman’s study (1979) framed messages in terms of “lives saved” (positive gain frame) versus “lives lost” (loss frame). Subjects had to choose between option A



that presented either the gain frame of “some lives saved for sure” or the loss frame of “some lives lost for sure” and option B that presented the “chance of all lives lost or no lives lost.”

In addition to risky choice framing, researchers have also studied attribute framing and goal framing (Levin 1998). All three types of message framing present a similar outcome discussed in two different ways. Attribute framing is a surface evaluation of message appeal. For instance, positive attribute framing would market ground beef as “75 percent lean” while negative attribute framing would describe it as “25 percent fat” (Levin 1998).

Goal framing is action-oriented messaging that attempts to influence decisions by emphasizing outcomes. It always intends to persuade the subject to do something, and this study will specifically explore the application of goal framing in political advertising. An example of negative goal framing in political communication would be, “Vote for Candidate X or lose your Medicare benefits,” while positive goal framing would say, “Vote for Candidate X and preserve your Medicare benefits.” In goal framing studies that promote two different behavioral actions, negative goal framing is historically more effective (Haydarov 2010). By assessing individual perceptions of advertising likeability and credibility, this study will explore whether negative goal framing is still more effective and how message reactions correlate with an individual’s age. In other words, this study will explore the question: **What is the relationship of age to the perception of goal-framed messages as likeable and credible?**

### **Moderating Factors in Processing of Goal-framed Messages**

Studies show that a few moderating factors in message framing can create interactive effects. These include mood, behavior advocacy and political sophistication. One study (Yan et al. 2010) showed that gain-framed messages emphasizing benefits are most effective when two other conditions are in place: (1) the message receiver was in a positive mood and (2) the

message advocated a particular behavior. On the contrary, loss-framed messaging emphasizing risk showed stronger results when the message receiver was in a sad mood and the message warned against certain behavior.

Although Yan's study examined health communication, it offers valuable insight for political campaigns — particularly in its recommendation to consider programming context when buying ad time. Specifically, Yan's study states that loss-framed messages are more effective when placed within tense, dramatic programming or the evening news. Alternatively, gain-framed messages are more effective when placed within comedy programming (Yan et al. 2010).

In another message framing study, Lee and Chang (2005) theorized that political sophistication levels could alter message framing effects. In addition, this study uncovered an important third variable — the nature of the message. The study discovered that voters with relatively low levels of political sophistication prefer to see socioeconomic issues framed in a more upbeat, positive manner. Meanwhile, voters with relatively high levels of political sophistication care more about political and ideological issues. Furthermore, sophisticated voters “prefer a soft-line message framing approach with a positive tone more than a die-hard message with a negative tone” (Lee and Chang 2005).

In studying strategies for effectively engaging followers via the Internet, Passy and Giugni (2001) came to a similar conclusion. There, the nature of the message also had bearing on the outcome. In addition to programming context, political sophistication and nature of the message, is age also a moderating factor in the effects of positive, gain-framed messages and negative, loss-framed messages? That is the issue explored in the present study.

## Senior Response to Message Framing

Consumer studies of the so-called “elderly market” published more than twenty years ago revealed consumers age 65 and older appeared generally “less sophisticated about the marketplace” than did a broader national population sample (Benet, Pitts and LaTour 1993). However, this same study supported the concept that market sophistication levels may increase as the more highly educated Baby Boomers start to comprise the older demographic. With increased market sophistication, political savvy would likely also increase. Nearly two decades ago, the elderly tended to focus political decision-making efforts first and foremost on the individual characteristics of politicians (Riggle and Johnson 1996). These voters, median age 72, often engaged in “satisficing,” scanning the candidates only until they found one that satisfied minimum requirements. For instance, such a basic detail as a candidate’s party affiliation might be sufficient criteria to influence older voters. However, younger voters, median age 24, when studied alongside their elders, tended to be more issue-centric and comprehensive in their political decision-making strategies (Riggle and Johnson 1996).

Cognitive processing slows with age, one factor that will always set older voters apart (Riggle and Johnson 1996). Cognitive speed might affect the impact of negative advertisements due to frequent comparison and contrast of elements between two political candidates, which in fact may be the most mentally demanding type of advertising to watch. Meirick (2002) notes, “point-by-point contrasts between alternatives prompt viewers to engage in more mental activity and elaboration.”

Such contrasts in comparison ads can be highly effective. Tedesco (2002) found these ads reduced the percentage of undecided voters from 44 to 24 percent. However, because comparison ads garner so much more attention and stronger reactions, message strength and

accuracy are critical in that format. Lastly, because comparison advertising requires such a high degree of mental processing, it may not be an ideal structure for targeting the older electorate because of their relatively slow cognitive processing.

Older audiences tend to prefer unambiguous, information-driven advertising rather than entertaining or emotional advertising. This politically-seasoned group of voters also tends to be more skeptical than their younger counterparts when it comes to negative or deceptive advertising. In this regard, the younger electorate is more vulnerable, at risk of giving credence to vague messages and outright deception as long as the advertisement is entertaining (Tinkham et al. 2009).

Although older voters prefer information-driven advertising, they do find it more difficult to process highly informational advertisements aimed directly at them (Tinkham et al. 2009). This research on age-related cognitive delays feeds concerns about senior susceptibility to devious advertising. The American Association for Retired Persons (AARP) even issued press releases regularly during the 2006 mid-term elections to warn seniors about scary ads that painted bleak futures for key social programs like Medicare and Social Security (Tinkham et al. 2009). Fast-forward two years later, however, and the AARP ran its own ominous ads warning seniors of possible changes to Medicare (McAuliff 2011).

The AARP is not alone in its concerns about senior vulnerability. Within American society as a whole, the older population is “commonly perceived as a vulnerable group,” in terms of being easily duped and highly afraid of victimization (Benet, Pitts and LaTour 1993). There is a history of seniors registering fearful reactions to negative, loss-framed messaging (Benet, Pitts and LaTour 1993). However, the past 20 years of academic research have failed to employ much simultaneous observation of loss-framed advertising effects on older and younger voters.

Over twenty years ago Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) suggested that the older population is actually less fearful, contrary to prevailing societal notions. By analyzing discussion of 10 crime victimization categories, Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) found that age was negatively correlated with the fear index. In other words, even the oldest study participants, ages 75 and up, were less afraid than the youngest ones aged 18 to 34.

Ferraro and LaGrange's finding implied that American society exaggerates senior susceptibility to fear appeals. In fact, more contemporary fear-of-crime studies have highlighted the inaccuracy of societal perceptions that perceived "vulnerable" groups such as women or seniors are more fearful. Other factors held more significance in these studies, including locality and social class. Still, researchers have yet to define any one individual trait that best indicates the likelihood of fear susceptibility (Wynne 2008). Because age could be a factor influencing advertising message effects, an updated look at this issue of framing is warranted.

### **Effectiveness of Fear Appeals**

Opinions vary widely on whether fear appeals are effective in advertising. A wide body of research supports the claims that fear appeals can encourage desired behavior in health campaigns (Yan et al. 2010, Hastings et al. 2004). However, Witte (2000) argues that a complex set of variables underlie the effectiveness of fear appeals, including individual levels of anxiety. Thus, political campaign clearly should not rely on fear appeals alone to bring about change.

In looking at political campaigns from the last decade, fear appeals have certainly yielded mixed results. For instance, Zaluzec (2010) points out that the 2000 race between George W. Bush and Al Gore reflected equal amounts of fear-based messaging on each side. The 2004 race between George W. Bush and John Kerry reflected slightly higher usage of fear-based messaging by the Bush campaign. Nevertheless, Bush won both races. Zaluzec (2010) implies that there is a

positive correlation between fear appeals and political success, especially if the message is specifically crafted for relevance to each different target audience.

More recently, the Pew Research Center for People & the Press assessed the public's reaction to negativity in political campaigns. The public gave President Barack Obama's 2008 campaign a grade of B+ after its noted emphasis on positive watchwords like "hope" and "change." His 2008 opponent John McCain, on the other hand, earned a grade of C+ after a campaign laden with negativity and fear. Fast-forward to 2012: Obama and opponent Mitt Romney earned grades of C+ and C, respectively, in the Pew survey for a race that was much more vicious and personal on both sides. The biggest complaint among respondents to the survey was failure by both camps to stick to the most critical issues such as the economy (CBS Charlotte 2012).

Regardless of effectiveness, some researchers label fear-based messaging as irresponsible and unethical with tremendous potential for backlash (Pinkleton et al. 2002; Benet et al. 1993; Hastings et al. 2004; Jasperson and Fan 2002). Hastings (2004) points out that the few existing real-world field studies of fear appeals show heightened public awareness of the candidate and perhaps even an attitude change, but no significant impact on behavior. Furthermore, Hastings (2004) points to ethical concerns such as increased anxiety or complacency on the part of the electorate. Because fear appeals are such a complex notion, advertisers should pre-test effectiveness within their target market, to ensure the advertisements are generating energy and motivation to act — as opposed to just generating nervous tension that could have a paralyzing effect on the audience (Henthorne, LaTour and Natarajan, 1993). While backlash is certainly an effect observed by Phillips, Urbany and Reynolds in their study of college-aged voters (2008), they also observed three other reactions to negative political advertising: reinforcement of

existing voter positions, defensive reactionary stances, and voter position changes known as “voter migration.”

Phillips et. Al (2008) point out that negative, fear-based advertising appears to have longer memory hold than positive ads. This helps explain the so-called “sleeper effect” showing a correlation between increased voter migration and the amount of time that lapses since they view negative political advertisements (Lariscy and Tinkham, 1999).

Although message presentation is sometimes an afterthought for those in elected office, the concept is integral to winning elected office (Bai 2005). One of the most common dilemmas facing political campaign managers is whether the message should take a negative, loss-framed approach, often designed to incite fear or worry. On the other hand, if campaign managers used positive gain frames, their messages could focus instead on future potential gains for society.

The American political arena has seen recent noteworthy successes that made minimal use of negative, loss-framed messaging (Markman, 2009). The 2008 campaign of President Barack Obama and 2010 campaign of Sen. Scott Brown (R-Mass.) relied heavily on more gain-framed, positive, hopeful and inspirational messages. Interestingly, both the Obama and Brown campaigns saw tremendous success and historic results, even though both candidates were at times considered “underdogs” in the race.

While it is true that many voters claim to view negative political ads as distasteful, they can produce results nevertheless — though not always the intended result (Negative campaigning 2011). On the national stage, the effects of negative campaign ads can depend on a variety of factors like individual mood, political savvy and nature of the message (Yan et al., 2010; Lee and Chang, 2005; Passy and Giugni, 2001), but can voter age also have an impact on audience perceptions?

This study will take an updated look at the relevance and resonance of goal-framed political message framing among this older voter demographic, with comparison to younger counterparts, through the use of positive messages oriented around the concept of “hope for gain” and negative messages oriented around the concept of “fear of loss.”

Negative, loss-framed political messages are clearly very prevalent in the American political arena, particularly when targeting the senior population. To assess whether such negative appeals are effective, this study will use the Millennial Generation born after 1980 as a comparison group to observe potential reactionary differences between Baby Boomers born between 1946 and 1964.

Currently the youngest voter group, Millennials, are notably more optimistic than members of preceding generations (Spiro 2006; Pew Research Center 2008). Thus it seems that such optimism would render this generation relatively immune to loss-framed appeals. Meanwhile, the first wave of Baby Boomers reached age 65 in 2010. Previously noted for youthfulness and optimism, Baby Boomers may be less so now as they begin to worry about financial security in retirement (Associated Press 2011). On the other hand, Baby Boomers have more experience with the American political scene, so they may be less swayed by the negative, polarizing messages of Washington, D.C. (Markman, 2009; Tinkham, 2009). This study will focus primarily on whether reactionary differences exist between these two generations; any underlying causes would require further study.

Because Baby Boomers are notoriously eager to take action and support causes they deem worthy (Ward 2011), it makes sense that an updated study on political decision-making will reveal issue-centric political decision processes among older voters and overall fewer disparities between these voters and their younger counterparts.



Although negative, loss-framed messages targeting seniors are as prevalent as ever, the Baby Boomers now populating the older demographic have a very different worldview from that of their predecessors. Based on this, the following hypotheses are advanced:

**H1: The Baby Boomer demographic (ages 55-70) and the younger comparison group (ages 18-33) will both find positive advertising messages more favorable than negative advertising messages.**

**H2: The older demographic will be more wary about current events and the future of America than their younger counterparts.**

## Chapter 2 - Methodology

The study focused on individual impressions of political advertisements, though participants were initially told only that the study was about “social issues.” Four separate political ads were designed for this study, with similar appearance but different verbiage and photos (Appendix A). All participants in this study viewed all four ads in random order and registered their reactions after each ad through a short series of questions.

PARTICIPANTS: For this study, participants were from two different age groups, recruited through local college and community groups in Manhattan, Kansas, and via web-based survey with participants across America. There were 100 people in the younger group, ages 18 to 33, and 100 people in the older group, ages 55 to 70.

Of the 200 U.S.-based participants, 42 percent were male and 58 percent were female. Only eight percent had no college education, while 53 percent had a four-year degree or graduate degree and 39 percent had some college or a two-year degree.

Geographically, by U.S. Census Bureau regions, 23 percent of survey participants came from the South Atlantic region: Delaware; Florida; Georgia; Maryland; North Carolina; South Carolina; Virginia; West Virginia and Washington, D.C. Slightly more than 17 percent came from the East North Central region: Illinois; Indiana; Michigan; Ohio and Wisconsin. About 15.5 percent came from the Pacific region and 15.5 percent from the West South Central region, the totality of which includes Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas. Finally, just under 12 percent came from the Middle Atlantic states of New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania, and the rest of the participants were scattered fairly evenly throughout the remaining states.

MESSAGE DESIGN: Four advertisements, included in Appendix A, presented gain-framed and loss-framed messaging about healthcare and higher education, two issues chosen for their likely relevance to the two age demographics. Candidate names in the ads were deliberately gender-neutral to avoid swaying individual perception, and the ads were specifically designed so the only variables were words and images, with no mention of political party affiliation.

Advertisement A, “sponsored” by Lee Russell, encouraged readers to “take charge of your education” and to “stand up and be counted” by voting for Lee Russell. It emphasized that “students could gain a lot this election” with things like “more federal funding, lower loan interest and less student loan debt.” Images related to college graduation and dedicated students in a classroom environment further emphasized this positive orientation.

Advertisement B, “sponsored” by Morgan Wilson, warned readers, “Your education is at stake!” It stated, “This election could be bad news for students” with things like “limited financing options, higher loan interest and more student loan debt.” The ad, which featured images of students appearing stressed and worried, concluded with the ominous message, “Don’t let Washington take over your life. Vote for Morgan Wilson.”

Advertisement C, “sponsored” by Lee Russell, encouraged readers to “take charge of your health” and to “stand up and be counted” by voting for Lee Russell. It emphasized that “seniors could gain a lot this election” with things like “more comprehensive Medicare, better doctor choice, and stable premiums.” Images featured happy, healthy retirees spending time at the gym, time with grandchildren and time with each other.

Advertisement D, “sponsored” by Morgan Wilson, warned readers, “Your health is at stake!” It stated, “This election could be bad news for seniors” with things like “limited doctor choice, more government control and unpredictable Medicare stability.” The ad, which featured

images of retirees in a healthcare environment or looking annoyed while dealing with paperwork and phone calls, concluded with the ominous message, “Don’t let Washington take over your life. Vote for Morgan Wilson.”

PROCEDURE: This study randomized the order in which ads were shown and allowed participants to remain anonymous, collecting non-identifying gender and age information for context purposes only. All participants viewed all four ads in random order, listing the first three words that came to mind after each ad. This thought-listing task was designed to obtain the subconscious, authentic first reaction.

Study participants then used a five-point Likert scale to express their opinions on each advertisement’s likeability and credibility (Appendix A). The Likert scale was structured as follows:

**How likeable is this ad?**

- 1 — very unlikeable
- 2 — fairly unlikeable
- 3 — not sure
- 4 — fairly likeable
- 5 — very likeable

**How credible is this ad?**

- 1 — not credible
- 2 — fairly not credible
- 3 — not sure
- 4 — fairly credible
- 5 — very credible

To reveal possible underlying motives, thought processes, patterns and potential areas of future study, all participants were asked at the conclusion to write answers to four open-ended questions:

- “From which source(s) do you prefer to learn about current events? Why?”
- “What sort of emotions do you typically feel when hearing about current events? Why?”
- When thinking about the future of America, do you typically feel more optimistic or pessimistic? Why?
- What do you consider the top three considerations when judging the merits of a political candidate?

These open-ended questions were included to gather more in-depth information and clarify the “why” behind the quantitative data. While the “why” was not the primary focus of this study, answers to these questions highlight opportunities for future study. Of particular interest is anecdotally assessing the level of cynicism and wariness, or conversely, the level of hopefulness and optimism, present within the two age demographics

Survey Monkey, a web-based survey tool, was primarily used for this study. SPSS statistics software was used to analyze the Likert scale results. For the thought listing task, the three words or phrases listed by participants after viewing each ad were compiled and manually scored by two independent coders as positive, negative or neutral thoughts.

**DEPENDENT VARIABLES:** There were two dependent variables for **H1: The Baby Boomer demographic (ages 55-70) and the younger comparison group (ages 18-33) will both find positive advertising messages more favorable than negative advertising messages.** These dependent variables, likeability and credibility ratings on the five-point Likert scale, were tested

with a 2 x (2 x 2) mixed ANOVA to assess whether participant age, advertising message context or advertising message frame influenced the likeability and credibility ratings. Age was a between-groups factor, while context and frame were within-subjects factors. Age had two levels (young and old), context had two (healthcare and education) and frame had two (positive and negative). Alpha was set at .05 in the SPSS analysis.

There were three dependent variables for **H2: The older demographic will be more wary about current events and the future of America than their younger counterparts.**

These dependent variables were “positive,” “negative” or “neutral” ratings for the words and phrases recorded during the thought-listing task. The words were rated by two separate coders analyzing the words independently of each other, assessing whether the words seemed positive, hopeful and optimistic (e.g. “success”); negative, pessimistic and angry (e.g. “liar”) or neutral words which often simply described the ads themselves (e.g. “cluttered”). The inter-rater agreement is shown for each age group in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. The Kappa coefficient of 0.891 for the older group and 0.911 for the younger group is generally considered a very good rate of agreement.

**Table 2.1: Inter-rater agreement for thought-listing task, ages 55-70**

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error <sup>a</sup>	Approx. T <sup>b</sup>	Approx. Sig.
Measure of agreement	Kappa	.891	.011	76.339	.000
N of valid cases		842			

**Table 2.2: Inter-rater agreement for thought-listing task, ages 18-33**

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error <sup>a</sup>	Approx. T <sup>b</sup>	Approx. Sig.
Measure of agreement	Kappa	.911	.010	84.127	.000
N of valid cases		967			

*Note.*

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptomatic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

There were 967 words or phrases recorded by those ages 18 to 33 and only 842 words recorded by those ages 55 to 70. The older demographic generated fewer records because they tended to think in two-word or three-word phrases, such as “politics in education,” whereas the younger demographic tended to think in terms of three separate words. To equalize the comparison of positive, negative and neutral words across both age groups, the results were converted to percentages of the whole. Answers to the four open-ended questions were also included to capture anecdotal insight into Hypothesis 2.

## Chapter 3 - Results

To test Hypothesis 1, the following assumptions were tested: (a) no outliers are present, (b) data are normally distributed, (c) variances are homogeneous, (d) covariances are homogeneous, and (e) sphericity can be assumed.

The raw data for the four within-subjects groups were converted to standardized residuals and inspected for outliers. Residuals were classified as outliers if any data points were equal to or greater than  $\pm 3$  standard deviations in a particular distribution. No positive or negative residuals for ratings of likeability or credibility across all with-subjects groups were equal to or greater than  $\pm 3$  standard deviations. Thus, no outliers were detected in the data.

The Shapiro-Wilk statistic was used to test whether the distribution for each combination of groups is normal. Three of the four within-subjects groups were significant at  $p \leq .05$ , which indicates that three groups departed from perfect normality. The Shapiro-Wilk test, however, is sensitive to minor departures from normality, especially when sample sizes are larger than 30 (Ghasemi and Zahedias 2012). The sample size for each group in this study was equal to 100.

Ghasemi and Zahedias (2012) argue that researchers should take further measures to determine whether their distributions depart importantly from normality. Further consideration typically involves the visual inspection of quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plots. Q-Q plots are graphs used to display the degree to which the quantiles of the normal distribution differ from the sample quantiles of the data. When the data fit the reference distribution, then the data points will lie on the reference line. Although not perfect, data points were not too distorted from the reference line, suggesting that the data violated the assumption of normality in minor ways only. Consequently, there is little reason to believe that the distributions depart importantly from normality.



Moderate departures from the homogeneity of variance assumption are often not a threat to mixed ANOVA designs unless group sizes are very unequal. The present study has both equal and large sample sizes. In this case, Field (2013) and Zimmerman (2004) recommend ignoring the assumption.

A further assumption of the mixed ANOVA is that covariances are similar across groups. For the likeability variable, covariances were homogeneous as assessed by Box's test of equality of covariance matrices ( $p = .80$ ). However, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices for the credibility variable was significant at  $p = .003$ . Field (2013) recommends the use of a more robust test statistic like Hotelling's trace if sample sizes are equal. The present study has equal sample sizes.

Sphericity is a condition in which the variances of the differences between all combinations of related groups (levels) are equal. However, it becomes an issue only when the levels of each independent variable are greater than two. Thus, sphericity can be assumed in this study.

### **Likeability and Credibility**

When comparing means of advertisement likeability, the within-subjects effect was significant. A main effect of message frame showed a statistically significant difference in likeability ratings between positive and negative frames across all contexts and age groups ( $F_{(1,198)} = 218.192$ ;  $p < .0005$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .524$ ). As shown in Table 3.1, positively framed messages were consistently ranked higher in likeability across all age groups and message contexts. This supports Hypothesis 1.

When comparing means of advertisement likeability, the between subjects effect was also significant. The mean scores for age of participants differ significantly at the 1% level: ( $F_{(1, 198)} = 6.44$ ;  $p = .01$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .031$ ).

**Table 3.1: Comparison of means – advertisement likeability**

Demographic		Likeability, Education +	Likeability, Education -	Likeability, Health +	Likeability, Health -
Younger	Mean	3.64	2.27	3.56	2.21
	N	100	100	100	100
	Std. Deviation	1.106	1.127	1.076	1.113
Older	Mean	3.11	2.13	3.31	2.01
	N	100	100	100	100
	Std. Deviation	1.278	1.022	1.245	1.000

When comparing means of advertisement credibility, the between subjects effect was not significant. Box’s test indicated that the assumption for equality of covariance matrices had been violated and therefore, the multivariate tests for Hotelling’s Trace will be reported.

A main effect of message frame showed a statistically significant difference in credibility ratings between positive and negative frames across all contexts and age groups ( $F_{(1,198)} = 218.192$ ;  $p < .0005$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .277$ ). As seen in Table 3.2, positively framed messages were consistently ranked higher in credibility across all age groups and message contexts. This supports Hypothesis 1.

There was a significant interaction effect between the type of frame and the age group, ( $F_{(1,198)} = 4.705$ ,  $p = .031$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .023$ ). This effect indicates that the credibility of an advertisement for different types of frames differed in young and old participants.

There was a significant interaction effect between the type of frame and the message context of the advertisement ( $F_{(1,198)} = 6.578$ ,  $p = .031$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .023$ ). This effect indicates

that the credibility of an advertisement for different types of frames differed in health and education contexts.

**Table 3.2: Comparison of means – advertisement credibility**

Demographic		Credibility, Education +	Credibility, Education -	Credibility, Health +	Credibility, Health -
Younger	Mean	2.96	2.65	3.10	2.46
	N	100	100	100	100
	Std. Deviation	1.004	1.058	.948	.989
Older	Mean	3.11	2.43	3.24	2.34
	N	100	100	100	100
	Std. Deviation	1.188	1.121	1.074	1.273

The results from the comparison of means support Hypothesis 1: **The Baby Boomer demographic (ages 55-70) and the younger comparison group (ages 18-33) will both find positive advertising messages more favorable than negative advertising messages.** Both age groups found positive advertising messages more likeable and credible than negative advertising messages, as shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. As mentioned previously, there was an interaction effect between age and advertisement credibility ratings. Of the two age groups, the higher credibility rating for both positive messages occurred among the older group, while the higher credibility rating for both negative messages occurred among the younger group.

The results of this study do not support Hypothesis 2: **The older demographic will be more wary about current events and the future of America than their younger counterparts.** To test this, content analysis was conducted using intercoder ratings and a cross-tabulation with SPSS. As shown in Table 3.4, the percentages of negative, positive and neutral words procured from the thought-listing task demonstrate a significantly stronger positive reaction to positive ads and significantly stronger negative reaction to negative ads in the

younger age group. In other words, there was clearly a more wide-ranging emotionality among the younger group and more even-keeled reactions among the older group.

Of all four advertisements, the negative healthcare ad elicited the strongest reaction from the 55-to-70 age demographic, and this was the only advertisement where they exceeded the reactionary level of their younger counterparts. For the 18-to-33 age demographic, the negative education ad elicited the strongest reaction by far. This is noteworthy because these ads were designed to appeal to those respective age groups.

This finding is in line with Prospect Theory, which grew out of Tversky and Kahneman's risky choice study — that is, people hate to lose more than they like to gain, particularly when the loss is very heartfelt and personally relevant.

**Table 3.3: Rater A/B cross-tabulation for words from thought-listing task, ages 55-70**

		<b>Rater A</b>											
		ED+ Pos	ED+ Neg	ED+ Neut	ED- Pos	ED- Neg	ED- Neut	H+ Pos	H+ Neg	H+ Neut	H- Pos	H- Neg	H- Neut
<b>Rater B</b>	ED+ Pos.	.43	0	.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED+ Neg.	0	.24	.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED+ Neutral	.01	0	.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED- Pos.	0	0	0	.07	0	.02	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED- Neg.	0	0	0	0	.57	.02	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED- Neutral	0	0	0	.02	.03	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Health+ Pos.	0	0	0	0	0	0	.45	0	.03	0	0	0
	Health+ Neg.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.14	.01	0	0	0
	Health+ Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	.03	.02	.31	0	0	0
	Health- Pos.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.06	0	.01
	Health- Neg.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.59	.05
	Health- Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.02	.26

**Table 3.4: Rater A/B cross-tabulation for words from thought-listing task, ages 18-33**

		<b>Rater A</b>												
<b>Rater B</b>		ED+ Pos	ED+ Neg	ED+ Neut	ED- Pos	ED- Neg	ED- Neut	H+ Pos	H+ Neg	H+ Neut	H- Pos	H- Neg	H- Neut	
	ED+ Pos.	.52	0	.04	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED+ Neg.	0	.17	.02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED+ Neutral	0	.01	.21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED- Pos.	0	0	0	.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED- Neg.	0	0	0	0	.64	.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ED- Neutral	0	0	0	.01	0	.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Health+ Pos.	0	0	0	0	0	0	.50	0	.03	0	0	0	0
	Health+ Neg.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.14	.02	0	0	0	0
	Health+ Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.31	0	0	0	0
	Health- Pos.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.12	0	.03	0
	Health- Neg.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.54	.04	0
	Health- Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.27

## Chapter 4 - Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine how a person's age influences reactions to political messages, specifically: a) whether positive political advertising messages resonate more than negative political advertising messages across age spectrums in terms of likeability and credibility and b) whether the older demographic appears more wary than their younger counterparts about current events and the future of America.

### **The Combined Effects of Age and Message Context**

Based on the results of the thought-listing task in this study, there appears to be a correlation between the age of an individual, the context of a message and the individual's reaction to that message. The older demographic, ages 55-70, registered more even-tempered reactions to the messages. Meanwhile, the younger demographic, ages 18-33, consistently reacted more strongly positive to positive ads and more strongly negative to negative ads – *with one exception*.

The negative health advertisement, which featured fear-centric verbiage and images of senior citizens distressed by the healthcare system, was the only advertisement where the older demographic reacted more strongly than their younger counterparts. In fact, it was that advertisement to which the older demographic reacted most strongly overall. Meanwhile, the younger demographic reacted most strongly overall to the negative education advertisement, which featured fear-centric wording and images of young adults distressed by the education system. Because the thought-listing task was designed to assess the immediate subconscious reaction to advertisements, these results seem to indicate that fear-centric wording can have stronger psychological resonance when the topic is directly relevant to the audience.

## **Favorability versus effectiveness**

In comparing the means of likeability and credibility as stated across all age groups participating in this study, there is a clear preference for positive messages. This supports Hypothesis 1 — that the Baby Boomer demographic and the younger comparison group will both find positive advertising messages more favorable than negative advertising messages. However, when comparing the results of the thought-listing task designed to assess the immediate subconscious reactions to advertisements, it becomes clear that negative advertising is more effective in terms of psychological resonance.

This effect was seen across both age groups through the results of the thought-listing task, because everyone registered stronger negative reactions to the negative ads than the strength of their positive reaction to positive ads. However, the negative advertisements generated the strongest negative reactions among both age demographics when the topic at hand and the advertisement's images pertained directly to that demographic. This finding is consistent with previous literature on political message framing.

The study results do support Hypothesis 1, because positive messages were stated to be more favorable in terms of likeability and credibility ratings. However, *favorability* and *effectiveness* are certainly two different things, and it would seem a political candidate would do well to target messages toward the latter goal.

## **Levels of wariness among the voting public**

The results of this study did not support Hypothesis 2, which stated the older demographic will be more wary about current events and the future of America than their younger counterparts. In looking only at comparison of means of advertisement and likeability, Hypothesis 2 may seem to be supported. After all, the older demographic rated higher credibility



for positive ads than the younger comparison group. The older demographic also rated lower likeability *and* credibility for negative ads than the younger comparison group, seeming to indicate lower tolerance for negative messages which could be perceived as wariness. However, this study was designed to look beyond that surface evaluation.

During the thought-listing task, reactions to positive and negative messages spanned a smaller range among the older group versus the younger group. In other words, the younger group tended to react considerably more positively to the positive ads and considerably more negatively to the negative ads. As stated previously, the one exception was the negative healthcare advertisement, which generated a slightly more negative reaction from the older group. This would seem to indicate more even-keeled reactions and lower levels of emotionality among the older group.

Looking specifically at the in-depth results of the thought-listing task, the highest positive word count in reaction to positive ads hit at 52 percent of all the words submitted for those ads by the younger group, compared to only 43 percent of all the words submitted for those ads by the older group. On the other hand, the highest negative word count in reaction to negative ads hit at 64 percent of all the words submitted for those ads by the younger group, compared to only 59 percent of all the words submitted for those ads by the older group.

### **Voter psychology**

It is interesting to note that the older group seems to react on a less emotionally varied scale than younger counterparts, but what does this really mean? Does it mean the older study participants are more tired? Are they more wary? Are they simply more mature and less emotional? This study was designed with a third component to gain a more substantive assessment of this phenomenon and to give insight into these questions.

The four open-ended questions at the end of the survey were geared toward revealing possible underlying motives and thought processes, revealing potential patterns and areas for further study in the future. These questions asked about the following: which news sources individuals follow; how they feel when watching coverage of current events; whether they feel more pessimistic or optimistic about the future of America; and what their top three considerations were when evaluating political candidates.

There was no significant difference between the age groups in feelings of pessimism or optimism about America's future. Specifically, of those who answered the open-ended questions, about 62 percent in both age groups stated feeling pessimistic about the future of America.

A stated perception of media bias arose as driving factors behind both pessimistic feelings and optimistic feelings. For instance, one 59-year-old male stated, "Pessimistic — media biased on both sides, reporting what they want." Yet, a 55-year-old female stated, "Optimistic. Bad news makes a bigger splash in the brain than good news, so good news is often edited out."

Another factor seen on both sides of the equation was the current state of human relations. For example, one 55-year-old female stated, "I feel optimistic because I think human consciousness is increasing and this means people treat each other with more respect." Meanwhile, a 29-year-old female stated she felt "pessimistic. All you hear is horrible things people do to one another."

Religious faith was another common denominator. For instance, whereas one 60-year-old male referenced prayer and faith in God as the basis for his optimism about the future, pessimism was found in several other cases linked to religious values. A 57-year-old female stating feeling pessimistic due to a perceived loss of religious freedom, a 55-year-old female stated feeling pessimistic because people have turned away from the American founders' "basic values" and a

65-year-old male stated feeling pessimistic because political activists “wrap themselves in religious BS to convince people they are doing it for the benefit of society.”

Answers to the open-ended questions clearly demonstrated that message framing studies can be very complicated because there really are two sides to every coin, dependent upon individual perspective and personal experiences. Personal bias will always be a wild card. This was further demonstrated in the thought-listing task, when the same advertisement — designed to be neutral in every way, even including gender-neutral candidate names and no indicator of political party affiliation — generated word responses like, “fear-mongering, negative Republicans” from one 31-year-old female and “scare, Democratic tactics” from one 66-year-old male.

In the discussion of optimism or pessimism about America’s future, one item emerged as distinct in the answers given by the older demographic. It became clear that if any one factor tempers fear and pessimism in older voters, it is their experience with political cycles. Thus, optimism was seen with the 61-year-old male who stated, “This is America and we survive,” the 55-year-old males who stated, “We are a strong country with a resilient economy” and, “The pendulum always swings eventually,” and other older males who cited American history and personal experience as reasons for optimism about America’s future. This is consistent with Tinkham’s inference that older voters have more political experience, so they put less stock in advertisements (2009).

### **Limitations and Future Research**

Naturally, there are some limitations to this study, and aspects that could have been structured differently. One key question was never asked: “Would you vote for this candidate?” Self-reporting always comes with some measure of censorship, whether conscious or

subconscious, so the answers to this question may not have been totally reliable. However, this question could serve to assess the effectiveness of the advertisements in a very concrete way. Essentially, how actionable are these advertisements? This study reveals how the advertisements make people *feel*, both consciously and subconsciously, but not whether they would drive people to *act*.

A second limitation to this study is the nature of the advertisement design. These ads were designed exactly identical, varying only in message and photos. Thus, it is easy to imagine that the real point of the study quickly became clear to participants, potentially influencing their responses. It is also easy to imagine that participants became disengaged by advertisement two or three due to a sense of boredom.

Areas of future study might include assessing whether political advertisements drive people to action and assessing the effectiveness of video or web advertisements compared to print advertisements. This study shows that, when it comes to the Baby Boomer generation, not much has changed from previous literature concerning reactions to political messages. However, future researchers might update the study for future generations.

## References

- Associated Press (2011). Baby Boomers getting nervous, poll finds. *The Washington Post*, April 6, 2011, A-12.
- Bai, Matt. (2005). The framing wars. *New York Times* July 17, 2005. Retrieved November 15, 2011 online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/17/magazine/17DEMOCRATS.html?pagewanted=1>
- Benet, S., Pitts, R. and LaTour, M. (1993). The appropriateness of fear appeal use for health care marketing to the elderly. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(1), 45-55.
- Bloomberg News. (2012). Karl Rove's strategies didn't pay off in many Election Day victories. *Dallas News*, Nov. 8, 2012. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2012 online: <http://www.dallasnews.com/news/politics/national-politics/20121108-karl-roves-strategies-didnt-pay-off-in-many-election-day-victories.ece>
- CBS Charlotte. (Nov. 27, 2012). Study: Public gives Obama re-election campaign C+ grade. Retrieved January 27, 2013 online: <http://charlotte.cbslocal.com/2012/11/27/study-public-gives-obama-re-election-campaign-c-grade/>
- Choi, Charles Q. (2006). "Framing effect" influences decisions. *MSNBC.com* Retrieved November 15, 2011 online: <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/14170927/#.TsKXC1bbKHN>
- Ferraro, K. and LaGrange, R. (1992). Are older people most afraid of crime? Reconsidering age differences in fear of victimization. *Journal of Gerontology*, 47(5), 233-244.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Los Angeles: Sage, 194.
- Ghasemi, A. & Zahedias S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 10(2), 486.
- Hastings, G., Stead, M. and Webb, J. (2004). Fear appeals in social marketing: Strategic and ethical reasons for concern. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(11), 961-986.
- Haydarov, R. (2010). Effects of attribute framing and goal framing on vaccination behavior: Examination of message content and issue involvement on attitudes, intentions and information seeking. (Unpublished graduate thesis). Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS.
- Henthorne, T., LaTour, M. and Nataraajan, R. (1993). Fear appeals in print advertising: An analysis of arousal and ad response. *Journal of Advertising*, 6(2), 61-70.
- Jasperson, A. and Fan, D. (2002). An aggregate examination of the backlash effect in political advertising: The case of the 1996 senate race in Minnesota. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(1), 1-12.

- Lariscy, R. and Tinkham, S. (1999) The sleeper effect and negative political advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 28(4), 13-30.
- Lee, Y-K. and Chang, C-T. (2005). Influences of message framing and political sophistication in political communication: An experimental study in Taiwan. Paper presented in the annual meeting of American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C. (NSC 94-2414-H-324-001-)
- Levin, I., Schneider, S. and Gaeth, G. (1998). All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 76(2), 149-188.
- Markman, A. (2009). Bipartisanship, spin and alignment: How language can change the political climate. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved April 13, 2011 online: <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/ulterior-motives/200902/bipartisanship-spin-and-alignment-how-language-can-change-the-political>
- McAuliff, M. (2011). AARP launches second ad to fight GOP Medicare plan. *Huffington Post*, June 16, 2011. Retrieved November 19, 2011 online: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/06/16/aarp-second-ad-republican-medicare\\_n\\_877944.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/06/16/aarp-second-ad-republican-medicare_n_877944.html)
- Meirick, P. (2002). Cognitive responses to negative and comparative political advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(1), 49-62.
- Negative campaigning can backfire in local political elections. Retrieved November 14, 2011 online: <http://www.killercampaigning.com/negative-campaigning-can-backfire-in-local-political-elections/>
- Passy, F. & Giugni, M. (2001). Explaining differential participation in social movements. *Sociological Forum*, 16(1), 123-153.
- Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2008). Young voters in the 2008 election. Washington, DC: Keeter, S., Horowitz, J. and Tyson, A.
- Phillips, J., Urbany, J. and Reynolds, T. (2008). Confirmation and the effects of valenced political advertising: A field experiment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(6), 794-806.
- Pinkleton, B., Um, N. and Austin, E. (2002). An exploration of the effects of negative political advertising on political decision making. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(1), 13-25.
- Riggle, E. and Johnson, M. (1996). Age difference in political decision making: Strategies for evaluating political candidates. *Political Behavior* 18(1), 99-118.
- Spiro, C. (2006). Generation Y in the workplace. *Defense AT&L*, Nov-Dec, 16-19.
- Tedesco, J. (2002). Televised political advertising effects: Evaluating responses during the 2000 Robb-Allen senatorial election. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(1), 37-48.

- Tinkham, S., Lariscy, R. and Avery, E. (2009). Political advertising and the older electorate. *Journal of Advertising*, 38(2), 105-119.
- Tversky, I. and Kahneman, D. (1981) The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453-458.
- Ward, S. 10 Baby Boomer trends and how to profit from them. About.com Small Business: Canada. Retrieved November 19, 2011 online:  
<http://sbinfocanada.about.com/od/businessideas/a/boomerbizideas.htm>
- Witte, K. and Morrison, K. (2000) Examining the influence of trait anxiety/repression-sensitization on individuals' reactions to fear appeals. *Western Journal of Communication*, 64(1), 1-27.
- Wynne, T. (2008). An investigation into the fear of crime: Is there a link between the fear of crime and the likelihood of victimization? *Internet Journal of Criminology*.
- Yan, C., Dillard, J. and Shen, F. (2010). The effects of mood, message framing and behavioral advocacy on persuasion. *Journal of Communication*, 60, 344-363.
- Zaluzec, J. (2010). The use of fear appeals in political advertisements: An analysis of the 2004 and 2008 presidential elections. (Unpublished capstone project). American University, Washington, D.C.
- Zimmerman, D. W. (2004). *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 57, 173-181.

# Appendix A - Survey and responses

## Survey

Please analyze the content of the advertisement, and then answer the questions below.

### Take charge of your education!

The advertisement features a collage of images and text boxes. On the left, a photo shows several students in graduation caps. To the right, a photo shows a student looking at a laptop. Further right, a yellow box contains the text 'Lower Loan Interest'. Below that, a photo shows a student working at a desk. In the center, a red box contains 'More Federal Funding' above a photo of a graduation cap and diploma. To the right of that, a blue box contains 'Less Student Loan Debt'. At the bottom left, text reads 'Students could gain a lot this election!'. At the bottom center, a logo consists of three overlapping squares (yellow, blue, red) followed by the text 'STAND UP AND BE COUNTED. VOTE for Lee Russell'.

\* 5. What three words come to mind when you look at advertisement A?

\* 6. How likeable is this ad?

- Very unlikeable
- Fairly unlikeable
- Not sure
- Fairly likeable
- Very likeable

\* 7. How credible does this ad seem?

- Not credible
- Fairly not credible
- Not sure
- Fairly credible
- Very credible



Please analyze the content of the advertisement, and then answer the questions below.

## Your education is at stake!



The advertisement features a central grid of images and text boxes. On the left, a woman looks stressed with her hands on her head. In the top center, a man reads a book. To the right, a woman reads outdoors. Below these are three colored boxes: yellow with 'Higher Loan Interest', red with 'Limited Financing Options', and blue with 'More Student Loan Debt'. A trash can with crumpled paper is also shown. At the bottom, the text reads: 'DON'T LET WASHINGTON TAKE OVER YOUR LIFE. VOTE for Morgan Wilson'.

**Higher Loan Interest**

**Limited Financing Options**

**More Student Loan Debt**

**DON'T LET WASHINGTON TAKE OVER YOUR LIFE.**

**VOTE for Morgan Wilson**

**This election could be bad news for students!**

\* 13. What three words come to mind when you look at advertisement B?

\* 14. How likeable is this ad?

- Very unlikeable
- Fairly unlikeable
- Not sure
- Fairly likeable
- Very likeable

\* 15. How credible does this ad seem?

- Not credible
- Fairly not credible
- Not sure
- Fairly credible
- Very credible

# Take charge of your health!



Seniors could gain  
a lot this election!

**STAND UP  
AND BE COUNTED.**  
VOTE for Lee Russell

\* 9. What three words come to mind when you look at advertisement C?

\* 10. How likeable is this ad?

- Very unlikeable
- Fairly unlikeable
- Not sure
- Fairly likeable
- Very likeable

\* 11. How credible does this ad seem?

- Not credible
- Fairly not credible
- Not sure
- Fairly credible
- Very credible

# Your health is at stake!

**This election could be bad news for seniors!**

**DON'T LET WASHINGTON TAKE OVER YOUR LIFE.**

**VOTE for Morgan Wilson**

\* 1. What three words come to mind when you look at advertisement D?

\* 2. How likeable is this ad?

- Very unlikeable
- Fairly unlikeable
- Not sure
- Fairly likeable
- Very likeable

\* 3. How credible does this ad seem?

- Not credible
- Fairly not credible
- Not sure
- Fairly credible
- Very credible

\* 17. For classification purposes only, please select your gender and age below.

	Gender	Age
Demographic info:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

\* 18. From which source(s) do you prefer to learn about current events? Why?

\* 19. What sort of emotions do you typically feel when hearing about current events? Why?

\* 20. When thinking about the future of America, do you typically feel more optimistic or pessimistic? Why?

\* 21. What do you consider the top three considerations when judging the merits of a political candidate?

Thank you for participating in this survey!

## Responses, ages 18-33

1 - Education positive

2 - Education negative

3 - Health positive

4 - Health negative

Rankings = 1 lowest, 5 highest

### A. Fem, 22

1 - Exciting, likeable, optimistic

Likeability 4, Credibility 3, Leadership 4

2 - Negative, stressful, scary

Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2

3 - Optimistic, peaceful, resolution

Likeability 5, Credibility 3, Leadership 4

4 - Unstable, fearful, controlling

Likeability 1, credibility 2, Leadership 1

### B. Fem, 21

1 - education, opportunity, youth

Likeability 4, credibility 3, Leadership 3

2 - negative, election, debate

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

3 - healthcare, social security, retirement

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

4 - slander, poor benefits, senior citizens

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

### C. Fem, 20

1 - school, expenses, debt

Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 4

2 - crisis, urgent, controlling

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2

3 - concerned, planning, caring

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4 - sad, negative, fast

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

### D. Fem, 22

1 - work, take charge, important

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

2 - stress, negative, money

Likeability 5, credibility 2, leadership 2

3 - positive, colorful, action

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

4 - older, negative, pity

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2

### E. Fem, 20

1 - student loans, college, money

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

2 - student loans, college, problems

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

3 - elderly, health, insurance

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4 - health, restrictions, laws  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

**F. Fem, 20**

1 - success, graduate, future  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - negative, students, frustration  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3 - health, love, togetherness  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - confusion, old, death  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 4

**G. Fem, 21**

1 - empowering, useful, pertains to my age  
Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
2 - depressing, stressful, negative  
Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3 - old people, excitement, colorful  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4 - old people, truthful, serious  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

**H. Fem, 20**

1 - busy, education, cheaper  
Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2 - education, busy, loans  
Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - busy, elderly, health  
Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 3  
4 - elderly, government, control  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

**I. Fem, 21**

1 - confident, responsible, happy  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - debt, stress, low-paying jobs  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3 - happiness, family, protection  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - worry, questions, uncertainty  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

**J. Fem, 21**

1 - college, expensive, interest  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - government, change, debt  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
3 - retirement, health, age  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - sick, old, stressed  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

**K. Fem, 21**

1 - positive, empowering, funding  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 5

2 - student loans, debt, interest rates  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - seniors, healthcare, voting  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - negativity, worry, bad healthcare  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 4

#### **L. Male, 22**

1 - perseverance, learning, past  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - money, stress, headache  
likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3 - Fun, future, hope  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - depressing, health, grandparents  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

#### **M. Male, 31**

1 - who, is, Lee  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - trying, to, scare  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - can, not, relate  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - trying, to, scare  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

#### **N. Male, 22**

1 - lower interest, funding, loan  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - bad, risky, nervous  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5  
3 - positive, healthcare, elderly  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 5  
4 - bad, government control, medical  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

#### **O. Fem, 21**

1 - funding, interest, loan debt  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2 - education, loans, debt  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3 - Medicare, premiums, doctors  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4 - control, limited, unpredictable  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

#### **P. Male, 21**

1 - education, helpfulness, dedication  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2 - negative, stressful, mean  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - colorful, family, happiness  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - unhappy, rough, bad  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

**Q. Male, 21**

1 - education, positive, loans  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - negative, stressful, politics  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2  
3 - taxes, elderly, health  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - negative, sad, helpless  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

**R. Fem, 22**

1 - carefree, positivity, voice  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - stress, debt, worry  
likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 2  
3 - happiness, health, elderly  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - negativity, fear, wary  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

**S. Fem, 23**

1 - education, students, disadvantages  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - student, rights, loans  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3 - health organization, health, vote  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - issues, health organization, seniors  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4

**T. Fem, 22**

1 - student, loans, funding  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 4  
2 - graduation, worry, completion  
likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3 - security, health, positive  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5  
4 - stress, uniform, control  
likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 4

**U. Fem, 21**

1 - exciting, opportunities, clear  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - college, expensive, confused  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - clear, good health, help  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - elders, vote no, bad health  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

**V. Fem, 21**

1 - education, lower loans, less student debt  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2 - education, bad, more debt  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1



3 - health, doctors, gain  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
4 - health, bad, unpredictable  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

#### **W. Fem, 21**

1 - charge, gain, lower  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - education, loan, debt  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3 - gain, stable, better  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 4  
4 - stake, control, unpredictable  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

#### **X. Fem, 21**

1 - political, positive, select audience  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2 - political, annoying, negative  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2  
3 - positive, political, cute pics  
likeability 4, credibility 1, leadership 3  
4 - extreme, political, targeted audience  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2

#### **Y. Fem, 23**

1 - loan, education, vote  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2 - interest, financing, vote  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - better, stable, comprehensive  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4 - bad, limited, unpredictable  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

#### **Z. Fem, 21**

1 - graduation, professional, bright  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - debt, depression, less college funding  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3 - positive, happy, inclusive  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - anti-government, unprecedented, slander  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

#### **AA. Male, 22**

1 - college, loans, cheap  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - loans, education, studying  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - elderly, retirement, grandparents  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - elderly, care, hospital  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

#### **BB. Female, 22**

1 - promising, uplifting, comfortable  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - scary, financial aspects, negative views of government  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3 - older generation, fun/colorful, money  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4 - depressing, scary, bad  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 2

**CC. Male, 21**

1 - student, graduation, school  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2 - anxiety, study, money  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - old, happy, exercise  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - old, sick, doctor  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

**DD. Male, 23**

1 - positive, reinforcing, good  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - depressing, negative, boring  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - not applicable, old, uneventful  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - fearful, sad, scary  
likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 3

**EE. Fem, 22**

1 - graduation, money, opportunity  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2 - negative, debt, stress  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
3 - positive, future, happy  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - negative, upsetting, healthcare  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 3

**FF. Male, 21**

1 - colorful, simple, clustered  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5  
2 - colorful, simple, clustered  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5  
3 - colorful, simple, clustered  
likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - colorful, simple, clustered  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5

**GG. Male, 22**

1 - diverse, classroom, motivation  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - vote, school, money  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3 - old people, death, life  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4

4 - healthcare, doctors, medicine  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

**HH. Fem, 20**

1 - graduate, college, money  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - finances, students, debt  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
3 - seniors, health, active  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - elderly, doctors, medical  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

**II. Fem, 20**

1 - money, student loans, college  
likeability 4, credibility 1, leadership 4  
2 - false, dumb, boo  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - happiness, optimism, healthcare  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - old people, mad  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2

**JJ. F, 20**

1 - education, graduating, voice  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - trouble, upsetting, negative  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - happy, voice, positive  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - depressing, bad news, worry  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 2

**KK. F, 21**

1 - proud, intelligent, prepared  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - stressful, awareness, alarming  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - touching, long life, health  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4 - sad, struggle, worry  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

**LL. Fem, 21**

1 - students, success, money  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - debt, students, stress  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - senior citizens, family, government  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - election, government, senior citizens  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

**MM. Fem, 22**

1 - university, loans, voting  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2 - loans, debt, college  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3 - healthcare, doctors, seniors  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - elderly, medicare, government  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3

**NN. Fem, 22**

1 - colorful, eye-catching, bold  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - colorful, eye-catching, organized  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4  
3 - colorful, eye-catching, bold  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - colorful, elderly people, eye-catching  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4

**OO. M, 19**

1 - useful, important, colorful  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2 - repetitive, scary, bad  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3 - election, colorful, organized  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - Obamacare, scary, colorful  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

**PP. F, 18**

1 - college, student loans, graduation  
Likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - stress, education, debt  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - elderly, healthcare, family  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership, 3  
4 - elderly, medicare health  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

**QQ. M, 18**

1 - graduation, work, money  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 5  
2 - money, college, stress  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - health, couples  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - unstable, worry, stress  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

**RR. F, 18**

1 - voting, school, graduation  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
2 - stress, debt, bad candidate  
Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1  
3 - health, old people, insurance  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - unhappy, rude, dangerous  
Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1

**SS. F, 18**

1 - nice, fortunate, helpful  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - rude, confusing, harsh  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - nice, smart, helpful  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - harsh, stress, lies  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

**TT. F, 18**

1 - politics, student loans, federal aid  
Likeability 5, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2 - politics, student loans, scams  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 4  
3 - elders, social security, politics  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4 - Obamacare, politics, elderly  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

**UU. M, 18**

1 - graduates, help, Lee  
Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
2 - vote stressed, black  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3 - red, old, yellow  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4 - helpful, hand, love  
Likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 2

**VV. F, 18**

1 - college, education, elections  
Likeability 4, credibility 5, leadership 4  
2 - Likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 1  
3 - Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4 - government, seniors, health  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 2

**WW. F, 18**

1 - school, college, money  
Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2 - concerning, stressful, frustrating  
Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3 - boring, simple, senior  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4 - sickly, senior, sad  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

**XX. F, 18**

1 - positive, future, education  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - stress, college, relevant  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3 - love, health, secure  
Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 3

4 - hospital, elders, trouble  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

**YY. F, 18**

1 - educate, money, stress  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2 - risk, stress, anxiety  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3 - elder, health, fitness  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4 - insurance, wealth, death  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 2

**ZZ. F, 19**

1 - professional, bright, non-specific  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2 - serious, urgent, stressful  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3 - family, health, elderly  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4 - sick, sad, help  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

**AAA. F, 18**

1 - graduation, money, college  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2 - frustrated, confused  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3 - happy, fitness, fun  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4 - questions, concerns, health  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

**BBB. F, 18**

1. Vote Lee Russell, we're all in this together, he is a fellow student who wants to help students  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2. I will have to pay a lot of money, Washington, D.C./government is to blame, Vote for Morgan  
Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. Seniors could gain a lot, Lee wants to help, positive  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4. Bad news for seniors, health is at stake, vote Morgan  
Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

**CCC. F, 19**

1. graduation, college, future  
Likeability 4, credibility 1, leadership 4  
2. money, stress, college  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 1  
3. health, senior citizens, medical  
likeability 4, credibility 1, leadership 4  
4. death, elder, tax  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

**DDD. F, 18**

1. more, money, school  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 3

- 2. debt, bad, expensive  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
- 3. politics, Lee Russell, seniors  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1
- 4. health, seniors, politics  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

**EEE. M, 18**

- 1. dumb, stupid, no  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
- 2. interrupting, what, politics  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
- 3. pointless, unpertainable, oldies  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
- 4. Dolly Parton, old, gross  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

**FFF. F, 18**

- 1. school, money, less  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4
- 2. stress, busy, school  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 2
- 3. happy, old, safe  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 4
- 4. sad, old, sick  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

**GGG. F, 18**

- 1. hopeful, happy, excited  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4
- 2. worried, scared, stressed  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3
- 3. happy, relaxed, at ease  
likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 5
- 4. scared, worried, anxious  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

**HHH. F, 18**

- 1. student-oriented, strong, education/money  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4
- 2. stress, sad, worried  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2
- 3. elderly, happy, take charge  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4
- 4. bad news, problems, risk  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

**III. F, 18**

- 1. successful, achieving, organized  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4
- 2. upsetting, boring, not eye-catching  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3
- 3. organized, colorful, warm  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2
- 4. organized, not eye-catching for the audience, boring  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

**JJJ. F, 18**

1. Who is Lee Russell, how will he lower loan interest? What more can students gain this election?

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. very relatable, bad news = negative thoughts, Washington has taken over education

likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3

3. Not relatable to me, no focus on platform, what can seniors gain?

likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3

4. bad news = negative, very negative ad, terrible candidate

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

**KKK. M, 18**

1. graduation, education, hopeful

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5

2. education, colorful, stressful

likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. happy, medical, caring

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. unhelpful, sad, health

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

**LLL. F, 31**

1. positive, vote, involvement

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. loans, politics, law

likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. Medicare, vote Obamacare

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. fear-mongering, negative, Republicans

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

News source = online articles for easy access; radio while I drive to/from work

Current events emotions = helplessness, it seems like "Washington" has too much bartering going on without really looking at what benefits the American people as a whole

Future = pessimistic, I don't know how to fix the system

Considerations = truthfulness, their beliefs, experience

**MMM. F, 29**

1. posted, overthrow, monotonous

likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3

2. loans, debt, interests

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 2

3. Genuine, heartfelt, family friendly

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

4. Control, repetitive, sad

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

News source = Fox News, I trust them

Current events emotions = Fear, it feels American is being used

Future = pessimistic, too much emphasis on political correctness

Considerations = moral, faith-driven, a heart

**NNN. F, 24**

1. election, loans, bullshit

likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. elections, education, bullshit

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. elections, health, bullshit



likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. election, old, bullshit  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
News source = Google news, varied sources  
Current events emotions = stress, mostly bad news  
Future = pessimistic  
Considerations = past experience, stands on issues, party lines

### **OOO. F, 28**

1. promises of better benefits to students  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. affects economy, affects all students  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. promises, possibilities, politics  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. trying to affect credibility by accusing or altering details  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
News source = internet, news, newspapers  
Current events emotions = depends on the event, positive or negative experience  
Future = lately pessimistic, too many promises, not a lot of actions  
Considerations = development, will, fulfillment, disposition, design, change

### **PPP. F, 32**

1. lower college debt  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. negative spin advertisement  
likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 1  
3. more elderly care  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. negative spin advertisement  
likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
News source = news, Norman Goldman talk show  
Current events emotions = disgust, dread  
Future = generally optimistic  
Considerations = Voting record- how they have previously voted during political office, personal character, stance on right to personal freedoms

### **QQQ. F, 26**

1. community college  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1  
2. student loan debt  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. retirement  
likeability 4, credibility 1, leadership 2  
4. Medicare  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
News source = CNN  
Current events emotions = N/A  
Future = N/A  
Considerations = N/A

### **RRR. F, 20**

1. basic, meaningful, counted  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. depressing, basic, lousy  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

3. elderly, basic, choices  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. negative, elderly, basic  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
News source = newspaper, reliable web sites, television  
Current events emotions = Anger, excitement, resentment, sadness; A lot of current events are sad and terrible, but too far away from home to have a huge impact.  
Future = Pessimistic. Right now America isn't in the best shape and hasn't been for quite some time. However, I guess we can only go up from here.  
Considerations = experience, charity, friendliness

### **SSS. F, 29**

1. vote lee russell  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. vote morgan wilson  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3. Vote Lee Russell  
likeability 3, credibility 5, leadership 5  
4. vote morgan wilson  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
News source = NPR, don't seem to favor anyone  
Current events emotions = fear, unsure what will happen next  
Future = Pessimistic. Too many men thinking about issues that really do not concern them.  
Considerations = track record, what they actually do, where their money comes from

### **TTT. F, 29**

1. okay, nondescript, reaching  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. scary, stress, worry  
likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 2  
3. interesting, nondescript, believable  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. unscriptive, exaggerated, not factual  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2  
News source = magazines, for the credibility. News I feel is too angled and filtered.  
Current events emotions = frustration at the numerous negative stories  
Future = Pessimistic. Every election we are promised things will get better and somehow never manage to improve by much.  
Considerations = honesty, keeping his promises upon assuming office, caring about his supporters not just lobbyists.

### **UUU. F, 27**

1. university, funding, work  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2. studying, funding, loans  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3. health, senior, doctors  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. health, seniors, assisted living  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
News source = Internet. I hate news and news stations. They are far too sensational and remind me of vultures over rotting meat. I want to know what's going on not analysis I didn't ask for, expert or otherwise.  
Current events emotions = Annoyance. Usually because of the unnecessary opinions injected where they aren't needed.  
Future = neither  
Considerations = level of government intervention; history in politics (career politician?); taxes

**VVV. F, 19**

1. non-specific, lacking, false  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
2. non-specific, lacking, false  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
3. non-specific, lacking, false  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1
4. very poor advertisement  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

News source = From credible accounts of those involved in and those affected by the events if they are posted freely online without the editing or biased selection and reporting of the news media.

Current events emotions = Lately - frustration, anger, shame, helplessness. There are an unacceptable number of horrible things going on in the world lately. And unfortunately, any good news rarely is reported by the media and posted online.

Future = Absolutely pessimistic. There are steady systems in place that ensure the continued allowance of the violation of basic human rights. The people in power who decide the laws represent a miniscule demographic of people actually living in the country (older, upper-class Caucasian men) and therefore cannot and will not make the best decisions to benefit the majority of the population. There would need to be a massive overhaul of government policies and public mindsets in order to make a positive change.

Considerations = I have found from personal experience that virtually no political candidates have 'merits'. I vote for democratic candidates with non-religiously influenced policies whose stated intent is to benefit a younger population.

**WWW. F, 22**

1. cluttered, federal debt  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3
2. cluttered, negative  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3
3. cluttered, positive  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3
4. cluttered, needs proof  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2

News source = Local news source, positive news mixed in with the bad

Current events emotions = Depressed. Far too much death, rape and terror

Future = Pessimistic: poor economy, massive government debt, large population, environmental issues, terrible crime rates, low overall happiness levels, large population debt, less 'help thy neighbors' and more 'help thyself'

Considerations = facts, honesty, alignment with my top issues

**XXX. F, 18**

1. graduate, teachers, school  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2
2. stress, school, what  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2
3. old, hammock, health  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2
4. old, colorful, what  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

News source = Google because it's most updated and reliable

Current events emotions = I don't really like them because it's always about random good or bad stuff that isn't relevant.

Future = I feel a little pessimistic because I have no idea if the government can solve all these problems.

Considerations = intelligence, leader, problem-solver

**YYY. F, 29**

1. lie, broke, no jobs  
likeability 3, credibility 1, leadership 2

2. liar, free college, overpaid  
 likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

3. elderly, retirement, nest egg  
 likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. elderly, politics, socialized medicine  
 likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

News source = News, I'm an auditory learner  
 Current events emotions = Life is going to suck for my kids because the world is going to hell in a handbasket.  
 Future = Pessimistic. All you hear is horrible things people do to one another  
 Considerations = I don't vote

**ZZZ. F, 26**

1. education, college, loans  
 likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. negative, libertarian, threatening  
 likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. healthcare, old people  
 likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. scaremongering, negative, olds  
 likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

News source = public radio because I can listen while doing other things  
 Current events emotions = Depression, anger and outrage are common because what makes the news, rightly or wrongly, are the things that are going poorly, and it's frustrating and disheartening to say the least to hear about so many problems where the will is apparently lacking to make any progress.  
 Future = Overall pessimistic because Americans are not engaged even on a local level, to say nothing of national and global issues, namely climate change which is going to have devastating impacts on every sector, every community, every other problem we're already facing. We're a country of simplistic platitudes and blind self-interest and it's not going to be long before we get some comeuppance.  
 Considerations = I want a candidate to be truly in tune with her or his constituents, not just parroting the party line but taking each issue on its own merits. I want a candidate who takes the long view, doing what's right in the longterm instead of taking the favorable position to get re-elected. And I want a candidate who actively solicits input from all- ALL- of her or his constituents on all issues instead of just waiting to be contacted from a handful of people who bother to take the initiative to get in touch with her or him.

**AAAA. F, 28**

1. command, money, loan  
 likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. stress, money, debt  
 likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. seniors, Medicare, insurance  
 likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. Medicare, seniors, negative  
 likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2

News source = Facebook, gives me multiple sources for the same event  
 Current events emotions = Sad. Most current events have to do with crime, death, destruction, debt or the like  
 Future = Pessimistic. The more technology we have, the dumber & less independent we are  
 Considerations = No smear campaigns, reachable goals, experience in a non-political role (example: teacher)

**BBBB. F, 30**

1. education, positive, interest in well-being of students  
 likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. debt, uneducated, negative  
 likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. positive, engaging, interesting  
 likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

4. negative, honest, sad

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

News source = Online news outlets - easily accessible, not always home to pick up newspaper

Current events emotions = Negativity, because that's what the news media focuses on. They capitalize on the fear and radical emotions of their audience.

Future = neutral, some days are just worse than others

Considerations = personality, experience, and track record of actions taken

#### **CCCC. F, 28**

1. success, education, graduation

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. study, stress, debt

likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. love, health, family

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. safe elderly helpful

likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 4

News source = internet

Current event emotions = sad

Future = pessimistic

Considerations = honesty, kindness, intelligence

#### **DDDD. F, 28**

1. color, junior college

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2

2. study, stress, debt

likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. stress, trash, young

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. alarmist, old, color

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

News source = internet and email for convenience

Current event emotions = interest, stress, I like to know what's going on but negative events can be a downer

Future = depends on recent events

Considerations = intelligence, experience, open-mindedness

#### **EEEE. F, 24**

1. education, future, positive

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

2. money, school, future

likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1

3. politics, health, seniors

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. seniors, health, politics

likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1

News source = I read many different news sources so I try to filter out the bias

Current event emotions = interested depending on the source

Future = pessimistic due to the disinterest of general public in events

Considerations = knowledge, experience, plans

#### **FFFF. F, 32**

1. get a loan

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

2. stop giving handouts

likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. seniors, healthcare, vote

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. seniors, healthcare, vote  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
News source = Drudge report, self-investigation  
Current event emotions = sad  
Future = pessimistic  
Considerations = political affiliation, stance on animal welfare

#### **GGGG. F, 25**

1. positive, inconclusive, hopeful  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2. smear campaign, insincere, not voting for that guy  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. positive, corny, inconclusive  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. obnoxious, whiny, negative  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
News source = NPR, Google News, BBC I feel they're fairly neutral and give the facts without too many opinions  
Current event emotions = sadness, hopelessness, nobody covers good news and that's a shame  
Future = Neutral - every generation says the past was better; I see no evidence that that's been the case. I'm sure my generation will grow to lament the "good ol' days," as well.  
Considerations = Concise plans spelled out; Claims backed by numbers/research; Interests aligned with my own

#### **HHHH. F, 25**

1. politics, deception, color  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2. stress, scary, intimidating  
likeability 4, credibility 5, leadership 4  
3. happy, sunny, positive  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
4. scary, stressful, money  
likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 3  
News source = Huffpost.com, CNN.com  
Current event emotions = anger, sadness, only negative things are aired  
Future = pessimistic, it's like the blind leading the blind  
Considerations = honesty, kindness, action

#### **IIII. F, 30**

1. student, college, bright  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. college, struggle, lies  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3. forward, seniors, colorful  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4. seniors, false, lie  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
News source = TV  
Current event emotions = depends on the events, most lately are disturbing and sad  
Future = pessimistic  
Considerations = I don't trust any. They all seem to put up a front and not follow through

#### **JJJJ. F, 24**

1. gain, election, education  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. loans, election, bad  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3. health, election, seniors

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. bad, healthcare, election

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

News source = television

Current event emotions = negative. Because of the sensationalist spin given to horrifying stories

Future = pessimistic, because of all the negative news stories and a sense of powerlessness

Considerations = history, affiliations, concerns

#### **KKKK. F, 23**

1. loan, help, election

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

2. college debt, loans, government

likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

3. seniors, health, election

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. seniors, health, government election

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

News source = Colbert Report, Jon Stewart, and news, to make it interesting and informative without being extremely biased

Current event emotions = Fear, disgust, usually horrible events are covered and most publicized

Future = I try to be optimistic as a teacher, but sometimes I'm truly worried for them, and for the future generations.

Considerations = College student aid, women's rights to contraception, senior citizen healthcare

#### **LLLL. F, 21**

1. college, done, graduate

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. college, cram, studying

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. family, senior, life

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. doctor, nurse, EMT

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

News source = internet, easy

Current event emotions = OK, it's not all good but not all bad

Future = half and half, depends on who runs us

Considerations = honest, liability, caring

#### **MMMM. F, 28**

1. dated, bland, common

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. shock and awe

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. dated, generic, flat

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. dated, flat, mundane

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

News source = internet, time

Current event emotions = disgust

Future = pessimistic

Considerations = social policy, background, debate

#### **NNNN. M, 31**

1. student, loans, election

likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3

2. negative, loans, unclear

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. seniors, election, vote  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. negative, election, seniors  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
News source = facebook, news channels, newspapers and online radio  
Current event emotions = about 60% negative, 30% positive, 10% indifferent  
Future = Optimistic. I feel the people of the country are regaining control and demanding that government be held to a higher more ethical standard.  
Considerations = is the candidate "real," "honest," positive

**OOOO. M, 32**

1. cluttered, nonsensical, happy  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
2. cluttered, confusing, stressful  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. deceptive, naive, banal  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. stressful, depressing, cluttered  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
News source = internet, because there's much more info available much easier than print.  
Current event emotions = indifferent  
Future = pessimistic because we follow Europe  
Considerations = intelligence, integrity, honesty

**PPPP. M, 31**

1. strong, powerful, happy  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. stressful, overwhelming, sad  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2  
3. really old people  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. still old people  
likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 3  
News source = internet, reddit  
Current event emotions = Passive, none, I'm trying to learn facts not let the country or world interfere with my day to day life  
Future = Optimistic, it's our ability and freedom to disagree that makes us so successful  
Considerations = How little or much mud they slinged through the campaign, their party, what's in the election handout

**QQQQ. M, 28**

1. student loan debt  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. student loan debt  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3. seniors could gain  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. more government control  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
News source = internet, TV  
Current event emotions = range of emotions  
Future = neither  
Considerations = trustworthy, capable, pragmatic

**RRRR. M, 32**

1. bad layout design



likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

2. this is terrible

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

3. still too busy

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

4. way too busy

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

News source = NPR, unbiased reporting

Current event emotions = a range depending on the issues

Future = pessimistic, people have no sense of personal responsibility. Especially politicians.

Considerations = party, experience, results

### **SSSS. M, 29**

1. ambiguous, unlikely, speculative

likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. scare-mongering, fear, loathe

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. positive, unproven, forward

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. scare-mongering, mud-slinging, tasteless

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

News source = Internet sites, as they accessible from mobile devices and my home computer, I do not have cable to watch TV news and do not buy a paper regularly.

Current event emotions = Unease, malaise, concern, regret. News is so full of scare tactics, spin, and opinion these days, not to mention sensationalism to make everything seem more blown up than it really is. The 24-hour news cycle is making everything worse.

Future = I'd guess optimistic. I think that a lot of the people who are behind some of the current problems will eventually die off, which, while morbid, will let a generation that is more similar to my own opinions and interests finally have a modicum of control over the country.

Considerations = intelligence, trustworthiness, morals

### **TTTT. M, 29**

1. advantageous, important, cheaper

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 2

2. anxious, urgent, students

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

3. dated, generic, flat

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. seniors, urgency, negativity

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

News source = Online news websites. They have comprehensive coverage in one location. I also like to hear about current events from friends and family.

Current event emotions = Indifference for the most part. I just keep up with current events for my own personal knowledge.

Future = Optimistic. I believe there are good leaders in this country and that there are no compelling reasons to feel pessimistic

Considerations = Honesty is the top consideration. Political history is another. Being amiable is another consideration.

### **UUUU. M, 32**

1. ugly, plain, uninformative

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. ugly, scare tactic, spam

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. boring, spam, outdated

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

4. ugly, spam, conservative  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
News source = Local news and social media, for relevance, and can't stand watching fearmongering assholes on tv.  
Current event emotions = depends on the event  
Future = Optimistic overall, though there seems to be an increase of idiots speaking the loudest.  
Considerations = Their actions, what they say, not affiliated with tea party or religious nuts and/or other crazies.

#### **VVVV. M, 26**

1. happy, graduation, education  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. fear, preying, OHGODSAVEUSALL!!!!  
likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. happy, healthy, good  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. manipulative, fear-mongering, spiteful  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2  
News source = Social media, it gives a good balance of left and right news sources  
Current event emotions = Mixed emotions. On one hand we've got some really good stuff going for us as a whole, but there seem to be worse, more violent things happening as well.  
Future = Optimistic. If I didn't try to stay optimistic, I'd just hide under my blankets. Which I'm totally doing today, but it's my day off, so I'm allowed.  
Considerations = Dedication to the people, not corporations, track record, economic stand.

## **Responses, ages 55-70**

### **1 - Education take charge**

### **2 - Education at stake**

### **3 - Health take charge**

### **4 - Health at stake**

**Rankings = 1 lowest, 5 highest**

#### **A. F, 55**

1. promising, college students, cheaper education  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. promising, changes  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. fun, joy, hope  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. depressing, worrisome, unknown  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
Current event source: Internet because it is current & newspapers because info is more detailed.  
Current event emotions: Sometimes sad, sometimes happy. Some news are good and happy some are sad.  
Future of America: I feel optimistic because I think human consciousness is increasing & this means people treating each other with more respect.  
Top 3 considerations: Animal welfare, environmental welfare & education.

#### **B. M, 60**

1. russell for students  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. wilson for students  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
3. wilson for seniors  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. wilson for seniors  
Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 2

Current event source: Newspaper for news from my hometown

Current event emotions: Sad because bad things are happening.

Future of America: Pessimistic because America is going in the wrong direction

Top 3 considerations: everyday person, thinks outside the box, hasn't always worked as a politician

### **C. M, 65**

1. spending, education, unnecessary degrees

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 2

2. education, college, politicians

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. can't see ad

Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. Antigovernment, teabaggers, scare tactics

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

Current event source: NPR

Current event emotions: Anger due to inaction and stupidity of congress.

Future of America: Tea baggers are blocking any forward progress. They wrap themselves in religious BS to convince people they are doing it for the benefit of society.

Top 3 considerations: honesty, leadership, integrity

### **D. F, 68**

1. politics in education

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. politics in education

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. senior medical care

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. senior medical care

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: radio TV NOT newspapers; newspapers are very liberal; radio/tv gives you a chance to make choices

Current event emotions: Frustration. Too many mixed messages.

Future of America: Pessimistic. Going down the wrong road in all areas.

Top 3 considerations: honesty, clarity

### **E. M, 64**

1. giveaways, taxes, debt

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. students, loans, debt

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. seniors, vote, lee russell

Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. control, less, seniors

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 4

Current event source: TV, newspaper

Current event emotions: sad, mad, too much killing, higher taxes, country going in wrong direction

Future of America: pessimistic

Top 3 considerations: less government, lower taxes, honesty

### **F. M, 62**

1. student, benefit, loans

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. Election, education, Washington

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. Positive action for seniors

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. seniors, nursing home

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: Internet, easily accessible and multiple ways of fact-checking

Current event emotions: Disappointment. Most news is negative and focuses on the faults, frailties and misdeeds of people.

Future of America: Optimistic because the news is generally about the smallest minority of people and events going on.

Top 3 considerations: stance on the issues, past behavior, ability to be open minded and not a political slave

### **G. M, 59**

1. electoral, youth, education expenses

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. electoral, youth, education

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. electoral, medicare, elderly

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

4. electoral, medicare, elderly

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: internet, for its convenience

Current event emotions: depends on the events

Future of America: Totally pessimistic, but about the entire world, not just the U.S.

Top 3 considerations: I don't trust or vote for any candidate from any established party

### **H. F, 58**

1. taxes, federal debt

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. same, old, same

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. here we go

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. old, old, old

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: newspaper, don't always like person telling story

Current event emotions: don't want to hear it - doom and gloom

Future of America: Very pessimistic - government involvement, government spending - wasting!

Top 3 considerations: Faith - Christianity, experience, term limits

### **I. F, 55**

1. graduation, education, smart

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. school, loans, bills

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

3. elderly, happy, health

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. elderly, sick, health

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

Current event source: news, credibility

Current event emotions: sad

Future of America: pessimistic

Top 3 considerations: party affiliation, position on issues, background of candidates

### **J. F, 55**

1. safe, warm, happy

Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5

2. free, government, money  
Likeability 4, credibility 5, leadership 3  
3. fear, hate, sex  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. safety, health, fear  
Likeability 4, credibility 5, leadership 5  
Current event source: newspaper, TV, radio  
Current event emotions: fear, Obama is destroying this country  
Future of America: fear  
Top 3 considerations: experience, experience, past leadership

**K. F, 55**

1. Less threatening, happier, positive  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. Busy, serious, limited  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3. Busy, serious, limited  
Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. Busy, serious, limited  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
Current event source: Fox News, more conservative view  
Current event emotions: frustration, too much lies being told  
Future of America: pessimistic, people have turned away from the basic values this country was formed around.  
Top 3 considerations: Godliness, honesty, history of their life

**L. F, 56**

1. student loans college  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. student loans, university  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
3. Old people, Obamacare  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4. seniors, manipulation, false  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: Associated Press app  
Current event emotions: Our nation is going downhill, very sad  
Future of America: pessimistic, we are so concerned about being PC, loyalty to country is gone  
Top 3 considerations: experience, moral compass, previous accomplishments

**M. M, 60**

1. Lower, federal, debt  
Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. Interest, financing, debt  
Likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 1  
3. Stable, Medicare, choice  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4. control, choice, stability  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, Leadership 2  
Current event source: Stations like PBS, they go in-depth  
Current event emotions: excitement, because its news  
Future of America: optimistic, I pray a lot and work at having faith in God.  
Top 3 considerations: Character, track record and leadership ability

**N. M, 66**

1. more, government, debt

Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. bad for economy

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

3. insurance, corrupt, politician

Likeability 3, credibility 1, leadership 3

4. scare, democratic tactics

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: Fox News, they tell it like it is, not what they think I need to know

Current event emotions: unbelievable that an educated country as ours can become so corrupt and self-centered

Future of America: pessimistic, \$17t in debt and politicians with no clue what they are doing to this country

Top 3 considerations: honesty, job creation and pass a balanced budget amendment

### **O. M, 55**

1. more positive message

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. Low information voters

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2

3. Positive message

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. Unnecessarily scaring seniors

Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 1

Current event source: internet, unfiltered

Current event emotions: disgust, some hope

Future of America: pessimistic, political parties unwilling to change

Top 3 considerations: honesty, alliances, will to do what's right

### **P. M, 55**

1. student loan debt

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. Limited financing options

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. More comprehensive Medicare

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. limited doctor choice

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

Current event source: CNN, reasonably comprehensive

Current event emotions: anger, the news seldom tells all that goes on behind the scenes

Future of America: more optimistic, the worst is almost over, there is light at the end of the tunnel

Top 3 considerations: Credibility, sophistication, track record

### **Q. M, 55**

1. government, intervention, waste

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. college, expensive, elections

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. Oldster, insurance, healthcare

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

4. Old, government, healthcare

Likeability 1, credibility 5, leadership 1

Current event source: Fox

Current event emotions: depressing, all bad news

Future of America: pessimism, Democrats in charge

Top 3 considerations: hair, hotness, honesty

**R. F, 57**

1. Optimism, power, future

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. panic, uncertainty, fear

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

3. control, seniors, election

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. scary, fear, doubt

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

Current event source: News. I prefer to hear about current events via news.

Current event emotions: Frustration. Too much political controversy for many years. USA is deteriorating.

Future of America: Pessimistic. America is becoming a country that does not allow freedom to its people (i.e. can't mention God because it may offend others).

Top 3 considerations: integrity, honesty, concern for constituents

**S. F, 60**

1. education, costs, debt

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. education, change, government

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

3. healthcare, seniors, cost

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. health, seniors, worry

Likeability 4, credibility 5, leadership 4

Current event source: Internet. Because I have a constant source where I can find the people or formats I prefer.

Current event emotions: I get angry at the government control and their refusal to listen to the people.

Future of America: Right now I am pessimistic.

Top 3 considerations: integrity, conservative, faith

**T. M, 65**

1. Education, loans, more federal help

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2

2. bad news, debt, interest

Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. Gain, choice, stable

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. healthcare, bad news, takeover

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2

Current event source: TV news and internet, hard to read

Current event emotions: too much negativity, if it wasn't for bad news there would be no news

Future of America: Pessimistic. Today's younger generation has lost respect and fortitude

Top 3 considerations: honesty, background, accomplishments

**U. F, 64**

1. positive balanced open

Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 4

2. republican scare tactics

Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1

3. health and healthcare assertiveness

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. sad not fair

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: TV, can get a variety of viewpoints, can multitask while on my computer and can DVR

Current event emotions: sad

Future of America: optimistic

Top 3 considerations: moderate, honest, intelligent

**V. F, 55**

1. education, student loans

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. stress, problems, money

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 2

3. retirees, health insurance

Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. elder care health

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: TV, newspapers, online

Current event emotions: depends on story

Future of America: Optimistic, it has got to get better

Top 3 considerations: pro-choice, non-Tea Party, voting record on issues

**W. F, 55**

1. Future, empowerment, choices

Likeability 5, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. Unrest, mistrust, anger

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. hope, understanding, care

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. Paranoia, fear, anxiety

Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 1

Current event source: None

Current event emotions: Numb, out of control

Future of America: Not sure because I don't have the truth.

Top 3 considerations: past performance, understanding of the issues, not afraid to stand up for what is right

**X. F, 55**

1. manipulative, propaganda, deceitful

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. Fear, stress, concern

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. Raising our taxes

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

4. staged, insincere, dark

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: Reuters, AP, Twitter, local news

Current event emotions: Sad. Angry. Trapped. The President and his staff lie. There is no credibility in the federal government.

Future of America: Pessimistic. I am a realist.

Top 3 considerations: Personal integrity, educational/professional history, successful family relationships

**Y. F, 59**

1. good for students

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. student loan department

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. better for seniors

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. Let's scare seniors

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: paper, TV, news



Current event emotions: disgust

Future of America: pessimistic, seems too many are waiting on entitlements and aren't willing to work.

Top 3 considerations: honesty, brave, ethical

**Z. F, 55**

1. college, students, election

Likeability 4, credibility 1, leadership 2

2. college, student, loan

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. doctor, government, election

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. healthcare, seniors, election

Likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2

Current event source: Internet. It has the capability to provide the fastest breaking news.

Current event emotions: Anxiety. There are so many negative occurrences in the news.

Future of America: Pessimistic. We were laid off and have no prospects in sight.

Top 3 considerations: experience, education and compassion

**AA. M, 61**

1. good, stand-up, likeable

Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5

2. Propaganda, questionable, bull

Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. care, likeable, trust

Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5

4. Propaganda, Obama, health care

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: TV news, because it is up to date.

Current event emotions: amazed, at all things that are going on in this world

Future of America: Optimistic, because this is the USA and we survive.

Top 3 considerations: Beliefs, record and track record in tough situations.

**BB. F, 55**

1. take charge education

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. education at stake

Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4

3. take charge health

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. health at stake

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: Fox news, local newspaper, C-Span, pretty balanced for local and world news

Current event emotions: irritated, upset, frustrated, Washington is out of touch with grass-roots people

Future of America: Pessimistic because our freedoms are being taken away and denied, Constitution is being ignored.

Top 3 considerations: character, integrity, background

**CC. M, 55**

1. loan, debt, facts

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

2. loan, college, hype

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. healthcare, problems, facts

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. healthcare, seniors, medicare  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3  
Current event source: fox news  
Current event emotions: sadness  
Future of America: pessimistic, the future does not look good.  
Top 3 considerations: party, truthfulness, and whether they state the facts or not.

**DD. F, 61**

1. college, debt, opportunity  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
2. Negative, pessimistic  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2  
3. health, stability, independence  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. uncertainty, negative, distasteful  
Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: Wall Street Journal  
Current event emotions: Depends on the event  
Future of America: Generally optimistic, given our individual freedoms. But pessimistic that government is taking more control at the expense of personal freedom.  
Top 3 considerations: sensitive to not spending beyond revenues, limit government intervention, limit taxation, as it is a drain on productivity

**EE. M, 58**

1. good, colorful, nice  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1  
2. not bad what  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. colorful, nice, OK  
Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. unfair, unreal, nothing  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: TV  
Current event emotions: amazed, at all things that are going on in this world  
Future of America: More Optimistic  
Top 3 considerations: honest, true, real

**FF. M, 55**

1. Positive  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. This not true  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. positive, help seniors  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. negative, wrong, not helpful  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: NPR  
Current event emotions: normal emotions depending on story  
Future of America: more optimistic, the Republicans are hurting themselves  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, integrity, positive message

**GG. M, 59**

1. Money, debt, save  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. money, debt, loans

Likeability 5, credibility 1, leadership 3  
3. more, better, save  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. less, bad negative  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2  
Current event source: TV, newspaper  
Current event emotions: frustrated, federal government is a self-feeding monster  
Future of America: pessimistic, media biased on both sides, reporting what they want.  
Top 3 considerations: focused, principled, knows how to negotiate when needed

#### **HH. F, 64**

1. students, debt, grammar error  
Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 2  
2. fear, students, debt  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. insurance, seniors, election  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 2  
4. scare tactics seniors  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: print newspapers, radio (commercial and NPR)  
Current event emotions: frustrated, disgusted, depressed  
Future of America: pessimistic because of the adversarial tone of political discourse and the inability of government representatives to work together cooperatively  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, trust, political views consistent with mine

#### **II. F, 59**

1. more federal aid  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. students federal aid  
Likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. choice of healthcare  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. senior health care  
Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3  
Current event source: skipped  
Current event emotions: skipped  
Future of America: skipped  
Top 3 considerations: skipped

#### **JJ. F, 55**

1. school, education, future  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. stress, sadness, uncertain  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3. happiness, active, hopeful  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. elderly, worry, helpless  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
Current event source: I like to read the newspaper. I watch the news on TV for the weather.  
Current event emotions: My emotions depend on what the current events are about. I do worry about what the world will be like for my children.  
Future of America: I would really like to think optimistic, but I'm really not sure. Because I really worry about my children.  
Top 3 considerations: reliable, honest, understanding

**KK. F, 65**

1. promises that cannot be kept, where are the facts, Morgan Wilson cannot change the world

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

2. serious students, asking students to vote, possibly crooked politician

Likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. crooked, unrealistic, promising the world

Likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. fraud, lies, unrealistic portrayal of seniors

Likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2

Current event source: newspaper, TV

Current event emotions: disgust at the excitement shown by some newscasters, enjoying “the moment”

Future of America: optimistic. Despite our crooked politicians, lousy economy and bad human behavior, the U.S. is still the best deal in town.

Top 3 considerations: integrity, honesty, and their concern over a full pocketbook

**LL. F, 55**

1. federal funding, student loans, election

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. high interest, student loans, election

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. medicare, elderly options, Morgan Wilson

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. doctor choice, election, control

Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: news on TV

Current event emotions: sad those ads were grim

Future of America: optimistic

Top 3 considerations: honesty, likeability and platform

**MM. M, 55**

1. graduation, improvise, unproven

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

2. bad news kids

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. uncertain, unknown, unproven

likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. scam, welfare, unknowing

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

Current event source: Fox news for their unbiased information

Current event emotions: mixed emotions

Future of America: Pessimistic because people want everything for nothing. It seems people are only out for themselves!

Top 3 considerations: patriotic, honest, fair

**NN. F, 55**

1. graduation, education, students

Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 2

2. frustration, students, no help

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. positive, choices, healthy

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. healthcare, elder, government control

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

Current event source: Always TV, sometimes internet

Current event emotions: Frustration especially with the government not getting along

Future of America: optimistic, feel we have to be positive no matter what  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, family, what they will do for the community

**OO. F, 55**

1. positive, colorful, happy  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. politics, fear, colorful  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
3. positive, hopeful, happy  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. politics, negative, fear  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: radio, internet  
Current event emotions: sad, because it tends to be bad news  
Future of America: neutral. I see both good and bad possibilities.  
Top 3 considerations: intelligence, morality, views on abortion

**PP. M, 58**

1. what is this?  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
2. what is this?  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. what is this?  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
4. what is this?  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: All that are relevant to be well-informed.  
Current event emotions: Frustration. Too many politicians are too willing to sacrifice the country for their beliefs.  
Future of America: Frustration. Tea Party and Republicans are willing to let the country suffer as long as their agenda is fulfilled.  
Top 3 considerations: general worldview, position on issues, personal traits

**QQ. F, 55**

1. Promising changes  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. The person running in the election is promising students a less expensive education if they vote for him.  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. Fun, joy and hope  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. depressing, worrisome, unknown  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
Current event source: Internet because it's current and newspapers because info is more detailed.  
Current event emotions: Sometimes sad, sometimes happy. Some news is good and happy and some is sad.  
Future of America: I feel optimistic because I think human consciousness is increasing and this means people treating each other with more respect.  
Top 3 considerations: animal welfare, environmental welfare, education.

**RR. F, 67**

1. Funding  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2. Funding, confused message  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. Upbeat, well-looking patients  
likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. Older patients, right winger

likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: Internet - mainstream news avoids important stories.

Current event emotions: Worried, too much division. America's essential structures are in trouble.

Future of America: Optimistic because grassroots groups are forming.

Top 3 considerations: Truth, commitment to structure, female

**SS. F, 55**

1. scam, manipulate, lie

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. bureaucracy, forms, unstable

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. Other, scam, manipulate

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

4. Abuse, advantage, money

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: Online, because the information is breaking there before it's on TV.

Current event emotions: Troubled at times, laughing at others. Information is wide in variation. Optimistic.

Future of America: Optimistic. Bad news makes a bigger splash in the brain than good news, so good news is often edited out.

Top 3 considerations: Do I personally know them, their history, mannerisms

**TT. M, 55**

1. narrow, pandering, uninformative

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. misinformation, scaremongering, uninformative

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. narrow, pandering, uninformative

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. scaremongering, comical, uninformative

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: Reuters, Wall Street Journal, The Economist, NPR

Current event emotions: Interest, concern. I care deeply about what is going on in our country and worry that the extremist political environment is making it difficult to make important decisions and is leading to bad policy.

Future of America: Optimistic, because despite the distinction in Congress and statehouses we are a strong country with a resilient economy and public servants who care about what they are doing

Top 3 considerations: pragmatism, good judgement, willingness to compromise

**UU. F, 62**

1. Positive, financial planning, good students

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. Student debt, college entrance, tuition

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

3. Insurance, healthcare, seniors

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. scare, Medicare, aging

likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3

Current event source: Neighborhood association newsletter, local TV news, local suburban newspaper

Current event emotions: Strong because they are close to home.

Future of America: Pessimistic because jobs and movement in the corporate world has gotten so competitive.

Top 3 considerations: stance on education, healthcare and national defense

**VV. F, 55**

1. bright, unsure, college

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. geometric, colorful, unsure

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. bright, old people, healthcare  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. same, unsure, boxy  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: Internet, easily accessible  
Current event emotions: Varies with situation; I'm reactionary  
Future of America: Pessimistic; that's my view of life  
Top 3 considerations: political party, age, political history

**WW. M, 55**

1. positive, taxes, debt  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. negative, blame  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. positive, informative  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. scare tactics, extreme, blame  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: newspaper  
Current event emotion: negative  
Future of America: Pessimistic, everything seems to be far right or left, Washington refuses to work together  
Top 3 considerations: views, moderate, overall knowledge

**XX. F, 59**

1. Republican, liar, scare  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
2. Democrat, dull, wonk  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. Republicans, insurance companies  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1  
4. Republican, liar depressing  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: Radio. NPR isn't as bad as most.  
Current event emotion: Anger, depression because of the damned Republicans.  
Future of America: Pessimistic. Republican extremists are throwing democracy in the trash and the democrats are wusses.  
Top 3 considerations: brains, honesty, compassion

**YY. F, 62**

1. Positive  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. Too much, negative  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2  
3. Positive  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4. Negative  
Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: television  
Current event emotion: sad, many are negative  
Future of America: Pessimistic. Things seem to be getting worse, not better.  
Top 3 considerations: truthful, honest, credible

**ZZ. M, 55**

1. Loans

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. College  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. Old age  
Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
4. Illnesses  
Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
Current event source: yes  
Current event emotion: sad  
Future of America: Optimistic. From my personal experience.  
Top 3 considerations: loyalty

**AAA. F, 55**

1. college students, federal financial options, election  
Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
2. college students, financial options, election  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 2  
3. seniors, healthcare, election  
Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
4. seniors, healthcare, election  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: Internet, most current and less partisanship  
Current event emotion: negativity, most of the new is negative  
Future of America: Pessimistic. Americans are not thinking for themselves.  
Top 3 considerations: intelligence, trustworthy, moderate

**BBB. M, 55**

1. not very likely  
likeability 3, credibility 1, leadership 2  
2. scare tactics  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 2  
3. positive  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. doesn't say anything  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: CNN, MSNBC  
Current event emotion: sadness  
Future of America: optimistic  
Top 3 considerations: integrity, honesty, fairness

**CCC. F, 57**

1. all look similar  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2. hype hype hype  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. somebody wants elected  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. pretty darn annoying  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: NPR, they're fairly trustworthy, they aren't as reliant on sponsors.  
Current event emotion: All kinds, depends on the story  
Future of America: We've lost our manufacturing sector to China. Looks bleak.  
Top 3 considerations: Why are they in politics? What's their party? Are they interested in helping themselves or America in general?



**DDD. F, 58**

1. help for children  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. unfair to children  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. good for seniors  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. seniors need advocates  
Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

Current event source: TV, do not trust what is put on the internet  
Current event emotion: depressed, lots of crazy things happening in this world  
Future of America: mixed feelings, not sure which way things will go  
Top 3 considerations: experience, reputation, what they stand for

**EEE. M, 55**

1. not very likely  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. scare tactics  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. positive  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. negative no information  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

Current event source: CNN, NY TIMES, MSNBC  
Current event emotion: sadness, we are not looking ahead, all decisions are based on momentary polls or gain of politician, no long-term thinking or acceptance of others  
Future of America: optimistic Pendulum always swings, eventually, the self-serving will have to give way to those who seek to do good for all.  
Top 3 considerations: integrity, honesty, fairness

**FFF. F, 56**

1. students could gain  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 5

2. bad news students  
likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. seniors could gain  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 1

4. more government control  
Likeability 2, credibility 5, leadership 5

Current event source: Fox News because I believe they are more reasonable and reliable and forthcoming than the other media news stations.  
Current event emotion: Sad at the way the country is going. I believe President Obama has done so much harm to the country I cannot imagine how many years it will take to overcome these problems he has created.  
Future of America: Optimistic. I believe the people are so fed up with the government that the people will surely stand up and do the right thing and vote in more conservatives and morally strong leaders.  
Top 3 considerations: Are they a Christian; Will they reduce the size of government and try to reduce governments intrusion into our lives and businesses; where they stand on abortion

**GGG. F, 57**

1. more taxes  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. more taxes  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. health insurance  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. health insurance

Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

Current event source: paper, radio

Current event emotion: how true is it?

Future of America: Pessimistic, government has sold out the people for socialism

Top 3 considerations: voting record

### **HHH. F, 59**

1. college debt, vote

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

2. youth, debt, vote

likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 4

3. cold symptoms, OJ

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

4. old, limited, vote

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

Current event source: internet

Current event emotion: sad, upset

Future of America: pessimistic

Top 3 considerations: good intentions, best choice, background

### **III. F, 57**

1. education, debt, important

likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. less options education

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

3. positive, health, caring

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. negative, republican, antipeople

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: TV, efficiency

Current event emotion: Anger. Sadness. Because Congress and Washington is so messed up right now

Future of America: Getting more pessimistic. Gridlock. Unwillingness to compromise. Ignorance of scientific fact.

Top 3 considerations: Is he/she logical? Does he/she care about people or corporations? Do they believe in science?

### **JJJ. F, 62**

1. All bull shit

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. scare tactics abound

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. get maximum information

likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 3

4. all bad news

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

Current event source: BBC and Christian Science Monitor

Current event emotions: Interested

Future of America: Pessimistic - too many people are mentally ill

Top 3 considerations: are they Republican, do we have proof of kickbacks, did they make their money--through honest work!

### **KKK. F, 60**

1. passion, strength, hope

likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5

2. stress, debt, frustration

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

3. love, family, joy

likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. hopelessness, negativity, despair

Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 2

Current event source: Internet; I can search out various news sources and compare them to get all sides of an issue

Current event emotion: I sometimes feel as if the world is out of control. I feel disgusted at the celebrity news that dominates.

Future of America: I am optimistic that we will be strong again some day, but, pessimistic about the current government's ability to make that happen any time soon.

Top 3 considerations: Integrity, experience, faith

### **LLL. F, 67**

1. college, politics, government

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. politics, education, debt

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. elderly, health, options

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. elderly, health, politics

Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

Current event source: newspaper, mail. No special reason.

Current event emotion: non-phased for the most part. Stage 4 lung cancer and don't get out in public much.

Future of America: Sad for the youth of America. People don't care about each other like they used to.

Top 3 considerations: Honesty, platform, family values

### **MMM. F, 57**

1. college costs

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4

2. college costs

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. insurance cost

likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. insurance costs

Likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

Current event source: media

Current event emotion: political unrest

Future of America: Pessimistic due to rising costs of college/healthcare/insurance and the soaring costs of everyday living such as gas/groceries/etc.

Top 3 considerations: issues, family, party

### **NNN. F, 56**

1. debt, young people, college

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. debt, college, future

likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 4

3. vitality, active, choices

likeability 1, credibility 5, leadership 4

4. senior citizen, no choices

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 2

Current event source: Internet

Current event emotion: anger, sorrow, hopeless

Future of America: Pessimistic

Top 3 considerations: Experience, understands their constituents, liberal

**OOO. F, 57**

1. vague, short, brief

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

2. deceptive, scare tactics, lack facts

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2

3. Lack specifics, deceptive, vague

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2

4. Scare tactics, vague, Un-American

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

Current event source: Internet, newspaper

Current event emotion: over-exaggerated but scary

Future of America: pessimistic because people in politics are always putting the other party down and can't work together and also putting down the president and the american political system.

Top 3 considerations: political party views, what they can do for you and not putting the other party down.

**PPP. F, 57**

1. positive, hopeful, people-oriented

likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. negative, debt, republican

likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1

3. positive content, democrat

likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. Republicans, scare tactics

Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1

Current event source: NPR/BBC unbiased

Current event emotion: discouraged, feel powerless to make a difference

Future of America: Optimistic; I work in a high school and see hopefulness in our students

Top 3 considerations: focuses on the issues, runs a positive campaign, does not bad mouth the other candidates

**QQQ. F, 57**

1. less loan debt

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. higher, limited, more

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. happiness, health, choices

likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. more government control

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

Current event source: TV, more up-to-date than newspapers

Current event emotion: depressed, too much bad news

Future of America: Until Obama, I was optimistic. Now very pessimistic

Top 3 considerations: honest, trustworthy, religious

**RRR. F, 57**

1. education, expense, government

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. school, cost, debt

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. health care, government, insurance

likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. medicare, government, scary

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: news and internet

Current event emotion: unstable, scared

Future of America: pessimistic  
Top 3 considerations: jobs, war against heroin, national security

**SSS. F, 57**

1. could gain students  
likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. higher loan interest  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. stand up, vote  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. Don't let Washington  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
Current event source: online, easy  
Current event emotion: sadness, state of the world  
Future of America: pessimistic; egos of individuals before that of the country  
Top 3 considerations: ability to communicate ideals, loyalty, presentation

**TTT. M, 60**

1. upbeat, honest, helpful  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 5  
2. lies, negative, partisan  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. positive, true, honest  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. bias, lies, false  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: NPR, internet  
Current event emotion: disturbed, lies and half truths are believed by far too many  
Future of America: undecided; I am still waiting for things to play out  
Top 3 considerations: truth, honesty, positive attitude

**UUU. F, 57**

1. education, students, money  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2. worry, waste, stress  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
3. seniors, medical care, insurance  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. unhappiness, seniors, instability  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: newspaper, public speakers  
Current event emotion: discouraged, pessimistic  
Future of America: optimistic, strangely enough because there is a lot of innovation going on  
Top 3 considerations: experience, views compatible with my own

**VVV. F, 61**

1. Who's Lee Russell  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
2. Who's Morgan Wilson  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. Who's Lee Russell  
likeability 4, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. Who's Morgan Wilson  
Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 2  
Current event source: TV, easy to turn on

Current event emotion: nauseated, too many horrible things going on  
Future of America: pessimistic because of people running government  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, past behavior, who is paying for their campaign

**WWW. F, 61**

1. positive, unclear  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. too much, purpose unclear  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
3. positive, loving, unclear  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. negative, unclear  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: Time magazine, newspaper, print form  
Current event emotion: depends on the issue  
Future of America: pessimistic because politics has become big business and honesty is harder and harder to come by.  
Top 3 considerations: positive, honest, open to varying points of view and able to mediate

**XXX. M, 59**

1. looks very good  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3  
2. don't vote for morgan wilson  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1  
3. very good ad  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 4  
4. doesn't look good  
Likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1  
Current event source: Computer because I can look up more about it.  
Current event emotion:  
Future of America:  
Top 3 considerations:

**YYY. F, 58**

1. students, education, help  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 4  
2. stress, students, bad  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 1  
3. good health, stable  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 5  
4. elderly, health, sick  
Likeability 3, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: The news because it's informative.  
Current event emotion: Sad and outraged. It's the way of the world.  
Future of America: pessimistic. Don't know.  
Top 3 considerations: What he stands for, his views, track record

**ZZZ. M, 70**

1. Who's Lee Russell  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 3  
2. Utter nonsense  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. Affordable Healthcare Act  
likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. utter nonsense

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3  
Current event source: Newspapers, online & hard copy, plus NPR & public TV  
Current event emotion: keen interest  
Future of America: optimistic because of our history and young people  
Top 3 considerations: experience, education, willingness to work across the aisle

**AAAA. M, 68**

1. more federal funding  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. more student debt  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. better doctor choice  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. vote bad Washington  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2  
Current event source: TV, CNN  
Current event emotion: Anger  
Future of America: neutral  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, transparency, generosity

**BBBB. F, 59**

1. education, youth, graduation  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 1  
2. stress, books, students  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. seniors, healthcare, doctors  
likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2  
4. elderly, confused, nursing home  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: Newspapers, TV, in-depth coverage  
Current event emotion: Sadness, too much violence  
Future of America: Optimistic, there are a lot of good people even with everything bad going on  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, self-sacrifice, independent thinker

**CCCC. F, 58**

1. college, students, money  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2. frustrating, negative, concern  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. positive, diverse, possible  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. elderly, health, negative  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: news shows, online  
Current event emotion: curiosity, discouraged  
Future of America: pessimistic, the news tends to focus on disaster  
Top 3 considerations: Their experience, their stand on education, their views on job creation in rural areas

**DDDD. M, 64**

1. positive political advertisement  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
2. negative political ad  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. politician promise again  
likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. another political advertisement

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: TV news

Current event emotion: sadness

Future of America: pessimistic. people don't care about each other. economic situation is not good.

Top 3 considerations: Ideas, ability to get their message across, do they care?

**EEEE. F, 55**

1. charge, stand up, vote

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. Washington, debt, higher

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. health, doctor, better

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. health, government, Medicare

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

Current event source: online, radio, TV. I prefer them because I use them regularly.

Current event emotion: It depends on the events. Good news=good feelings, Bad news=sad feelings

Future of America: pessimistic. dashed hope

Top 3 considerations: honest, sympathetic, visible

**FFFF. F, 60**

1. more money wasted

likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 1

2. I don't care

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. joke, bullshit, lies

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

4. disgust at politics

Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 2

Current event source: internet and news on tv

Current event emotion: disgust

Future of America: pessimistic for seniors not being able to live decently

Top 3 considerations: how they have voted in the past, how rich they are, and party affiliation

**GGGG. F, 58**

1. positive, biased, proactive

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. negative, biased, uninformed

likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

3. positive, biased, sweet

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3

4. biased, untrue, scary

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

Current event source: national newspaper, variety of perspectives

Current event emotion: overwhelmed, so much sadness in the world

Future of America: optimistic

Top 3 considerations: expertise in a relevant field, amount of public service, stand on issues I care about

**HHHH. M, 56**

1. college, loans education

likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. education, debt, despair



likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. seniors, choice, vote  
likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. choice, fear-mongering, seniors  
Likeability 1, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: local newspaper, NPR  
Current event emotion: powerless, disenfranchised  
Future of America: pessimistic  
Top 3 considerations: Not the incumbent; Not Tea Party candidate; Not an NRA backed candidate

### **III. M, 65**

1. stand up  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 1  
2. higher loan interest  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1  
3. charge of your health  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1  
4. health at stake  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1  
Current event source: Fox News  
Current event emotion: sad  
Future of America: pessimistic - giving up the things we have. The minority is ruling  
Top 3 considerations: honest, lower taxes and get rid of big government

### **JJJJ. F, 56**

1. more positive ad  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. negative scare tactics  
likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. less negative ad  
likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. negative scare tactics  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: national newspapers  
Current event emotion: shock, concern  
Future of America: pessimistic - world events are so severe and unmanageable  
Top 3 considerations: democratic, moderate, pro-choice

### **KKKK. M, 60**

1. bid for votes  
likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2. shallow scare tactics  
likeability 3, credibility 1, leadership 2  
3. single issue voter  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 2  
4. scare the elderly  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
Current event source: newspaper, presents balance  
Current event emotion: sorrow and pleasure, people do wonderful and terrible things  
Future of America: Neither optimistic or pessimistic. What will be will be.  
Top 3 considerations: tolerance for ambiguity, respect for differences, modesty

### **LLLL. F, 55**

1. Youth gets attention  
likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. unwanted big government  
likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. all ages win  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 3  
4. expensive health care  
Likeability 3, credibility 4, leadership 3  
Current event source: Internet. I don't read the newspaper and I don't watch TV  
Current event emotion: Depends on the event. Government, I'm angry. Death or injury, I'm empathetic  
Future of America: Pessimistic. Everyone wants reward without responsibility. Parents don't take responsibility for their children. They expect others to.  
Top 3 considerations: reigning in big government, reducing government spending, reducing the defense budget to pay for needed programs for the people of America

**MMMM. F, 56**

1. positive, hope, empowerment  
likeability 1, credibility 5, leadership 3  
2. manipulative, scare tactics, hysteria  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1  
3. comfort, stability, safe  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 3  
4. hysteria, mud-slinging, scare tactics  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: TV, Internet. Easy  
Current event emotion: Disgust. Slanted journalism, emotionally charged stories rather than real news.  
Future of America: Optimistic. We are Americans. We will sort it out in spite of our press and politicians.  
Top 3 considerations: fiscal responsibility, business friendliness, past experience in the private sector

**NNNN. M, 57**

1. wise, Democrat, sensible  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
2. lying f---ing Republican  
likeability 1, credibility 3, leadership 1  
3. security, sensibility, Democrat  
likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. F---ing lying Republican  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: Daily Kos, The Daily Show, Mother Jones, The Nation  
Current event emotion: Rage, depression  
Future of America: Pessimistic because Republicans are going to take over the senate  
Top 3 considerations: Are they liberal? Are they experienced? Are they qualified?

**OOOO. F, 56**

1. graduate, college, vote  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
2. college, debt, loans  
likeability 3, credibility 2, leadership 4  
3. healthy, vote, choice  
likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 5  
4. vote, Obamacare, health  
Likeability 4, credibility 5, leadership 5  
Current event source: internet, fast and easy to access  
Current event emotion: Fear - too many unsettling events, nothing positive  
Future of America: Pessimistic in last five years, no strong leadership  
Top 3 considerations: experience, likeability, character

**PPPP. F, 60**

1. more college graduates

likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

2. classic scare tactic

likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 1

3. expanded senior benefits

likeability 3, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. cuts senior benefits

Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4

Current event source: newspaper, local and national news

Current event emotion: Helplessness, so many bad things happening in the entire world. Ebola potential threat to Americans, political ineptitude and health programs are giving less and we are paying more.

Future of America: Pessimistic, political ineptitude, potential Ebola threat and lack of a good president at the helm.

Top 3 considerations: Honesty, with a sincere desire to serve their country. An attitude of not increasing the national debt and finally someone that can overhaul the health care debacle that the current president has saddled us with.

**QQQQ. F, 58**

1. positive, misleading, colorful

Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3

2. Negative, incomplete, colorful

Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 3

3. Positive, incomplete, misleading

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. negative, misleading, confusing

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 3

Current event source: BBC News, NPR, local newspaper

Current event emotion: depends on the event

Future of America: pessimistic, political gridlock

Top 3 considerations: integrity, fairness, open-minded

**RRRR. M, 66**

1. Take charge Lower

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

2. Limited financing options

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

3. More comprehensive Medicare

Likeability 2, credibility 3, leadership 3

4. bad news Limited

Likeability 2, credibility 4, leadership 3

Current event source: Internet

Current event emotion: depressed

Future of America: Pessimistic, do-nothing Congress

Top 3 considerations: record, knowledge of issues, personality

**SSSS. M, 69**

1. liberal, progressive, sensible

Likeability 5, credibility 5, leadership 3

2. Conservative, Republican, ignorant

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

3. good health care

Likeability 5, credibility 4, leadership 4

4. scare tactics, fear

Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1

Current event source: TV news, internet news, research

Current event emotion: I'm always a skeptic, don't get too emotional  
Future of America: I'm usually optimistic, the other side usually plays up the fear and doesn't always tell the truth.  
Top 3 considerations: credibility, political affiliation, voting history in office

**TTTT. M, 55**

1. Maybe too optimistic  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
2. Politician scare tactics  
Likeability 2, credibility 2, leadership 2  
3. Maybe too confident  
Likeability 4, credibility 3, leadership 3  
4. politician scare tactics  
Likeability 2, credibility 1, leadership 2  
Current event source: internet news  
Current event emotion: joy, anger, disappointment  
Future of America: pessimistic  
Top 3 considerations: intelligence, humble, constitutional education

**UUUU. M, 65**

1. He's a Democrat  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 5  
2. He's a crackpot  
Likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 3  
3. Vote for him  
Likeability 4, credibility 4, leadership 4  
4. He cannot win  
Likeability 1, credibility 4, leadership 3  
Current event source: newspaper, I can read it at my leisure and whenever I like  
Current event emotion: Annoyance, usually. Too many mindless idiots are taken in by the crackpots out there.  
Future of America: Optimistic, as long as the Republicans don't win control of the government  
Top 3 considerations: honesty, compassion, effectiveness

**VVVV. M, 65**

1. more government spending  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
2. more scare tactics  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
3. More government control  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
4. government scare tactics  
Likeability 1, credibility 1, leadership 1  
Current event source: internet  
Current event emotion: frustration  
Future of America: Pessimistic, our leadership is corrupt and inept.  
Top 3 considerations: pro liberty, pro bill of rights, pro term limits.