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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to explore the positioning strategies of opposition
candidates in television political advertising. Advertising message strategies of
opposition candidates were compared by examining differences in presentation of
partisanship, issue stands and candidate images. Also, differences of advertising tone and
appeal types in ads were examined. Another purpose of the present study is to examine
the differences and similarities between Korean and American advertising strategies by
looking at the 2002 Korean presidential campaign.

Data for this study was analyzed as all advertisements (N=17) produced by the
opposition Grand Nation Party (GNP) and the governing Millennium Democratic Party
(MDP).

The results of this analysis show that the opposition GNP and the governing MDP
differed with partisanship, issue stands and candidate images. The governing party used
fewer negative message strategies in its ads than the opposition party. Additionally,
appeal types between opposition candidates were considerably emphasized. Overall, the
results provide support for the argument that the comparisons between the United States and Korea yield similarities in campaign communication with regard to candidate status even though there are differences in political culture of both countries.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Mass communication mediates wide-ranging informative dimensions such as awareness, knowledge and even action.

In terms of public discourse, these aspects of mass media can lead to diverse and dynamic effects on democratic process in society. From this viewpoint, media election coverage has been shown to affect voter decision-making (Benoit 2003) and perception (Freedman and Goldstein 1999; Miller and Klobucar 2003) as well as election turnout (Kahn and Kenney 1999). Accordingly, candidates endeavor to deliver messages and interact with voters using various forms of media. Consider that, in contemporary society, voters can base their selection of candidates and voting decisions on political messages accessed only through media.

In an environment where such political information is emphasized, candidates who are limited in their ability to meet constituents face-to-face must use mass media to communicate their messages to the electorate. Thus, media is considered to be the vital tool for reaching voters during an election period. In choosing media venues, candidates are able to exercise some control over their political messages during the campaign. One type of political communication, televised political advertising, has been used primarily because it directly provides voters with candidates’ issue stances and personal images by
presenting positive images of their platforms or by constructing unfavorable images of their opponents. Prior research has shown that many of the attributes commonly formed in television political ads—repetition of messages, exciting visuals and dramatic audio effects—make voters more likely to remember information conveyed by those ads, than do news or even political debates (Just, Crigler, and Wallach 1990). Also, television spots have been found to more likely to influence voters than newspapers and TV news (Brians and Wattenberg 1996).

Media election, particularly the use of the television spots, is a natural element in American politics. Likewise, Korean “media election” which includes the use of political advertising, has become a typical electoral mode of the major party since the 1990s.

In Korea, televised political advertising was introduced in 1992 as an alternative to reduce high campaign costs. Before its introduction, election campaigns required heavy expenditures due to a national campaign trail with its partisan mobilization. To mobilize citizens to participate in the campaign trail, parties raised illegal funds, spending most on involuntary participators in the campaign trail. In addition, this illegal election campaign fund raising made citizens apathetic towards politics in general (Korea Times December 5, 2002).

Since the introduction of television political advertising, election campaigns have changed from national campaign trail of partisan mobilization into media campaigns. The 2002 Korean presidential campaign used television political advertising as a means of disseminating political information to the electorate. Such ads not only may have
promoted candidates’ positions on issues but also enhanced attacks against opposition candidates.

This study explores how media campaigns, particularly television political advertising, represented candidates’ messages in the 2002 presidential election. The analysis of Korean television political advertising can help us understand more fully the candidates’ strategies and main agenda in these campaigns. Moreover, the investigation of this phenomenon provides insight into how candidate advertising reflects public concerns and opinions. The extent of this responsiveness to public concern will mirror the development of the democratic process.

The second goal of this study is to investigate how political advertising is used as a standardized means for conveying political information, compared with those of other countries, especially the United States (US.). Although the tradition and practice of the democratic political system may differ between the two nations, examining message strategies of the two opposing candidates allows us to make sense of media practices in different political and social settings. The adoption of Americanized campaign communication, for example, the increased use of television, may result in either a patterns used in Korea and the US or unique differences in narrative structure used in each country. In this sense, the present study explores the possible generalizability of the American campaign advertising style in light of this comparison of the 2002 Korean case.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the positioning strategies of opposition candidates in television political advertising. The advertising message strategies of opposition candidates were compared by examining differences in presentation of partisanship, issue stands, and candidate images. The advertisements in the 2002 Korean presidential election will illustrate the differences in actual content between two major party candidates for presidency, especially with regard to the relative emphasis on partisanship, issues and the candidates’ personal qualities. The study demonstrates how and why candidates construct messages differently and how their messages impact on modes of candidate communication with voters.

This study also analyzes the differences in the use of positive and negative message strategies between opposition candidates. Among several dimensions of political advertising, negativity can be defined as an attack on the opponent’s policies, personal character or positions on an issue during the election campaign, while positivity can be referred to as praising or defending the candidate with regard to the election strategies mentioned above. Scholars in communication have studied political spots, particularly the effects of negative advertising. The results of some research in negative political advertising demonstrate that it can make “harm of the opponent as well as boomerang, harming the sponsor” (Amy and David 2002 p. 4). For this reason, whether or not negative political advertising provides the electorate with reliable information upon which to base their voting decisions is a major debate within political communication research.
In addition to examining how and why candidates construct messages as well as their use of positive and negative message strategies, this study also looks at how opposition candidates use appeal types.

According to Kaid’s study (2001), candidates in the 1992 Korean presidential election concentrated on image ads. The political broadcasts were primarily positive in their spotlight and leaders relied on emotional, rather than logical statements to support their points. The analysis of the 1992 Korean presidential election ads is meaningful because it shows what kinds of message strategies and appeal types were embodied in both print and television advertising during the campaign.

However, Kaid’s study did not concentrate specially on television political advertising nor consider the differences in message strategies used by opposing candidates. Furthermore, the study of the 1992 presidential election did not show whether or not opposition candidates took different message strategic positions. The research questions in the present study will attempt to analyze these factors.

Finally, the Korean model of the political campaign advertising is compared to American model. It is worth investigating whether Korean candidates adopted American campaign techniques according to candidate status or made a unique distinction in terms of cultural indicators. Ultimately, this study examines to what extent Korean media election is Americanized.

In sum, the four main research questions will be addressed regarding television political advertising. The ways in which candidates choose to present themselves to voters via television political advertising is explored. Also, the investigation of this
phenomenon provides an opportunity to look at how candidate advertising reflects public concerns and opinions important to the electorate in a democratic society. The study will examine the extent to which television political advertising is influenced by public opinion. Finally, the similarities between Korea and the United States with regard to televised political advertising are examined. According to Kaid’s international study (2001) of political advertising, there has been an increasing similarity in televised political advertising across countries. Hence, the actual formats and styles of advertising copies used in Korean campaigns will be compared to those in the United States.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Television Political Advertising in the Election Campaign

Television (TV) has favorable characteristics compared to other media because it provides visual, lively scenes for viewers. Since the advent of TV, media-mediated communication of election campaigns has changed in the ways in which political candidates communicate with citizens.

Technological characteristics of TV have allowed candidates and voters to interact with each other via mass communication. In the United States, candidates have introduced new forms of campaign communication. For instance, they have been using spot ads since the 1952 Eisenhower-Stevenson race and candidates have participated in televised debates since 1960 (Joslyn 1984). In election campaigns, the emergence of these forms of campaign communication have made it possible for candidates to directly offer election information to a number of voters, some of whom might not be otherwise accessible.

The literature on media elections shows that the characteristics of TV reinforce effective message delivery to people. Lang and Lang (1984) referred to this effectiveness as the intimacy, simultaneity, directness and completeness of the view of public events afforded by television. They also argued that television allows for a close-up view of
personalities and events, and creates a sense of familiarity with public figures, political activities, and distant places. This type of face-to-face contact is presumed to have resulted in an increased sense of intimacy and personalization of politics. By adding sight to sound, visual simultaneity provides a vicarious experience that is like being transported to the scene of political events. Because they do not have to rely on a third party to report what goes on, the viewers can make judgments of their own and interpret political events on their terms. Television provides political events with a fuller, richer, more complete picture of public events than conveyed by other media.

Candidates also employ various strategies to transmit messages more effectively to the targeted audience. These message strategies aim to secure candidates’ position pertinent to partisan affiliated voting, issue stands and personal image in order to gain support of voters. The literature on political advertising supports the influence of message strategies on a candidate’s position in the campaign race.

Political advertising has advantages in that it can be designed to target voters who support a particular candidate during the campaign. Candidates control both the substance and style of advertising. They are able to attain strategic positions in the form of advertising better than in other media venues. In this sense, candidates have strong reasons to rely on ads to get their messages across to voters. They try to “communicate some attention-getting and memorable images and some information about the candidate’s or opponent’s political orientation, experience, or views in a way that resonates with the target public” (Kern 1996 p. 62).
If political advertising affects people’s emotional reactions and their cognitive evaluation of political actors, who are the most influenced voters? In surveys conducted during political rallies in New Hampshire during the presidential elections in 1988, 1992, 1996 and 2000, Trent and Friedenberg (2002) found that the percentage of Independents in the subsamples had grown continuously from one election campaign to the next, “doubling between 1988 (19.1%) and 2000 (38.5%)” (p.2109). In this sense, Kern’s (1996) argument that ads are designed to reach people who may not be very involved with the campaign and who may be resistant to political messages can have important implications. Brians and Wattenberg (1996) found that nonpartisans’ recall of negative advertising mobilized higher turnout. By contrast, Ansolabehere et al. (1994) stated that negative ads demobilized independents from voter participation since the ads brought about political cynicism. Such contrasting results support the claim that political advertising messages can influence voters depending on candidate message strategies.

Message Content and Candidate Status

In light of partisanship, issue stands, and images in the political spots and candidate status, message strategies operate to attract favorable voting intention of the electorate. Message strategies can vary depending on candidate status as the incumbent, challenger or open race candidate in a competitive race. According to Dover (1998), the earlier perspective in research of political communication regarded elections as quadrennial power struggles between the Democratic and Republican parties where voters cast their ballots primarily on the basis of long-held partisanship. However, he
argues that media intervention in campaign communication became a momentum to shift this perspective away from a strong party affiliation base into a candidate-centered one. Similarly, Swanson (2003) points out:

*The relationship between political parties and voters has been less one of identity and long-term commitment and more a relationship of persuasion in which fickle consumers with rapidly changing tastes and little brand loyalty are induced to buy a product at the point of purchase (pp.21-22).*

Consequently, the advancement of information and communication technology has resulted in the rise of candidate-centered campaigns, especially as the influence of political parties on elections has declined.

Due to media presentation techniques, electoral campaigning is often criticized since such mediated communication tends to concentrate on candidates rather than issues. Research suggests that the media in Canada (Medelsohn 1993) and the United States (Jamieson 1992) downplay parties and issues, even when an important issue or ideological concern emerges for debate. The power to present one’s self and one’s opponent in dramatic and contrasting ways was fully realized with the arrival of television, particularly political advertising.

This tendency to focus on the candidate may partially explain the well-known phenomena of American electoral politics: Democratic identifiers who vote Republican at the presidential level. Few studies are known about whether absence or presence of party identification impact advertising content. Some political analysts suggest that in the present political information environment, voters are “surrounded.” This may result in a
decline in the emphasis on party-oriented appeal and an increase in candidate-oriented appeal with regard to political advertising content.

Voters can evaluate candidates and make voting decisions based on issue stands and the candidates’ personal traits. Pomper (1975) points out that voters “change their partisan choice from one election to the next, and these changes are most closely related to their positions on the issues and their assessment of the abilities of the candidates” (p.10).

In light of issue stands, political advertising may have an impact on forming public opinion on particular issues as well as servings as a standard for candidate evaluation. Miller and Klobucar (2003) argue that media news and advertising messages in an election campaign mirror citizens’ issue preferences and perceptions of the policy orientations that candidates express. Candidates try to “preempt the public agenda using campaign communication by suggesting new policy issues, shifting issue positions, or being closely lined up with the public on particular issues” (p. 102). Likewise, Hofstetter and Strand (1983) found that citizens tended to perceive candidate issue positions as a function of media exposure, even though television news and advertising were more weakly associated with their perception than other media formats.

Issue-image ads have key differences in their content and the style. The content analysis of television issue and image ads from U.S. presidential campaigns 1952 to 2000 indicates that 70% of image ads in the sample (N=429) capitalized on the positive qualities of the sponsoring candidate, while 56% of the issue ads (N=784) were more focused on attacking the opponent (Johnston and Kaid 2002). Also, they found that in
issue ads, the candidate was more likely to “speak for himself”, “appear on camera speaking to the viewer”, and make an “emotional appeal,” while in image ads, he was supported by “an anonymous speaker”, and tried to convey “source credibility appeal.”

However, these image strategies have come under scrutiny. This type of political advertising has been criticized for excessively portraying the candidate’s personality, overemphasizing his or her political career and qualities for the office, rather than focusing on issue-oriented or party-tied recommendations (Jamieson 1992; Sabato 1991). In addition, some scholars claim that the content of the advertising spots does not provide sufficient issue-related political information for voters.

Shyles (1983) raised an objection to this criticism that the content of the advertising spots provide political information for voters. His findings showed that the content of advertising reflected salient issues during the 1980 presidential primary campaign.

Negativity and Candidate Status

Generally, negative and positive ads are distinguished by their relative emphasis on the sponsoring candidate and his or her opponent. Negative ads focus on criticism of the opponent while positive ads center on the “good” characteristics, accomplishments, or issue positioning of the sponsoring ads (Kaid and Johnston 1991).

Since the 1980s in the US, the growth of negative advertising has made scholars pay attention to the effects of this message strategy. Research of negative political advertising
campaigns suggest that negativity may result in the intended and unintended effects of a voter’s disposition to favor or oppose a candidate.

Some scholars contend that negative ads have positive effects on the public gaining political information. Brians and Wattenberg’s study (1996) using 1992 American National Election Study data explored political knowledge among media sources—televised political advertisements, television news and newspapers—during the 1992 presidential election. The number of correct response to issue stands and presidential evaluation showed that television political advertising was the medium that contributed most to political learning and accurate political knowledge. In particular, their findings suggest that negative advertising has informational potential in contributions to greater issue knowledge late in the campaign. In this sense, these findings indicate that negative political commercials can contribute to the growth of an informed citizen. Similarly, Lau (1982, 1985) also found that political spots with negative cues are more likely to influence vote choice than those with positive cues.

The most controversial issue of negative political advertising is the degree to which backlash effects occur. Findings are mixed as to whether negativity is effective or not with regard to candidate status. Some studies indicate that negative political advertising messages may create a backlash effect (Kaid et al. 1991; Hill 1989; Sooner 1988; Ansolabehere et al. 1994, 1995). Hill’s investigation (1989) of voters’ reactions to the 1988 campaign advertisements indicated that negative ads did not negatively influence the opponent and damaged the sponsoring candidate. Sooner (1988) found the similar results, suggesting that negativity can be either failing or successful, and focusing on the
relationship between candidate status and the effectiveness of different types of negative appeals in a statewide election. The challenger’s negative personal attack on the incumbent generated a backlash effect, when the incumbent immediately responded to the attack. However, the negative attack was relatively effective when the incumbent did not directly respond.

With regard to party affiliation, studies have demonstrated that negative advertising can convey effective messages rather than boomerang by providing harmful political information about the target candidate (Merritt 1984; Robideaux 2002). Robideaux found that even though negative ads were not effective, unlike the response to comparative ads, the subjects reacted positively to their own party’s candidate negative ads when the targeted opponent was attacked in terms of party affiliation.

Another controversial issue concerns why opposing candidates “go negative” and how negativity is represented in the electoral context. Some research suggests that candidate status is closely related to the tone of political commercials. Lau and Pomper’s analysis (2002) of U.S. Senate elections, 1988 to 1998, indicates that negative campaigning has advantages for challengers, while positive campaigning is more effective for incumbents. In the study of Congressional election campaigns (Tinkham and Weaver-Lariscy 1996), a significant relationship was found between the types of message strategy a candidate selects (e.g., negative, comparative, positive and non-personal issues) and the outcome of the election. They concluded that data from both 1982 and 1990 verify that the challenger was more likely to employ a negative message strategy than the incumbent. They argued that “going negative” strategy of incumbents caused
harmful election outcomes even though challengers and open-race candidates stressed opponents’ personal traits. Similarly, Benoit et al. (1997) found in the analysis of 206 televised campaign advertisements from the US presidential elections of 1980-1996 that challengers tended to do more attacking than incumbents.

Interestingly, Hale et al. (1996) randomly selected a sample of 420 ads generated for US Senate elections between 1984 and 1994 and showed that negative ads were utilized more often than positive ads by challengers, in relatively large states and in more competitive races. Pfau et al. (1992) provided a case study in the 1990 Wellstone US Senate campaign in Minnesota. They discussed how a little known challenger, Wellstone, used less harsh attack ads so that he conveyed persuasive campaign messages, to face a highly credible incumbent, Boschwitz. Skaperda and Grofma (1995) also pointed out that in the electoral context, the changing results of polling can influence the use of negative campaign message strategies over the course of the campaign. They contended that candidates who receive more support will be less likely to attack than candidates who are behind in the polling.

In examining candidate status in advertising content, Kaid and Johnston (1991) compared negative and positive ad content of presidential candidates from 1960 through 1988. The findings showed that challengers used slightly more negative ads than incumbents, although there were no significant differences in candidate status. They contended that the incumbent has the advantages of being in a better position than any other type of candidate. In relation to party affiliation, 31 percent of Democrats’ ads were negative, compared to 28 percent of Republican’s ads (Kaid and Johnston 1991).
In looking at negative political advertising from an international perspective, prior cross-cultural studies have demonstrated that cultural indicators centered on the difference between the Unites States and Asian nations. Findings show that Asian nations tended to use more indirect attacks and less negative appeals than the United States (Lee et al. 1998; Tak et al. 1997; Chang 2000).

Appeal Types

The literature provides evidence that appeal types in advertising content have similarities across nations.

In a study of American issue and image ads from 1952 to 2000, Johnston and Kaid (2002) found that in the presence of appeal types, image ads relied on emotional and source credibility appeal (respectively 83%). Issue ads focused on logical appeal (81%) more than emotional appeal (78%). However, although the dominant appeal type in issue ads centered on ethical appeal, issue ads used emotional appeal (44%) more than logical appeal (38%). There is also a difference in the use of fear appeal in image ads (14%) and issue ads (26%).

Holz-Bach, Kaid and Johnston (1994) found in the national elections in Germany, the US and France that logical appeals were used more frequently in France while emotional appeals were used more frequently in the US and Germany. Lee et al. (1998) found that Korean and American ads relied more on emotional appeal than other appeal types in the 1992 presidential election. It is important to note, however, that even though Korean politics has applied the America style of political spots since the introduction of
political advertising in 1992, the substance and style of appeal types of Korean advertising in the 2002 presidential election may have different patterns, especially with regard to candidate status.

Fear appeals in negative ads are used to persuade the undecided by creating anxiety and tension and then by seeking ways to reduce these feelings (LaTour and Zahra 1988). Recipient’s emotional tension is aroused by negative communication and he or she attempts to reduce that kind of anxiety and danger. The significance of the theoretical formulation from an advertising standpoint can also be applied to political advertising. Kern (1989) agrees that negative messages in political advertisements create voter anxiety and fear. She also asserts that “hard-sell” types of negative ads utilize fear appeals. Political fear appeals to the targeted voters are emphasized in the advertising messages by suggesting vulnerability with regard to the opponent’s personality and issue policies. But the political advertising content depicted by and the degree of fear aroused by a particular message can affect various response patterns of voters. Kaid and Johnston (1991) mention that “candidates rarely make negative attacks themselves, instead using independent sources or surrogates and [that] independently sponsored negative ads are the most successful” (p. 55). In addition, the finding suggests that negative ads were more issue-oriented than positive ads but relied more on emotional and fear appeals (Kaid and Johnston 1991).
Americanization of Korean Election Campaign

The important strategies and tactics of the modern election campaign were developed in the United States (Swanson and Mancini 1996; Blumler et al. 1996). Various campaign communication strategies such as media campaign, recruitment of professional campaign managers, and the increase of negative and attack advertising have been found across nations in spite of cultural and political differences in democratic societies. However, political television advertising has more importance in the US than in Western European countries due to regulations regarding electoral advertising (Holtz-Bacha 2003). Nevertheless, Holtz-Bacha argues that the exportation of US models in campaign communication “has fueled the discussion of an “Americanization” of campaign strategies” (Holtz-Bacha 2003 p. 109).

Blumler et al. (1992) support comparative communication research. First, comparative research explores “patterns and problems in spatial and temporal environment” (p. 3). To compare between nations, comparative research reveals the reason why the unique case happens. Second, comparative research can apply the specific case in a particular country to generalize “theories, assumptions and propositions” across time and space (p. 3). In this sense, “American style of political spots” (Kaid and Holtz-Bacha 1995) may be utilized in the liberal democracies.

The Korean political system and presidential election system is different from that of the United States in that there is no “incumbent” since a Korean president only serves one term for five years. Strictly speaking, unlike the American presidential electoral system, the Korean presidential election is open race. However, the president’s party may
be viewed in the same light as an incumbent. Kaid and Johnston (1991) defined “assumed incumbents” as presidents who “occupied the White House at the time of the election” (p.58). Korea’s governing party candidate may have the same advantage as an incumbent president and is thus considered an “assumed incumbent.” In keeping with Kaid and Johnston, challengers to the assumed incumbent are thus more likely to rely on negative campaign strategies.

This study assumes that like American presidential campaign, candidate status will determine different campaign message strategies in the Korean electoral context. The investigation of the differences of partisanship, issue stands, candidate images, message tone in ads and appeal types between the opposition parties will provide the basis for comparative research of the relationship between candidate status and message strategy.

Research Questions

Though campaign advertising is familiar to the public in the United States as a vehicle of candidate communication, the first political television advertisements were just begun in the 1992 presidential election campaign in Korea (Tak, Kaid and Lee 1997). During the general cycle of campaign 2002, television political spots played an important role to carry out candidate communication with voters. Thus, it is meaningful to examine television political advertising as a part of election campaign communication was used between opposition candidates. One assumption is that opposition candidates in the 2002 Korean presidential election differently structure advertising message strategies to create their desired impressions on potential voters. The other assumption is that opposition
candidates in the 2002 Korean presidential election differently structure advertising message strategies, compared to the American campaign model.

The present study regards governing party candidate, Roh Moo-Hyun as the assumed incumbent and the opposition party candidate, Lee Hoi-Chang as the challenger.

**RQ 1: Is there any difference in presentation of partisanship, issue stands, and candidate images in the ads between the opposing candidates?**

Opposition candidates may place emphasis on different partisan affiliation and different issue-image positions in the advertisements. The subquestion will be examined to analyze the degree of party affiliation appeal and the contrast of issue-image ads between the opposing candidates. Political advertising messages articulated by the candidates can be successful in attracting the public when they reflect the perceived needs of the public, that is, the things they have on their minds. Through the analysis of the messages in the ads, the present study will reveal how opposition candidates suggest and illustrate the future resolutions that may be implemented after they are elected.

**RQ 2: Is the governing party candidate less likely to use negative message strategies in its ads than the opposition party candidate?**
Messages tones—positive, comparative and negative—in the advertisements of the opposing candidates will be different. This subquestion will be investigated to understand the relationship between candidate status and message tones.

**RQ 3: Do the types of appeal in the ads for the governing party candidate differ from those for the opposition party candidate?**

Opposition candidates may place emphasis on different appeal types in advertisements in the 2002 Korean presidential election. Logical, emotional, ethical, and fear appeals used in the advertisements will be addressed to figure out the relationship between candidate status and appeal types.

**RQ 4: Do the advertising message strategies of opposition candidates in the 2002 Korean presidential election differ from the strategies used in American campaign model?**

Finally, from a cross-cultural perspective, there is little known about whether candidate status positions result in different message strategies in the cross-sectional campaign context. This research question attempts to explore the extent to which the opposition candidates in the 2002 Korean presidential election operate in a strategic fashion, compared to American candidate campaign strategies.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

In this study, content analysis was used to pursue a systematic method by which
the self-presentation strategies of the opposition candidates employing political
advertising could be identified to compare, and contrast their political positions. Based on
presence-absence of content, the qualitative analysis of content can be applied to small
samples. Furthermore, since qualitative analysis stresses the intention of communicators
and message effects on the audience (Berelson 1970), the use of this method in the
present study makes the explicit interpretation and understanding of candidate message
strategies clear. The categories produced in this study were modified and replicated from
the coding of videostyle by Kaid and Davidson (1986).

Content Analysis

Content analysis is a research tool used to determine the presence and absence of
certain words or concepts within texts. Researchers quantify and analyze the presence,
meanings and relationships of such words and concepts, then make inferences about the
messages within the texts and even within the culture and time of which these are a part.
To conduct a content analysis on any such text, the text is coded, or broken down into
manageable categories according to the unit of analysis.
Content analysis in the social sciences is possible because of the nature and characteristics of communication. Krippendorff (1980) states:

*Communications are messages that exchanged between interlocutors. The composition and the content of these messages are to some extent intended by the originator and may have of consequences. Most important, communications are exchanged in the context of existing relationships among the communicators and modify the relationships in the process.*

Berelson (1970) points out the general assumptions of content analysis. First, since the characteristics of communication are reflected in the content, “inferences about the relationship between intent and content or between content and effect can be validly made or the actual relationships established” between communicators (p.18). Second, to some extent the argument goes, content analysis is meaningful in that “the meanings that the communicator ascribes to the content, by assigning it to certain categories, correspond to those understood by the audience” (p.19). Third, the quantitative analysis of content “is applied only when the content units – various categories for analysis – have a more or less equal weight” (p. 20). As a result, researchers describe and explain important factors in the communication process by scrutinizing the frequency of the occurrence of the selected categories.

In *Analyzing Media Messages*, Riffe, Lacy and Fico (1998) took the following steps to state the process of analyzing content: (a) “develop research hypotheses or questions,” (b) “examine existing literature that has used the variable or that discusses that measurement of the variable,” (c) “use good previous measures, or if the measurement is
Data And Methods

In order to gain a comprehensive perspective and understanding of the content of advertisements, content analysis was conducted in all ads of the opposition candidates. The unit of analysis was each political spot.

For this videostyle analysis, all of the televised political advertisements for the 2002 presidential election cycle were collected through both parties, party websites, and the Korean Broadcast Commission.

A total of 17 advertisements (ruling party 11, opposite party 6) were analyzed in this study. The advertisements of the governing party consist of those aired on the national network as well as unaired ones. All advertisements of the opposition party were aired on the national network. In Korea, since there is a regulation that the period of official presidential campaign is 22 days before the voting date (November 27 to December 18), candidate spot ads are relatively small compared to those of other media. The data were coded based on Kaid’s political advertising code sheet and analyzed by the muti-response method and crosstabulation with SPSS 10.0.
Reliability and Validity

Coding procedures should include intercoder reliability. To reduce coder bias, two graduate coders who are fluent in both Korean and English were trained with an instruction program. The program explained the coding system and the definitions of variables. The instructor further explained any problems with the system or definitions. Intercoder reliability was determined by Holsti’s formula to the entire sample. Intercoder reliability yielded the average .91, with individual item scores ranging from .53 to 1.0. According to Damore (2002), there is no statistical method to secure accurate validity. Instead, he suggests that construct validity can be an alternative method. The role of construct validity is to connect interrelated concepts from the abstract dimension as well as to link theories to data from the empirical dimension. Damore (2002) states that since candidate strategies are designed to support the sponsoring candidate and to defend the opponent’s attack, data will reflect their intentions. In this sense, these constructs and variable measurements are valid.

Categories

Identifying the unit of analysis is an important step when formulating the categories in content analysis (Kaid and Wadsworth 1989). Consistent with the study design, which examined the candidate videostyle present in a spot ad, the unit of analysis for this study, is defined as a political spot ad.

*Partisanship.* The content categories for the candidate spot ads included the presence or absence of partisanship: party and candidate slogan; voice-over and visual
text containing party logo; appearance party representative and endorsement by party or another party leaders; identification of the candidate’s party affiliation.

*Issue Stands.* The content categories for presence and absence of issue stands included the emphasis of the spot ad (e.g., campaign issue or candidate image), issues mentioned, a number of issues, a sense alienation or cynicism referred to in the spots (e.g., feeling that ordinary people are not able to influence government or polices; politicians are not responsive to what people want; distrust of government or politicians in general; or reference to consequences of alienation-might not vote, might as well not bother, no need to participate), and a discussion or scene of participation of voters referred to in the spot (e.g., donation; volunteer; voting and policy suggestion).

*Candidate Images.* The content categories for presence and absence of campaign images were the candidate characteristics emphasized in the spot (e.g., honesty/integrity; toughness/strength; warmth/compassion; competency; performance/success; aggressiveness; activeness; qualifications)

*Positive vs. negative tone in the ads.* Negative advertising is conceptualized as the attack on the opponent – his or her policies, accomplishments, personal traits and associates, and so on – while concentrating on the attributes of the opponent. On the other hand, positive advertising is defined as defending and acclaiming one’s own advantages. Comparative ads refer to a comparison of the sponsoring candidate to his or her opponent at one or more levels. The content categories for the presence and absence of campaign advertising tone were based on the focus of the ad (e.g., candidate-positive; opponent-negative; comparative; or cannot determine). In the case of negative ads, negative
messages were also analyzed using categories for the presence or absence of a negative attack, the type of attack made, who made the attack, the purpose and nature of the attack and the strategies used in making the attack. Attack types consisted of direct attack against the opponent, direct attack against another politician, direct attack against another party, a more general/indirect attack against government and other parties, a indirect/implicit attack without specific mention of the object of the attack, or not applicable. The subject who made the attack was coded as candidate attacks opponents, known surrogate attacks opponent, anonymous announcer attacks opponent or not applicable. The purpose and nature of the attack and the strategies used in making the attack included attack on personal characteristics of opponent, attack on issue stands/consistency of opponent, attack on opponent’s group affiliations or association, attack on opponent’s background/qualifications or attack on opponent’s performance in past offices/positions. In addition, strategies used in making negative attacks were coded as use of humor/ridicule, negative association, name calling, or guilty by association.

**Appeal types.** Appeal types – logical, emotional, ethical and fear appeals – are the persuasive ways to attract voters in American political advertising. Logical appeals use statistical evidence, while emotional appeals include stimulating feelings such as happiness, pride, anger, and patriotism (Lee et al. 1998). Ethical appeals utilize the credibility and trustworthiness of candidate or the speaker (Lee et al. 1998). The types of appeals used (e.g., logical, emotional, ethical appeal), presence or absence of fear appeal, and the content of appeal used (e.g., partisan, issue-related, personal characteristics of the
candidate, or the linking of the candidate with certain demographic groups) were included within the categories.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The main research question addressed how opposition candidates structure their advertising messages to influence voters and what are differences and similarities between the Korean and American political advertising message strategies. Four specific questions were used to guide the research. The first analysis outlined below indicates how opposition candidates both structure and present partisanship, issue stands, and candidate images. The second analysis addressed message tone in advertising. The third analysis dealt with appeal types. Finally, the results were compared to the American style of political spots.

Partisanship

An examination of the presentation of partisanship indicates that there is a slight difference between the opposing candidates. Only the opposition Grand Nation Party (GNP) candidate utilized party identification in advertising spots. While all of the GNP’s six ads contained the party’s logo in the visual text, the party’s name was not indicated in the audio portion of the ad, specifically, in the voice-over. By contrast, ads for the governing Millennium Democratic Party (MDP) candidate did not contain any information from which the partisan identity of the candidate could be identified. Additionally, the content in both parties’ ads did not present specific references, which
would have motivated voters to turn to traditional partisan loyalty. For example, ad content did not include endorsements by either party. Important partisan leaders, as well as those representing the philosophical centers of their respective parties were conspicuously absent from these ads. Instead, all ads of both parties emphasized the candidates’ slogans both in visuals and in the voice-overs. This emphasis on a characteristic of the candidate rather than party affiliation illustrates changes in candidate and consultant perceptions of what factors of a campaign influence voters. Partisanship was no longer perceived as the main criterion upon which the voters based their choice of candidates.

In the spot ads of the 2002 Korean general election, partisan-only appeals were rare. Instead, voters were asked to judge the candidates as people rather than as representatives of a party. With these changes in ad appeals, voters could reinforce their perception and evaluation of candidates on the basis of candidate-centered rather than party-centered information.

**Issue Stands**

An interesting phenomenon in Korea’s 2002 election campaign was the dynamic interaction of citizens and candidates through advertising messages. The issues discussed in campaign advertising tell us a great deal about the public agenda and the evidence shows that both candidates were involved in shaping these issues through campaign communication.
Two surveys by Korea Gallup and Daehan daily newspaper two months before the polling day defined citizens’ main concerns with regard to campaign issues. The public’s perception was that economic growth, job creation and price stabilization were the major problems while political reform and anti-corruption were secondary national concerns.

When asked by Korea Gallup (October 19, 2002) “what’s the most important problem that the president-elect should solve for the office term,” respondents answered: economic growth and job creation (38.1%), eradication of corruption (13.3%), and political reform (12.5%). Another survey by the Daehan daily newspaper (October 8, 2002) shows that when asked the same question, respondents placed top priority on price stabilization and unemployment (29.6%). Political reform was ranked as important by 21.4 % of respondents with anti-corruption rated by 15.5%.

For the most part, although there were differences in the relative emphasis, the issues addressed in the 2002 campaign advertisements were similar to the issues identified as a result of polling. However, as can be shown in Figure 1, the advertisements focused primarily on the economy, politics, women, education, and unification/international affairs.

Among the issues discussed frequently by both candidates, the results indicate that there were differences in the amount of advertising addressing economic concerns. Economy-related advertisements (29.5%) of the opposition party candidate, Lee Hoi-chang numbered higher than those of the governing party’s candidate, Roh moo-hyun (18.9%). Lee’s ads focused on the “economy in general” (11.8%), “job growth” (11.8%) and “cost of living” (5.9%). Roh’s ads were directed toward “unemployment/jobs”
(6.3%), “economy in general” (6.3%), and “poverty/hunger/homeless” (6.3%). However, the content in both advertisements was quite different. Lee’s “Truth” ads claimed that the incumbent party’s failed economic policy had resulted in a steep rise in housing costs and personal financial crises. At the same time, Lee emphasized his alternative policy emphasizing job growth. His attack messages regarding economic concerns condemned the incumbent government for its economic policies. In Roh’s television ads, the focus was on poverty and the fair distribution of wealth.

According to the results, neither candidate’s issue stands for the economy dealt with the primary economic concerns of the public—economic growth, price stability and unemployment—in detail. Only Lee’s ads suggested a concrete proposal to create jobs, even though his ads attacked the economic polices of the incumbent government. The opposing candidates did not suggest how they would employ tangible economic policies during their office term.

A considerably different perspective emerged with regard to the political issue positions discussed between the opposing candidates. The political messages in Lee’s ads made references to “dissatisfaction with the government” (11.8%). All of Lee’s ads referred to a sense of alienation or cynicism in politics but only seventeen percent of his ads encouraged voting and suggested policies. The incumbent President, Kim Dae-jung’s administration had received public criticism with regard to its members’ involvement in bribery as well as scandals involving President Kim Dae-jung’s sons. Lee’s advertisement, “Truth” addressed this problem. In starting with the question, “Do you remember the promise?,” this advertisement depicts Kim Dae-jung’s administration as
corrupted and dishonest. Accordingly, it suggests that Roh Moo-hyun’s support for Kim Dae-jung could be evidence of Roh’s past political faults. Next, the advertisement directly attacks Roh’s policies with regard to administration, partisanship and international relationships, particularly those with the United States and North Korea.

Lee Hoi-chang emphasized a restoration of anti-corruption and the moral integrity to government by attacking the Kim Dae-jung’s scandals and by suggesting that Roh Moo-hyun, as a successor, would carry on the questionable moral and ethical quality of that administration.

Unlike Lee’s ads, Roh Moo-hyun’s conveyed “dissatisfaction with politics in general,” especially regional antagonism and money-politics. While twenty-five percent of his ad messages were concerned with this issue, nineteen percent mentioned public participation in his political campaign, emphasizing his public support with ads depicting people’s voluntary donations to his campaign fund raising activities. In fact, three of Roh’s six aired ads mentioned the people’s donations in support of Roh.

In the comic animated advertisement “Cheerful Political Reform,” the main characters were voters who supported Roh. This ad begins with the joyful background music of “Bahama,” performed by the Euro-Disco group, Boney M. The voters in this ad do not believe politicians, thinking that they care more about money politics than the people they serve. However, these voters see Roh as different from the past and present presidential candidates and thus, make donations to his election fund, hoping that he will be elected as a president “for the people” rather than “for the power.” The various reasons for which the common people contributed to his campaign suggested the need for
political reform and created an image in which Roh was seen as the candidate to bring about that reform.

In the “Evergreen” ad, an anonymous narrator talks about Roh’s political journeys, presenting defeats in his previous campaigns for the National Assembly as due to deep-rooted regional prejudice in Korea. In the narration, Roh promises that he will be a president “for the people,” owing only to the ordinary people, everything that he is.

The “Letter for People” advertisement was aired on the national network the evening before the voting day. Roh moved forward to urge voters to take part in casting a vote for him. While Roh’s voice reads his letters to voters, various pictures of his election campaign supporters are shown. The advertising copy, “even though you have been disappointed by old politics and policies, do not give up your right in this general election,” appealed the voters in their 30’s and 40’s.

In viewing the content of both candidates’ ads addressing unification and international issue stands, one can see substantial differences. Only one of the Lee’s six ads solely addressed “unification policy” (5.9%). Lee maintained emphatically criticized the unification policy of the incumbent government. Known as the “sunshine policy,” this was an attempt to open the door to North Korea using the principle of reciprocity. Lee, however, condemned this sunshine policy as being little more than gratuitous support.

Roh Moo-hyun, on the other hand, stressed the importance of a unification policy with North Korea. Twenty-five percent of his ads mentioned the unification issue as the focus of his campaign.
“Women” (11.8%), “education” (17.6%), and “health care in general” (11.8%) were issues upon which Lee’s ads showed greater emphasis. Related issues addressed were equal rights at work, childcare, health care, school education, and better treatment of teachers. Two of Lee’s ads mentioned the current government’s failed policies and promoted Lee’s solutions with regard to these issues. By contrast, Roh did not place much emphasis on addressing these issues. Only 6.3 percent of his ads dealt with education and women’s equal rights issues.

The 2002 election advertisements provided some policy indications, but more importantly, illustrate the different strategies used by the candidates. While Lee’s ads outlined specific information about particular means to accomplish policy objectives, Roh’s ads tended to stress agreed-upon values rather than detailed policy solutions. The results show that the opposition candidates took different approaches in dealing with issue stands, especially those related to political reform and unification affairs. They also appealed to different segments of voters by raising and stressing different issues.

Candidate Images

During the election campaign, opposition candidates drew on advertisements in the very different ways. For the most part, Lee’s ads focused on campaign issues, while Roh’s ads were devoted to candidate image (See Table 1).

Figure 2 demonstrates that the characteristic traits of both candidates show a significantly different pattern. Roh was more likely to use “warmth /compassion” (19.4%), “honesty/integrity” (16.1%), and “activeness” (12.9%), while Lee employed
only “warmth/compassion” (14.3%), and “activeness” (7.1%) to much lesser degrees. Lee was more likely to use “competency” (35.7%) and “qualification” (35.7%) traits whereas Roh’s ads used “competency” (9.7%) and “qualification” (16.1%). The image ads emphasized on different characteristics of these opposing candidates. Roh’s ads projected the image of a warm, honest but active president while Lee’s tried to produce an image of a competent and qualified president.

Roh Moo-hyun, regarded as liberal and reformist, was shown sitting on a stool, strumming a guitar and singing a popular Korean folk song “With Love” in the advertisement. In displaying Roh’s youthful image, this ad suggested a new kind of Korean president, reiterating Roh’s attempt to project himself as wanting to be a president “for the people.”

Similarly, Lee also tried to convey this image. In the very last commercial to be aired in his support, Lee’s picture is set to his own narration. He explains his past five-years of experience as a representative of the opposition party and much like Roh, attempts to project the image that here is a leader sharing the sentiment of the common people’s lives.

However, Lee’s ads focused more on impugn the scandal-plagued incumbent government of Kim Dae-jung and labeled Roh’s leadership as that of “an unstable novice.” In the “Danger vs. Safety” advertisement, a bus driver’s qualifications serve as a metaphor for those of the president. Since a bus driver has a responsibility for his passengers, he should drive carefully and care for his passengers’ safety. Likewise, it is a president’s responsibility to manage a nation and to show concern for his/her people.
Lee’s ad describes Roh as a dangerous and incautious driver who drives a bus on his own authority with little concern for his passengers. In the last scene of the ad, there is an accident. On the other hand, Lee is described as a qualified, sharp driver who cares for his passengers. Lee’s passengers feel security because of his safe and thoughtful driving skills. At the end of the ad, a famous actor popular among the middle aged states that “it is a very important time to decide who is going to drive a bus named “Korea.” Popularity does not make for a qualified president. Think about whether or not you feel safe with your choice.”

Another Lee’s advertisement, “Nation Management” which is the most rhythmic and cheerful of Lee’s advertisements was also devoted to an attack against Roh’s personal trait. Computer graphics are used with upbeat and comical background music. This advertisement shows the importance of being a president who manages a nation. By illustrating how long it takes to learn to ride a bicycle, drive a car, navigate a ship and pilot an airplane, the ad puts into perspective the time needed to learn to lead a nation. This advertisement suggests that Roh is an unprepared candidate, calling him “a novice.” On the other hand, Lee’s administrative and political experience—President of the National Bank, Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection, Supreme Court Judge and Representative of the GDP—illustrates that he is a prepared and competent candidate for President.

The advertising strategies used shows that Roh was more likely to employ “calling for changes (14.3%)” and “emphasizing optimism and hope for future” (25.7%).
However, Lee emphasized “yearning for the past (18.8%)” and the use of “personal experience, anecdotes to support candidacy” (18.8%) (See Figure 3).

In candidate image ads, both candidates employed a very different message strategy. Roh more focused on his own positive characteristics, while Lee concentrated on attacking against the opponent’s personal attributes.

Positive vs. Negative Message Strategies

The second question asks whether the governing party is less likely to use than the opposition party’s negative, attack messages. Table 2 shows the result of message tones used by both candidates. Half of the opposition party ads relied on positive messages, while the remainder focused on negative messages, primarily comparative ads. The opposition party promoted its candidate, Lee, as positive while denouncing the “assumed incumbent,” Roh, and his party.

With regard to the attacking component in advertisements, Lee’s advertisements made “direct attack against the opponent”(16.7%) or “another party” (16.7%) and “indirect/implicit attack without specific mention of the object”(33.3%). In contrast to this strategy, the ads of the governing party were all positive. Only two of Roh’s ads contained negative messages. Roh’s ads consisted of “direct attacks against the opponent”(9.1%) and “more general, indirect attack against government and other parties”(9.1%) (See Table 3).

More importantly, the subject who made attack was quite different between the opposing candidates. Lee did not himself attack his opponent in any of ads. Instead, the
subjects who made the attacks were as follow: “know surrogate attacks opponent” (16.7%) and “anonymous announcer attacks opponents” (50%). On the other hand, in Roh’s ads, the subject who made attack was Roh himself (18.2%) (See Table 4).

Finally, with regard to the dominant purpose or nature of the attack in negative ads, Lee’s ads questioned the “personal characteristics of opponent” (33.3%) and the “opponent’s group affiliation or associations” (33.3%). Roh’s ads also targeted “personal characteristics of opponent” (9.1%) and “opponent’s group affiliation or associations” (9.1%). In terms of attack strategies, Lee’s ads employed “negative association” (33.3%), “name-calling” (16.7%) and “others” (16.7%), while Roh’s ads utilized “name-calling” (9.1%) and “others” (9.1%).

**Appeal Types**

The third question involves examining whether or not the types of appeal employed in the ads for the governing party differ from those of the opposition party.

The candidates used the following types of appeals: logical appeals (use of evidence,) emotional appeals (to invoke feelings) and source credibility/ethos appeals (appealing to qualifications as candidate). Lee’s ads employed “logical appeals” (40%) most often, followed by “emotional appeals” (30%) and “source credibility/ethos appeal” (30%). Roh’s ads made use of “emotional appeals” (50%), “source credibility/ethos appeal” (45%) and “logical appeals” (5%). Because Roh put emphasis on the projection of candidate image, he used many more emotional appeals than logical
appeals. In comparison, Lee’s use of emotional and logical appeals did not differ drastically relative to Roh’s.

Fear appeals were used in 66.7% of Lee’s ads, but not at all in Roh’s ads. Almost sixty seven percent of Lee’s ads contained negative messages with all employing fear appeals. All of Roh’s ads were positive so there was no use of fear appeals.

When examining appeal content, one can see that Lee used “candidate issue concern appeal”(15.4%), “vague policy preference appeal”(30.8%), “specific policy proposals”(7.7%), “personal characteristics of candidate”(23.1%), and “linking of candidate with certain demographic groups”(23.1%). Roh employed “personal characteristics of candidate”(57.9%), “linking of candidate with certain demographic groups”(26.3%) and candidate’s issue concern”(10.5%), and “vague policy preference appeal”(5.3%) (See Figure 4).

With regard to content of appeal, Lee concentrated on issue-related appeals even though his ads were devoted to candidate issue concern and vague policy preference. Roh emphasized the personal characteristics of the candidate more than any other appeal type.

Americanization of Korean Election Campaign

In the 2002 Korean presidential election, political advertising showed a favorable inclination towards American style and content of political ads.

Evidence from the present study sheds light on the assertion that Korean political advertising follows American style in a few ways. Among them, partisan identification, negative campaign tactics and the usage of appeal types were closely related to candidate
status. While challenger, Lee relatively portrayed party-related symbols, Roh only stressed his campaign slogan and logo.

The conservative opposition party candidate, Lee’s negative ads have the positive force, but they were devoted to the attacks against the policies of the current government as well as the opponent’s personal characteristics. Lee’s advertising content in the campaigning was full of the past but had little about the future. But reform-oriented assumed incumbent, Roh adopted the positive campaign strategy. His advertising content focused on “change of old politics”—the change from illegal campaign fundraising for mobilizing voters into citizens’ voluntary donation —and the future while refraining from highlighting the past.

Korean candidates tended to rely on emotional appeal than logical appeal, just as used in the American ads. With regard to candidate status, the analysis showed some differences in the use of appeal types between both candidates. All of Lee’s negative ads relied on fear appeal message strategies, while All of Roh’s positive ads focused on emotional and ethical appeal.

In the presentation of issue-image ads, opposition parties deemphasized specific issue concerns with promoting policies and themes that would appeal to the electorate as a whole. On the other hand, in the content of image ads, Roh focused upon personal morality and Lee occupational competencies.
This study aimed to investigate how in the 2002 Korean presidential election opposition candidates structured advertising message strategies to create their desired impressions on potential voters. The assumption was that like the American presidential campaign, candidate status would determine the different campaign message strategies employed in the Korean electoral context.

Using this perspective, the present study described how candidate status (e.g., assumed incumbent and challenger) influenced the style and substance of candidate advertising spots, focusing on messages emphasizing party identification, issue stands, candidate images, message tones (e.g., positive or negative), and appeal types.

Overall, the findings indicate that the opposing candidates employed different message strategies. The analysis of this study reveals real difference in the content and approaches of television political advertising. This study examines whether such exercise can lead to valuable insight about the general role played by political advertising across cultures. Ultimately, the findings indicate that the similarities are a result of the importation of an American style of political spots.
Partisanship, Issue stands and Candidate Images

As predicted, there were slight differences between the presentations of partisanship in the advertising content of the candidates. Challenger Lee’s ads tended to exhibit the party’s logo in visual text while Roh’s ads did not provide any information identifying his own party. However, the opposing candidates utilized similar campaign tactics in order to offer candidate information to voters. Both parties largely stressed the candidates’ slogans using visuals and voice-overs. In addition, ads containing trustworthy remarks from important and supportive leaders of the candidate’s party were not present in any of either candidate’s ads. This suggests that party affiliation did not play an important role in mobilizing voter choice during this campaign. Rather, both parties emphasized candidate-oriented campaign messages. The findings support the notion that party-oriented campaigning gave way to candidate-oriented campaigns in the 2002 Korean presidential election.

This phenomenon also implies that Korean political advertising spots yielded to the American style of political spots. American political advertising has been the most traditional and typical means of campaign communication as well as media presentation within a political system centered more on the individual candidates than on parties (Holtz-Bacha 2003). Although Korean political advertising is usually limited to electoral campaigns, in particular twenty days before the election date, the content of ads in the 2002 electoral campaign displayed a considerable degree of personalization.

With regard to the second subquestion discussing issue stands, results of this study show marked differences between the opposition candidates. Challenger Lee was
more concerned about economic issues than assumed incumbent Roh. Lee’s ads primarily mentioned “economic in general” and “job growth” (both 12%). By contrast, Roh’s ads included “unemployment/job”, “economic in general” and “poverty/hunger/homeless” (each 6.3%). Important to this finding is the fact that the messages of Lee’s ads attacked the incumbent government’s failure in its economic policies. On the other hand, assumed incumbent Roh’s ads did not attack the economic policies of the incumbent government at all. Rather, Roh’s ads focused on poverty and portrayed his vision for fair distribution of wealth when he holds in power.

Political issue positions of both candidates exhibited a considerable difference in advertising content. Two of Lee’s ads referred to “dissatisfaction with government” while 25% of Roh’s ads talked about “dissatisfaction with politics in general” focusing on regional antagonism and money-politics. This results indicates that the challenger, Lee ascribed the political scandals—corrupt politicians and people’s cynicism for politics—to the corruption of the incumbent government and attacked Roh’s qualities for officeholder, since he was the candidate supported by that government. Roh tended to approach the more deep-seated causes of problems in politics in general.

As a result, Lee emphasized the moral integrity of his new government while Roh encouraged public political participation in the campaign. Three of the six ads broadcast by Roh mentioned ordinary citizens’ voluntary donations to his campaign.

The roles of unification and international issue positions were significantly different between the candidates. Only one of Lee’s six ads dealt with “unification policy,” criticizing the incumbent government for its gratuitous support for North Korea.
However, 25% of Roh’s ads emphasized a “unification policy” and an independent relationship to the United States.

Other issues related to women, education and healthcare in general were featured in Lee’s ads, which also criticized government-failed policies and promoted his solutions and promises. By contrast, Roh’s ads referred to these issues in only 6.3% of his ads.

The opposing candidates took different issue stands on the specific policies that were the most important concerns to voters in the 2002 Korean campaign advertisements. Challenger, Lee focused on an attack against the current government and his opponent, while the assumed incumbent Roh promoted his issues and suggested positive message strategies. The findings, which appear particularly noteworthy, given the Korean style of political spots, indicate that the opposing candidates structured their presentation in the ads according to candidate status. Also these findings suggest that the American campaign communication in which the assumed incumbent employs the advantages of the incumbent while the challenger tends to “go negative” can be applied to Korean campaign communication.

The third subquestion described here suggested that the opposition candidates depicted their personal traits using a significantly different pattern. Roh’s image ads portrayed Roh as a warm, honest but active president, whereas Lee’s ads promoted him as having the ability and experience to be a more competent and qualified president. Roh’s ads projected his image as that of a leader sharing the sentiment of citizen’s lives and in touch with the public. Two of the ads broadcast by Lee stigmatized Roh’s
leadership as that of “an unstable novice,” and focused on Lee’s qualified and competent career as administrative and political leader.

In the advertising strategies used to project candidate images, both candidates took different approaches. Roh was more likely to be “calling for changes” (14.3%) and “emphasizing optimism and hope for future” (25.7%). On the other hand, Lee emphasized “yearning for the past” (19%) and “personal experience, anecdotes to support candidacy” (19%).

With regard to candidate image strategies, the findings imply that candidate status determined the decision to employ negative campaign tactics. In this study, the assumed incumbent Roh employed a positive image positioning and promoted himself as a warm and honest leader. He also provided his vision of the future of Korea. Conversely, challenger Lee devoted his ads to attacking his opponent, accusing Roh of lacking the qualifications for president, and focusing instead on his own stability, experience and personal traits. Using the premium of the governing party and progressive candidate characteristic, Roh tried to propose his political visions for future. Challenger, Lee attributed the national economic and political crises to the current government’s policies and attempted to “return to the past” when his party was in power.

**Positive vs. Negative Strategies**

The result of opposition candidates’ decisions to “go negative” offers strong support for the relationship between candidate status and attack strategy.
Half of Lee’s ads delivered positive messages and the others included negative messages, mainly comparative ads. The message strategies in negative ads specified indirect/implicit attack with specific mention of the opponent and his party rather than direct attack against the opponent and his party. Only two of Roh’s ads included negative messages, since his focus was on creating positive images of himself as the candidate to choose.

Both candidates’ strategies differed with regard to the subject who made attack. In Lee’s ads, “known surrogate (17%) and anonymous announcer (50%)” attacked the opponent, while in Roh’s ads, the candidate himself (18.2%) was the source of the attack. In addition, in all ads, although the degrees expressed were significantly different between candidates, the dominant purpose and nature of the attack in negative ads was to bring into question, the “personal characteristics of the opponent” and/or “the opponent’s group affiliation or association”.

This finding has important implications for cross-sectional studies of campaign advertising tone. Previous research shows that due to cultural differences, Korean political ads tend to avoid “negativism” in order not to produce “backlash effect” (Lee, Kaid and Tak 1998). The results presented here suggest that even though cultural values are different, candidate status determined the negative campaign tactics employed in the Korean campaign. Particularly, the challenger, Lee used many more negative messages in attacking his opponent and the current government. This campaign strategy followed the American style stressing the importance of candidate status: challenger or incumbent (Lau and Pomper 2002; Tinkham and Weaver-Laricy 1996; Benoit et al. 1997; Hale et al.
1996; Skaperda and Grofma 1995). That this model seems to have crossed international boundaries is important.

**Appeal Types**

A previous study comparing Korean campaign ads to American campaign ads at the 1992 presidential level found that Korean ads followed the American style in the usage of appeal types (Lee, Kaid and Tak 1998). The findings indicated that logical, emotional and fear appeal had varied between Korean ads and American ads. “Korean ads used more ethical appeals (50%) than did American ads (21.1%)” (Lee, Kaid and Tak 1998 pp. 82-3).

Based on this point, the analysis of appeal type is worthwhile in confirming whether or not the opposing candidates in the 2002 Korean election followed American style appeal type. The findings show that the candidates used different appeal type message strategies. While Lee’s ads were more likely to rely on logical appeals, Roh spots made much more use of the emotional appeal (50%) than the logical appeal (5%). Since Roh emphasized candidate image as the principal element of voter persuasion, he depended on emotional and ethical appeals. In contrast with Roh’s ads, Lee used three appeal types, although logical appeal appears to have been used more than other appeals. All of Lee’s negative ads also contained fear appeal messages whereas Roh’s ads contained no fear appeal messages at all.

In appeal content presented in ads, Lee was more concerned with “vague issue preference and candidate issue concern” rather than “personal characteristics of candidate
and “liking of candidate with certain demographic groups.” Conversely Roh focused more on his characteristics and appealed to targeted voters rather than stressing issue concerns.

The candidates’ use of appeal types reveal that both candidates took a stance on message strategies using candidate status as a basis. Roh took advantage of his “assumed incumbent” status and used positive image message strategies, focusing on touching the hearts of voters. By contrast, Lee more often utilized fear appeals, using ads evoking dark and fearful moods to emphasize what the ruling MDP had failed to do.

Americanization of Korean Election Campaign

The main conclusion is that opposition parties operated in a strategic fashion that must be sensitive to the distinctive characteristics of candidate status. In the 2002 Korean presidential campaign, candidates rarely used party-oriented messages and significantly candidate-oriented messages, as is common in the American ads. Josylin (1984) pointed out that the majority of American spot ad appeals are candidate- rather than party-oriented. Similarly, the spot ads of the 2002 Korean general election display the same patterns. Opposition parties attempted to appeal to less attached voters in order to strengthen its optimal influence on undecided voters, not their traditional party affiliation. Support for this result was also found in previous research. (Dover 1998; Swanson 2003; Medelsohn 1993; Jamieson 1992; Sabato 1991). In addition, Similar to Benoit’s result (2000), the result of this study shows that the incumbent party candidate, Roh praises and
defends more, and attacks less, than challenger, Lee. Also, as Styles (1983) points out, opposition candidates made a difference in taking a stance on their issue concerns.

However, like the result of Lee et al’s study (1998), Korean candidates were still more likely to rely on image ads than issue ads. This finding draws a distinction from the American style, which was more likely to accentuate issue ads than image ads (Lee, Kaid and Tak 1998; Johnston and Kaid 2002). Korean candidates tended to emphasize emotional appeal than logical appeal, just as used in the American ads (Lee, Kaid and Tak 1998; Holz-Bach, Kaid and Johnston 1994), although opposition candidates differed in their usage of appeal types.

This study is worth noting the extent to which the American style of political spots has been accepted in Korean campaign communication. Overall, the results provide support for the argument that comparisons between the United States and Korea yield similarities in campaign communication with regard to candidate status even though there are differences in the political culture of both countries.

Limitations And Future Directions

This study illustrates the advantages of exploring a candidate’s comprehensive message strategy by exploring the use and content of American-style of campaign commercials during the 2002 presidential election campaign. Candidate message strategies allow us to grasp not only candidate communication with voters in domestic context but also the cross-sectional globalization of American campaign communication in democratic society.
Despite of the significance of these findings, the study has several limitations, particularly in terms of the nature of cross-cultural comparative research. As we have noted, the data represents only a beginning. Given that the race for the Presidency is generally competitive, the analysis of campaign messages presented here lacks in considering the context of major party competition.

Second, there are numerous factors that can affect campaign communication, including, “use of political and media consultants, availability of funding and other resources” (Lee, Lariscy and Tinkham 2003), media evaluation on candidates’ political advertising (e.g., adwatch), contextual factors (e.g., ad timing and ad tone) and the difference between the number of advertisements made and broadcast (Goldstein and Freedman 2002), to name a few. These factors should be considered when investigating overall candidate campaign strategies. However, these factors are excluded in this study in order to concentrate on the relationship between candidate status and campaign message strategies, relative to the American campaign model.

Third, with respect to the method and the measures employed, the single small sample may be an obstacle to generalizing the exportation of the American style of political spots. Due to regulations that place restrictions on Korea’s official campaign period, the advertisements made and broadcast were relatively small. Also, since the instrument’s message categories were developed with the US campaign advertising in mind, the content of advertisements may fail to convey the exact meanings of the original language as a result of translation.
Although these limitations are obvious, this effort to analyze the generalization of the comparative research and the globalization of the American style of political spots serves as the impetus for future study. Future study will develop and test the contextual factors in political advertising, such as competitiveness in the race, advertising timing and tone, the difference between advertisements made and broadcast, etc. Given that political systems and cultural values are different across nations, such contextual factors may make a difference across nations. More importantly, future study will expand beyond a single case study. The disadvantage of a single study is that it lacks in explaining the phenomenon in terms of the generalizability. A wide range of longitudinal comparative research will better describe and explain the “Americanization” of campaign communication across countries.
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### TABLE 1
Commercial Emphasis*Opposition Candidates Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee, Hoi Chang</th>
<th></th>
<th>Roh, Moo Hyun</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Issue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Image</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
Negative Attack Used*Opposition Candidate Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lee, Hoi Chang</th>
<th></th>
<th>Roh, Moo Hyun</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3
Negative Attack Made*Opposition Candidate Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N=17)</th>
<th>Lee, Hoi Chang</th>
<th>Roh, Moo Hyun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct attack against the opponent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct attack against another party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more general, indirect attack against government and other parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An indirect/implicit attack without specific mention of the object of the attack</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, Hoi Chang</td>
<td>Roh, Moo Hyun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate attacks the opponent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known surrogate attack the opponent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous announcer attack the opponent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate attacks the opponent</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known surrogate attack the opponent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1
Issues Between Opposition Candidates

- Education/school: Lee 17.6, Roh 6.3
- Participation in politics: Lee 18.8, Roh 11.8
- Dissatisfaction with politics in general: Lee 25, Roh 11.8
- Dissatisfaction with government: Lee 11.8, Roh 5.9
- Unification/International Issues: Lee 25, Roh 6.3
- Women's Issue (equal right): Lee 11.8, Roh 6.3
- Welfare/Welfare reform: Lee 11.8, Roh 6.3
- Health care in general: Lee 11.8, Roh 6.3
- Poverty/Hunger/Homeless: Lee 6.3, Roh 6.3
- Job growth: Lee 11.8, Roh 6.3
- Economy in general: Lee 11.8, Roh 6.3
- Unemployment/Jobs: Lee 6.3, Roh 6.3
- Cost of living/Inflation: Lee 5.9, Roh 6.3

Legend: □ Lee Hoichang  ■ Roh Moohyun
FIGURE 2
Candidate Characteristics Between Opposition Candidates

- Qualification: Lee Hoichang 16.1, Roh Moohyun 35.7
- Attractiveness: Lee Hoichang 12.9, Roh Moohyun 7.1
- Agreeableness: Lee Hoichang 9.7, Roh Moohyun 7.1
- Competence: Lee Hoichang 7.1, Roh Moohyun 9.7
- Past Performance/Success/Failure: Lee Hoichang 9.7, Roh Moohyun 35.7
- Agressiveness: Lee Hoichang 6.5, Roh Moohyun 7.1
- Toughness/Strength: Lee Hoichang 16.1, Roh Moohyun 9.7
- Honesty/Integrity: Lee Hoichang 14.3, Roh Moohyun 19.4
- Warmth/Compassion: Lee Hoichang 0.5, Roh Moohyun 10.0
FIGURE 3
Ad Strategies Between Opposition Candidates

- Attacking the record of the opponent: Lee Hoichang 12.5% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 25.7%
- Emphasizing optimism/hope for the future: Lee Hoichang 25.7% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 0%
- Candidate makes gender an issue: Lee Hoichang 2.9% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 6.3%
- Taking offensive position on the issue: Lee Hoichang 2.9% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 6.3%
- Emphasizing own accomplishments: Lee Hoichang 2.9% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 6.3%
- Identifying with experiences of others: Lee Hoichang 6.3% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 17.1%
- Use of expert authorities (nonpolitical) to support position/candidacy: Lee Hoichang 6.3% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 6.3%
- Use of personal experience, anecdotes to support position/candidacy: Lee Hoichang 17.1% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 18.8%
- Inviting viewers participation, action: Lee Hoichang 8.6% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 8.6%
- Reinforcing/promoting traditional values: Lee Hoichang 6.3% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 6.3%
- Yearning for the past: Lee Hoichang 18.8% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 18.8%
- Calling for change: Lee Hoichang 14.3% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 14.3%
- Use of personal tone ("I"): Lee Hoichang 8.6% vs. Roh Moo-hyun 8.6%
FIGURE 4
Content Of Appeals Between Opposition Candidates

- Linking of Candidate with certain demographic groups
  - Lee Hoichang: 23%
  - Roh Moohyun: 26.3%

- Personal Characteristics of Candidate
  - Lee Hoichang: 7.7%
  - Roh Moohyun: 23.1%

- Specific Policy Proposals
  - Lee Hoichang: 5.3%
  - Roh Moohyun: 7.7%

- Vague Policy Preference
  - Lee Hoichang: 10.5%
  - Roh Moohyun: 30.8%

- Candidate Issue Concern
  - Lee Hoichang: 15.4%
  - Roh Moohyun: 15.4%
Appendix A. Summary of Advertisements in the 2002 Presidential Election Campaign

Hoi-Chang Lee AD #1: Danger versus Safety

In this advertisement, a bus driver’s qualifications serve as a metaphor for those of the president. Since a bus driver has a responsibility for his passengers, he should drive carefully and care for his passengers’ safety. Likewise, it is a president’s responsibility to manage a nation and show concern for his/her people. Lee’s ad describes Roh Moo-hyun as a dangerous and incautious driver who drives a bus on his own authority with little concern for his passengers. In the last scene of the ad, there is an accident. On the other hand, Lee Hoi-Chang is described as a qualified, sharp driver who cares for his passengers. Lee’s passengers feel security because of his safe and thoughtful driving skills.

At the end of the ad, a famous actor popular among the middle aged states that “it is a very important time to decide who is going to drive a bus named ‘Korea.’ Popularity does not make for a qualified president. Think about whether or not you feel safe with your choice.”

Hoi-Chang Lee AD #2: Truth

Opening with the question, “Do you remember the promise?” this advertisement presents the previous government’s failures in addressing issues involving medical care
and insurance, education, housing and the personal financial crises. It also depicts Kim Dae-jung’s administration as corrupted and dishonest. Accordingly, it suggested that Roh Moo-hyun’s support for Kim Dae-jung could be evidence of Roh’s past political faults and failures. Next, the advertisement directly attacks Roh’s policies with regard to administration, partisanship and international relationships, particularly those with the United States and North Korea. Then, the advertising copy, “Do you want to be more suffering in future five years?” directly and negatively attacks the opposing candidate. The end of the ad offers several promises with regard to medical care and education to improve the current administration’s previous failures.

Hoi-Chang Lee #3: Vision

In this advertisement, numerous voters appear and state their wishes. A father says, “I wish that my son will have a respectable president.” Each wish is related to women’s issues, the economy and/or education. The advertising copy states, “Lee Hoi-Chang will turn your wishes to reality, and return to you what was lost during the last five years,” emphasizing that Lee is the best choice for the next five years.

Hoi-Chang Lee #4: Real man, Hoi-Chang Lee.

This advertisement shows that Lee’s has experienced hard times since his defeat in the last presidential election. Accompanied by Lee’s voice, images depict his record of achievement despite the difficulties he has endured. Lee tells of his experiences, explaining that he has learned many valuable things by talking and listening to the poor
and the weak. He emphasizes that he will be a good president because of the hard times that he has endured.

**Hoi-Chang Lee #5: Women - Education.**

This advertisement focuses on women’s issues—childcare, nursing the elderly and Education, including the high costs of educational and the disintegrating relationship between students and teachers. These have been some of the most serious problems facing the country and the ad presents Lee’s proposed solutions compared to the previous government’s failures. When the previous government’s failures are presented, images evoking a dark and fearful mood are depicted, such as a buzzing TV in a dark classroom. On the other hand, Lee’s policies are presented with happy and cheerful women and children, suggesting a feeling of hope and promise.

**Hoi-Chang Lee #6: Nation Management.**

“Nation Management” is the most rhythmic and cheerful of Lee’s advertisements. Computer graphics are used with upbeat and comical background music. This advertisement shows the importance of being a president who manages a nation. By illustrating how long it takes to learn to ride a bicycle, drive a car, navigate a ship and pilot an airplane, the ad puts into perspective the time needed to learn to lead a nation. This advertisement suggests that Roh is an unprepared candidate, calling him “a novice.” On the other hand, Lee’s administrative and political experience—President of the National Bank, Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection, Supreme Court Judge
and Representative of the GDP—illustrate that he is a prepared and competent candidate for President.

Moo-Hyun Roh #7: Tears

With the music of Beatles, “Imagine,” black and white pictures show cheerful and happy people in various surroundings—a playground, and meadow, and a soccer field. The end of the ad shows Roh shedding a tear with the advertising copy, “Roh’s tear will change Korea. Think twice and see Moo-Hyun Roh. Roh, Moo-Hyun, a new Korean president.”

Moo-Hyun Roh #8: Cheerful Political Revolution

This advertisement is a comic animation in which the main characters are voters who support Roh. This ad begins with the joyful background music of “Bahama,” performed by the Euro-Disco group, Boney M. The voters in this ad do not believe politicians, thinking that they care more about money politics than the people they serve. However, these voters see Roh as different from the past and present presidential candidates and thus, make donations to his election fund, hoping that he will be elected as a president “for the people” rather than “for power.” The various reasons for which the common people contributed to his campaign suggest the need for political reform and create an image in which Roh was seen as the candidate to bring about that reform. In this ad, Roh is saying he will be a president for the ordinary people, one who is honest and fairly raises funds from his supporters, not from the major companies.
Moo-Hyun Roh #9: “Evergreen”

In Roh’s advertisement, the songs offer a powerful message for people in their 30’s, who have lived through the 1980s. The 1980s signifies a struggle for truth and freedom from a corrupt government and those who lived through that period—thirty-somethings—have their own uniting cultures and passions. “Evergreen” is a well-known song made popular by that generation during the 1980s. In a political gathering to resist the government in 1980s, they sang this song together to express and strengthen their determination to demand freedom and truth. By singing “Evergreen,” Roh attempts to identify with that generation and with the troubles it has endured.

With the song playing in the background, Roh’s narrates his political journey, including his defeat in the previous National Assembly elections, which he attributes to deep-rooted regional prejudice. He also talks of his current popular support, which is illustrated by his grass roots fundraising success. In the narration, he promises that he will be people’s president, working for them and not the powerful interest groups. After all, he owes his success to the ordinary people.

Moo-Hyun Roh #10: “Winter Story”

This animated advertisement depicts a street cleaner who silently does his best everyday, in good weather and bad. His neighbors know that he has been honest and diligent and if he needs help, they do not hesitate to offer. When pulling his trash cart up a hill, people voluntarily gather behind him to help. At the end of the ad, the cleaner takes off his hat and he is Moo-Hyun Roh. Roh, like the cleaner has honestly and
humbly persevered through hard times in his political journey, but only because of the help of the people.

Moo-Hyun Roh #11: “Humor”

Unlike other Roh’s other, more serious ads, this one is very light-hearted. The characters, a diverse group including a young couple with a baby, an older couple, and a man in his 30’s, express that they will vote for Roh without any question. With upbeat and comic background music, they smile happily.

Moo-Hyun Roh #12: “Letters for People”

This ad, released in the evening before the voting day, depicts Roh’s supporters accompanied by Roh’s voice reading a letter to voters. The advertising copy, “even though you have been disappointed by old politics and policies, do not give up your rights,” targets voters in their 30’s and 40’s. Since these voters experienced painful failures in trying to achieve a political revolution in the 80s, they hesitate to vote for Roh who is progressive candidate. This advertisement tries to persuade them to vote for Roh.

Moo-Hyun Roh #13: “Smile”

Accompanied by the song, “Evergreen,” the ad displays pictures taken during his political journey—his objection to the unification of the three parties in 1998, his victory in the 2002 primary elections, etc. The advertising copy, “The president who was honest in the past. The president who will be honest in the future,” emphasizes his honest
political record and promises that he will not be changed by the harsh conditions of the future.

Moo-Hyun Roh #14: “With Love”

In this ad Roh sings the song, “With Love,” a very popular people’s song in Korean history. Against this musical background are pictures of people experiencing happiness, anger, sorrow and joy. They are in a field, a playground, a candle demonstration, a labor strike, the scene of an election campaign and a soccer field of the 2002 World Cup. The lyrics of the song, “… with unchanged and perpetual love, guard the people in the darkness…” means that Roh will forever be there for the people no matter how joyful, angry or sad they are.
Appendix B. Political Advertising Coding Sheet

1. Coder ID

2. Commercial ID#

3. Candidate name

4. Length of candidate is seeking:
   (1) 20 to 30 seconds
   (2) 31 to 45 seconds
   (3) 60 seconds
   (4) Two to five minutes
   (9) Others (specify): ___________________________

5. Who sponsored the ad:
   (1) Committee for election/re-election of candidate
   (2) Citizens for good government group
   (3) Issue-based group
   (4) Independent third party group
   (5) National political party
   (6) Cannot determine
   (7) Combination (specify)
   (8) Other (specify): ___________________________

6. Format of Commercial:
   (0) Documentary
   (1) Video Clip/Music Video
   (2) Testimonial (reaction)
   (3) Introspection
   (4) Issue Statement
   (5) Staged Press Conference
   (6) Opposition focused
   (7) Issue Dramatization
   (8) Question and Answer/Confrontation
   (9) Other (specify): ___________________________
7. Is the ad candidate or opponent focused?
   1. Candidate-positive focused
   2. Opponent-negative focused
   3. Comparative ad
      (Equally candidate-positive and opponent-negative)
   4. Cannot determine
8. Is there a negative attack made in the ad?
   1. Yes
   2. No
8a. If a negative attack is made, is it:
   1. A direct attack against the opponent
   2. A direct attack against another politician
   3. A direct attack against another party
   4. A more general, indirect attack
      against government and other parties
   5. An indirect/implicit attack without specific mention
      of the object of the attack
   8. Not applicable (no attack is made in the ad)
9. If an attack is made, who makes the attack?
   1. Candidate attacks opponents
   2. Known surrogate attacks opponent
   3. Anonymous announcer attacks opponent
   8. Not applicable (no attack is made)
10. If negative attack is made, what is the purpose or
    nature of the attack?
    (code 1 if present, 0 if not present)
    1. Attack on personal characteristics of opponent
    2. Attack on issue stands/consistency of opponent
    3. Attack on opponent’s group affiliations or associations
    4. Attack on opponent’s background/qualifications
    5. Attack on opponent’s performance in past offices/positions
    6. Code for dominant purpose or nature of attack
11. What strategies are used in making the negative attack?  
(code 1 for present, 0 for absent)  
(1) Use of humor/ridicule  
(2) Negative association  
(3) Name-calling (using negative labels)  
(4) Guilty by association  
(8) Not applicable (no attack is made)  
(9) Other (specify) _____________________________  
(10) Code for dominant strategy  

12. Tone of ad’s ending statement (not including sponsor ID):  
(1) Negative  
(2) Positive  

13. Production technique (code for dominant technique):  
(1) Cinema verite  
(2) Slides with print and voice-over or  
slides with movement, print, voice over  
(3) Candidate head-on  
(4) Somebody other than candidate head-on  
(5) Animation  
(6) Special production techniques  
(7) Combination (specify): _____________________________  
(8) Other (specify): ________________________________  

14. Setting of the ad (code for dominant setting):  
(1) No setting (e.g., graphics only)  
(2) Inside home or family setting  
(3) Inside factory or industrial setting  
(4) Inside classroom/educational setting  
(5) Inside office/other professional setting  
(6) Inside grocery/store setting  
(7) Inside general setting  
(8) Outside family setting  
(9) Outside factory setting  
(10) Outside schoolyard  
(11) Outside farm setting  
(12) Outside scenic  
(13) Combination (specify): _____________________________  
(14) Other (specify): ________________________________
15. Who is pictured in the ads?

(1) No one
(2) Candidate only
(3) Candidate’s opponent only
(4) Candidate and opponent only
(5) Candidate and other people
(6) Candidate, opponent, and other people
(7) People other than the candidate only

16. If people other than the candidate or opponent are pictured in the ad, are they (code 1 if present, 0 if absent):

(1) Men
(2) Women
(3) Family of candidate
(4) Children (not candidate’s)
(5) Senior citizens
(6) Ethnic/racial minorities
(7) Other (specify): ________________________________

17. Who is speaking? (code for dominant speaker)

(1) Candidate
(2) A government official or office-holder
(3) An anonymous announcer
(4) Non-government celebrity
(5) Spouse or family member
(6) Citizen(s)/Constituent(s)
(7) Combination (specify)
(8) Not applicable (no one speaks)
(9) Other (specify): ________________________________

18. The dominant speaker(s) is/are (code for dominant):

(1) Male
(2) Female
(3) Cannot determine
19. Does the candidate have eye contact directly with the viewer?  
(code for overall eye contact of candidate only)  
(1) Never  
(2) Sometimes  
(3) Almost always  
(4) Always  
(8) Not applicable/candidate not present

20. Is the candidate usually?  
(code for dominant expression):  
(1) Smiling  
(2) Attentive/serious  
(3) Frowning/glaring  
(8) Not applicable/candidate not present  
(9) Other

21. Does the candidate use gestures?  
(1) Never  
(2) Sometimes  
(3) Frequently  
(8) Cannot determine/candidate not present

22. Does the candidate touch others pictured in the ad?  
(1) Never  
(2) Sometimes  
(3) Frequently  
(8) Cannot determine/candidate not present

23. Body movement/posture of the candidate:  
(code for overall movement /posture of candidate only)  
(1) Compact/closed  
(2) Expansive/open  
(3) Combination of closed/open body movement/posture  
(4) Only head and shoulders of candidate shown  
(8) Not applicable/candidate not present

24. Fluency (code for candidate only):  
(1) Stumbling/hesitant/non-fluent  
(2) Fluent  
(3) Candidate did not speak  
(8) Not applicable/candidate not present
25. Use of language intensifiers (code for candidate only):
   (1) Almost never
   (2) Sometimes
   (3) Frequently
   (4) Candidate did not speak
   (8) Not applicable/candidate not present

26. Rate of speech (code for candidate only):
   (1) Slow
   (2) Moderate
   (3) Fast
   (4) Candidate did not speak
   (8) Not applicable/candidate not present

27. Pitch variety (code for candidate only):
   (1) Monotone
   (2) Varied
   (3) Combined monotone and varied pitch
   (4) Candidate did not speak
   (8) Not applicable/candidate not present

28. Dress (code for candidate only):
   (1) Formal
   (2) Casual
   (3) Code for dominant dress of candidate
   (8) Not applicable/candidate not present

29. Staging of ad (for live shots and pictures only):
   (1) All obviously staged
   (2) Natural appearing
   (3) Cannot determine
   (4) Other (specify): ____________________________

30. Sound characteristics
   (code for dominant characteristics):
   (1) Candidate live
   (2) Other person(s) live
   (3) Voice over (by candidate or surrogate)
   (8) Not applicable/no candidate present
31. **What special effects/production techniques are used in the ad?**  
   (code 1 for present, 0 if absent)  
   (1) Computer graphics or titles  
   (2) Computer alteration or morphing  
   (3) Slow motion  
   (4) Fast motion  
   (5) Reversed motion  
   (6) Freeze frame  
   (7) Split screen  
   (8) Superimpositions  
   (9) Montage  
   (10) Stop motion photography  
   (11) Use of stills  
   (12) Music  
   (13) Focus (sharp vs. soft)  
   (14) Lighting effects  
   (15) Other special effects (specify): __________________

32. **Is the emphasis of this commercial primarily on:**  
   (1) Campaign issues  
   (2) Candidate image

33. **Types of appeals used in the ad**  
   (code 1 for present, 0 if absent):  
   (1) Logical appeals (use of evidence in ads)  
   (2) Emotional appeals (to invoke feelings)  
   (3) Source credibility/ethos appeals  
   (Appealing to qualifications as candidate)  
   (4) Code for dominant content of the ad

34. **Are fear appeals used in the ad?**  
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

35. **Structure of appeal (code for dominant structure):**  
   (1) Inductive (examples then conclusion)  
   (2) Deductive (conclusion then examples)  
   (3) Cannot determine
36. Content of appeal used
(code 1 for present, 0 for absent):
(1) Emphasis on partisanship of candidate 36(1). ________
(2) Issue-related appeal: candidate’s issue concern 36(2). ________
(3) Issue-related appeal: vague policy preference 36(3). ________
(4) Issue-related appeal: specific policy proposals 36(4). ________
(5) Personal characteristics of candidate 36(5). ________
(6) Linking of candidate with certain demographic groups 36(6). ________
(7) Code for the dominant content of the ad 36(7). ________

37. What issues, if any, are mentioned/discussed:
(1) Unemployment/jobs 37(1). ________
(2) Cost of living/inflation 37(2). ________
(3) Recession/depression (economic) 37(3). ________
(4) Trade deficit 37(4). ________
(5) Economy in general 37(5). ________
(6) Job growth 37(6). ________
(7) Health care in general/patient bill of rights 37(7). ________
(8) Poverty/hunger/homeless 37(8). ________
(9) Welfare/welfare reform 37(9). ________
(10) Environment/pollution 37(10). ________
(11) Dissatisfaction with government 37(11). ________
(12) Ethics/morals decline 37(12). ________
(13) Women’s issue (equal rights) 37(13). ________
(14) Defense (military) 37(14). ________
(15) Unification/international issues 37(15). ________
   (Relationship between North and South Korea)
   (Foreign relations, Fear of war, Arms control)
(16) Youth violence 37(16). ________
   (Includes school violence, juvenile delinquency)
(17) Education/School 37(17). ________
(18) Is any one particular emphasized?
   (Please specify the specific issue) __________________

38. Total number of different issues discussed in the ad: 38. ________
39. What strategies are present in the ad?
(code 1 for present, 0 for absent)

1. Incumbency stands for legitimacy
2. Voice for the state
3. Use of personal tone ("I")
4. Addressing viewers as peers ("we")
5. Calling for changes
6. Inviting viewer participation, action
7. Emphasizing optimism/hope for the future
8. Yearning for the past
9. Reinforcing/promoting traditional values
10. Representing the philosophical center of party
11. Using endorsement by party and other important political leaders
12. Use of personal experience, anecdotes to support positions/candidacy
13. Use of statistics to support positions/candidacy
14. Use of expert authorities (nonpolitical) to support positions/candidacy
15. Identifying with experiences of others
16. Emphasizing own accomplishments
17. Taking offensive offensive position on the issue
18. Attacking the record of the opponent
19. "Above the trenches" position
20. Candidate makes gender an issue
21. Other strategy(ies) used?

Specify: ____________________________
40. What candidate characteristics are emphasized in the ad?  
(code 1 for present, 0 for absent)  
(1) Honesty/integrity 40(1). ________  
(2) Toughness/strength 40(2). ________  
(3) Past performance/success/failure 40(3). ________  
(4) Aggressive/fighter 40(4). ________  
(5) Cooperation with others 40(5). ________  
(6) Competency 40(6). ________  
(7) Leadership 40(7). ________  
(8) Experience in politics 40(8). ________  
(9) Sensitive/Understanding 40(9). ________  
(10) Knowledgeable/intelligent 40(10). ________  
(11) Qualified 40(11). ________  
(12) Action oriented proponent 40(12). ________  
(13) Trustworthy 40(13). ________  
(14) Of the people (commonality) 40(14). ________  

41. Is the ad specially directed toward?  
(code 1 for present, 0 for absent)  
(1) Young voters 41(1). ________  
(2) Women 41(2). ________  
(3) Veterans 41(3). ________  
(4) Senior citizens 41(4). ________  
(5) Other(s) (specify): ______________________________ 41(5). ________  

42. Dominant camera angle used in the ad  
(code for candidate only):  
(1) High 42. ________  
(2) Straight-on  
(3) Low  
(4) Movement combination (specify)  
(5) Not applicable/candidate not present  

43. Dominant type of camera shot used in ad  
(code for candidate only):  
(1) Tight (head and shoulders) 43. ________  
(2) Medium (waist up)  
(3) Long (full length)  
(4) Movement combination (specify)  
(5) Not applicable/candidate not present
44. Does the ad identify the office that the candidate is seeking (code 1 for present, 0 for absent):

45. Does the ad identify the candidate’s party affiliation (code 1 for present, 0 for absent):

46. Does the ad list/provide candidate’s campaign web site address?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

   If yes, list web address provided: ______________________
   ______________________

47. Is there any music present in the ad? (code 1 for present, 0 for absent)

48. If music is present style of music?
   (1) Not present
   (2) Classical
   (3) Modern (Pop, Rock, Jazz)
   (4) Instrumental
   (5) Marching music
   (6) Trumpet or announcing music
   (7) Korean Folk music
   (8) National Anthem
   (9) Other
   (10) Combination

49. What is the relationship between music and text?
   (1) More music than text
   (2) More text than music
   (3) Balance between text and music

50. Can Korean symbol be seen in the ad? (code 1 for present, 0 for absent):
51. If yes, mark present or absent for the following:
   (1) Flag
   (2) National Colors/Blue/Red
   (3) Famous Korean Landscapes
   (4) Famous Documents (such as Korean Alphabet)
   (5) Representation of prior presents/Famous Figure
   (6) Other Famous Patriotic Symbols

52. Does a candidate or party representative appear in the spot?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

53. If yes, is the candidate or party member presented:
   (1) Positively
   (2) Negatively
   (3) Neutrally
   (4) Both positive and negative

54. Is Candidate or party slogan used in the ad?
   (0) No
   (1) Yes

55. Is a sense of alienation or cynicism referred to in the spot in any way?
   (code 1 for present, 0 for absent):
   (1) Feeling that ordinary people are not able to influence government or politics
   (2) Politicians are not responsive to what the people want; Politicians aren’t willing to do what people want
   (3) Distrust of government or politicians in general
   (4) Reference to consequences of alienation - might not to vote, might as well not bother, no need to participation

56. Is a talk or scene of participation of voters referred to in the spot in any way?
   (code 1 for present, 0 for absent):
   (1) Donation
   (2) Volunteer
   (3) Voting
   (4) Policy Suggestion