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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess whether advertising influences South Africans’ voting behaviour. The research compared two advertising appeals, fear and rational, to assess which is most preferred by voters. A secondary purpose was also to review whether having knowledge of voters’ influencers and using that knowledge, coupled with an advertising appeal, would influence voters’ behaviour. The study also briefly reviewed whether demographics such as race, gender and education level could have an impact on voting behaviour. The study also reviewed the relationship between the influencers and voting behaviour.

The research was done using an online and hard-copy questionnaire. Sampling was both random and by referral. Three hundred and nineteen valid questionnaires were returned. Various frequency analyses were conducted to establish the varying relationships amongst the variables.

The main findings of the study were the following: firstly, race is a very significant issue influencing South African voting behaviour. The second finding is that trust in the leader of the political party and that political party’s previous government performance are significant issues that voters consider when engaging in voting. The third finding from the study was that the advertising appeal most preferred by voters between rational and fear is rational appeal. The final finding is that voters can be influenced by advertising to change their voting behaviour, however the change is not brought by advertising in isolation other factors need to be considered.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The study of voting behaviour began in 1940 at Columbia University by Paul Lazarsfeld and his group of social scientists. They conducted various studies to assess changes in individual voting intentions over the course of a presidential campaign (Bartels, 2008). Although greater focus has been invested in understanding consumer behaviour, there is an emergence of renewed interest in analysing voting behaviour.

In order to provide a response to the research question posed, the report commences with a literature review, which firstly places into context political marketing and provides a brief review of political advertising as a medium. The report evaluates the two appeals that are used for comparison in the study. The second component of the literature review evaluates the two main theories of voting behaviour, namely: Michigan Model (Campbell et. al., 1960) and Rational Choice theory. The section preceding the literature review will be the results obtained from the data collated from various respondents through a survey questionnaire. The results are then discussed in relation to the research questions. The report concludes with a summary and recommendations for future studies.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to assess which form of advertising appeal, whether fear or rational, is most effective in influencing the voting behaviour of South Africans. Using the Michigan Model and Rational Choice Theory regarding factors of influence on voting behaviour, the study will couple these factors and the respective appeal in order to ascertain the most effective combination of influence and advertising appeal.

Various research studies have been done around the impact of political advertising on citizens, such as the exploration of the impact of a positive,
negative or mixed tone of advertising on voter turnout (Ansolabehere & Iyengar, 1995; Ansolabehere, Iyengar, & Simon, 1999; Djupe & Peterson, 2002; Goldstein & Freedman, 1999, 2002a; Kahn & Kenney, 1999; Lau & Pomper, 2004; Martin, 2004; Peterson & Djupe, 2005; Wattenberg & Brians, 1999); the effectiveness of political advertising on Nigerian electorates (Olujide, Adeyemi & Gbadeyan, 2010) and many more. This study adds to the existing literature in order to advance the theoretical and methodological engagement about the influence of advertising on voting behaviour.

Fourie and Froneman (2005) confirm that political marketing is a novice field in South Africa, as they state that South African political parties seem to utilise marketing methods to a reduced degree than their American counterparts. This was confirmed in a study by Nel in 1995. Five years later their study seemed to show that political parties were progressing towards using marketing tactics to influence voting behaviour.

The results have the potential to be used in finding a systematic pattern in the use of advertising in political marketing to enable campaigners and marketers to be more effective in their segmenting, targeting and positioning in order to influence citizens voting behaviour.

Lees-Marshment (2001) states that those seeking to attract the custom of the majority of the mass market and hoping to remain mass market leaders, nowadays must engage in extensive research of the market place, understand the consumer preference and attempt to appropriately shape the image and market positions of themselves and their competitors.

1.3 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

The interest in voting behaviour and the influence of advertising on that behaviour has been increasing over the years. One of the critical reasons for this resurgence is the amount of money spent on political campaigns. Pre-1926 political
communication was through radio and print media, and the messaging was mainly by speeches, to raise funds. It was only in the 1952 American presidential elections when Dwight Eisenhower used television advertising as a campaign device that the use of marketing as a political technique emerged (Houston & Rothschild, 1978).

In the United States 2012 presidential election, from January to September 2011, the campaign tactics spread across rallies, banners and mainly advertising. Over $470 million was spent by the Obama campaign and $298 million by the Romney campaign (Javers, 2012).

In South Africa, the figures spent in campaigning are also astronomical. It was published in the Daily Maverick, 28 October 2013, that in 2009, the African National Congress inadvertently revealed that it had spent approximately R200 million on its campaign, and this amount is expected to increase dramatically in 2014 (Grootes, 2013).

From 1948, the National Party had been the leading governing political party in South Africa. (Ottaway, 1991). That changed after the first democratic national elections in 1994. The African National Congress (ANC), which had before 1990 received enormous patronage as the symbol of the anti-apartheid’s struggle, obtained 62.6% of the vote’s. The National Party received 20.4% of the votes and the Democratic Party (DP) gained 1.7% of the votes (Electoral Commission, 2004).

Year on year since the elections in 1994 ANC has been obtaining fewer votes, whilst those of opposition parties like the Democratic Alliance (formerly known as Democratic Party) have increased. The increase in voter numbers for opposition parties such as the DA means that South African politics are underway to becoming more competitive. Unlike previous elections since the first democratic elections in 1994, the ruling ANC is also under immense pressure. The current administration under President Jacob Zuma has been inundated by a number of disgraces, such as the alleged exorbitant costs on renovations at the President’s private home at Nkandla, the Guptagate saga, the death of soldiers in the Central
African Republic, the non-delivery of textbooks to schools in Limpopo and its biggest shame, the Marikana massacre (Munusamy, 2013).

Political parties need to engage in strategic marketing activities to promote themselves to their constituencies in order to differentiate themselves from their competitors, institute long-term political relations of joint trade and execution of promises (Sun, 2008). For the citizens of South Africa this means there are more alternatives and considerations in their selection of the ultimate custodian of the country.

Various academics note that the popular contemporary campaign styles in democratic countries are the use of direct mail, issue and opposition research, television and radio advertising, public opinion polling, etc. These are fundamental to candidates seeking votes in contemporary elections (Napolitan, 1972; Agranoff, 1976; Luntz, 1988; Medvic & Lenart, 1997; Medvic; 2000; Dulio, 2004).

According to various researches, it has been proven that the influence of marketing on voting behaviour is affirmed, and the use of marketing tactics during campaigns does have a significant impact on turnout and/or voting behaviour (Bartels, 2006; Holbrook, 1993; Shaw, 1999; Gerber & Green, 2000; Claassen, 2011).

However, the interesting dichotomy in the South African context is taking into account the various influencers and their impact on the constituents.

Since the termination of apartheid, South Africans have voted in three national elections. During these elections, race has overwhelmingly predicted voting behaviour for white and black voters (who together comprise nearly 90% of the voting age population) — so much so that many have described South African elections as a “racial census” (Ferree, 2006).

Ninety percent of white South Africans eligible to vote were estimated to have voted in the 2009 elections, which is the highest proportion since 1994, with nearly all of them voting for the opposition Democratic Alliance (DA). The coloured voters in the Western Cape were over 60% in comparison to the 2004...
elections where there were just over 30% voters. They voted almost exclusively for the DA.

The DA vote rose from 1.9 million in 2004, 12.4% of the total, to 2.8 million in 2009, 16% of the total (Mthembu-Salter, 2009). This has a striking resemblance to other developing countries such as Argentina, where 64% of voters identified with one of the country’s two oldest parties in 1985, but that number dwindled to 15% by 2002. Similarly, in Venezuela, a 1973 survey found that over 70% of respondents identified with one of its established parties, but less than 10% still did so in 1997 (Lupu, 2012).

The question is whether, after 20 years since the first democratic elections, campaign tactics such as advertising can be used effectively to influence the voters’ behaviour in South Africa.

1.4 PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.4.1 Main problem

The problem to be studied in this paper is to identify whether advertising can influence the voting behaviour of South Africans when combining the appropriate influence and advertising appeal. As stated previously by Brader (2005) his recommendation was that there is a need to learn more about emotional appeals, as they are a vital part of political communication.

The uniqueness of the South African voting behaviour is enforced by its history of apartheid, which was a system that allowed only a small minority of the South African population to engage in voting behaviour. In contrast to progressive democracies, the analysis of voting behaviour is yet to adopt its rightful place in the vast subject of African studies (Keulder, 1998).
1.4.2 Sub-problems

The research objectives of the study can be outlined as follows:

- To investigate if demographics, namely gender, race and level of education influence voting behaviour
- To assess which advertising appeal, fear or rational, is the most preferred appeal by voters
- To investigate if voters’ voting preference is influenced by advertising
- To examine the relationship between influencers and voting behaviour.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study fills a gap within literature to add on existing literature about understanding how advertising can be utilised to influence voting behaviour. The selection of the tools used to persuade the voters is of great importance in that political parties need to ensure that they understand their context when communicating to voters in order to influence them favourably. Brader (2005) commented at the end of his research, that it is worth contrasting the effects of distinct emotional appeals such as fear-based advertisements to obtain an understanding of how these motivate and persuade voters.

Franz and Ridout (2007) identified a gap after their research that identified that understanding the impact of the information differences such as content and tone
is essential to be able to understand the influence of political adverts. In the research of Indian Perspective about Advertising Appeal, Mishra (2009) recommends that for future research a study be conducted, on where the correlation of the advertising appeal with the voter behaviour, emotions and attitude can be studied.

The study will enable campaigners and marketers within political marketing to have a more defined approach to advertising to voters in order to influence their behaviour in a favourable manner. This is critical because voters need information in order to make informed voting decisions and typical election issues (emotional messages) should be used to attract voters’ attention (Fourie & Froneman, 2005). The statement is reinforced by Newman (1993) that because mass media have the ability to effectively report and enlighten people – to shape the opinions and attitudes of people, especially in their capacity as voters.

The rationale for the study is the requirement to comprehend what is an effective advertising appeal and influence in the persuasion of the current and future South African voter.

1.6 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was applicable only to people over the age of 18 who are South African citizens. The study excluded those who are illiterate as well as those who do not understand English. The study is limited to the Gauteng province and excludes those in other provinces. Respondents are from an urban environment only, thereby the view and the results can only be inferred to a particular sector of the South African population.
1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms are used frequently in the report and should be explained for the reader:

- **Advertising appeal** – is the key message in the advertising communication. It stimulates the desires and talks to the human need that can be fulfilled by the product which is advertised (Mishra, 2009).

- **Fear appeal** – is defined as the use of appeal that promotes an emotional response to a threat that expresses, or at least implies, some sort of danger (Cochrane & Quester, 2005).

- **Influencers of voting behaviour** – as defined by the Michigan model are candidate image, partisanship and policy (Highton & Kam, 2011). Government performance, which is added as an influencer, is as identified in the rational choice theory (Ostrom, 1998).

- **Partisanship** – a psychological kinship, unwavering relationship with a political party that may not necessarily transform into a concrete bond. It could be through registration, or consistently voting and methodically militancy about the political party (Antunes, 2010).

- **Political marketing** – in theory it is about developing and promoting political goods and services that the broader electorate wants. In practice, it is a competitive tool to win power by targeting segments of the electorate (Marland, Giasson, & Lees- Marshment, 2011).

- **Rational appeal** – is the use of appeal that is mainly objective, functional and utilitarian (Leonidou & Leonidou, 2009).

- **Voting behaviour** – a process in which citizens appoint their representatives during elections (Keulder, 1998)
1.8 ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions of the study were the ability of advertising to influence voting behaviour. However, some scholars argue that advertising does not have the capacity to boost voter turnout to universal levels to the extent that adverts help citizens cast a ballot, as the difference attributed to adverts is marginal (Franz & Ridout, 2007).

Another assumption is that people have some form of basic understanding of politics and advertising. The study also assumes that the respondents will answer honestly. The final assumption is that of the respondents having looked at the adverts on the questionnaire and being able to imagine them being real adverts displayed on posters/billboards/pamphlets or even used as television adverts.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The literature review will introduce political marketing. This is to establish the connection between marketing and political marketing, and to introduce one of the means of political marketing, that of political advertising. The report also reviews the two appeals of advertising, rational and fear. The other half of the literature review is dominated by the voting behaviour theories, which provide the key influencers used in the study.

The South African democracy is a developing democracy, which is currently carving a pathway towards competitive politics. The country has many political parties who are engaging in contesting for power. The political parties require an understanding of the use of political campaigning elements to enable them to be informed regarding the effectiveness of the tactics within political marketing.

Research shows that in political surveys a substantial amount of respondents report that they have not yet fostered any clear voting inclination (Arcuri, Castelli, Galdi & Zogmeister 2008). Even a few months prior the election, rates of 20% or more undecided voters are not unusual (Mannheimer, 2003, cited in Arcuri et al., 2008). In addition, figures showed that majority of the undecided respondents come to a decision only a few days prior to voting, sometimes on the same day of the election (Barisone & Mannheimer, 1999, cited in Arcuri et al., 2008).

2.2 POLITICAL MARKETING

Political marketing is a science that is still trying to find clear definition (Scammell, 1999; Savigny & Temple, 2010). In order to get to the definition of political marketing, we have to define the field of politics first.

Politics is essentially about managing a service in the form of promises to constituents. The promises evoke expectations and once the political party is in a position to implement the promises, the expectation is that they will.
The term ‘political marketing’ was adapted by Kelley (1956). Henneberg (2006) defines political marketing as seeking to establish, maintain and enhance long-term political relationships at a profit for society, so that the objectives of the individual political actors and organisations involved are met.

Political marketing in the 1990s was commonly viewed as purely about the use of sales techniques in election campaigns (Lees-Marshalment, 2006). Lees-Marshalment (2009b) expanded on her definition and states that political marketing is about political organisations adapting business marketing techniques to achieve their goals, such as persuading voters to support them or to sell a policy or leader. One of the methods of persuasion is advertising, which is reviewed next.

2.3 ADVERTISING AND ADVERTISING APPEALS

According to Sullivan and Sapir (2012), campaigns are becoming influential as party allegiances weaken, particularly among the younger generation who are more volatile in their voting choice and more likely to be influenced by messaging received from campaigns. One form of marketing technique used for persuasion as part of campaigning is advertising.

2.3.1 Advertising

According to Brooker (1981), marketers use advertising to influence consumers’ behaviour regarding goods and services. Advertising and other types of promotional messages are used to sell products and services as well as to promote causes, market political candidates, and deal with societal problems such as alcohol and drug abuse (Belch, Belch, Kerr, and Powell, 2008). Authors such as Brooker (1981) defined advertising purpose as that of creating awareness of a product or company to create a sale of the product to the reassurance of purchasers of the products that they have made wise choices.
In the context of political advertising Freedman and Goldstein (1999, 2002) advocate that the exposure of political adverts is positively linked to political interest, learning and turnout. The implication is that citizens who are exposed to political adverts displayed a positive interest in politics, learning as well as the likelihood of participating in voting.

In politics, in order to influence citizens’ behaviour, politicians use advertising. Using campaigns with elements such as advertising, marketers attempt to manipulate voters’ emotions purposefully towards influencing their behaviour in voting (Pratkanis & Aronson, 1991). According to Cochrane and Quester (2005), by comprehending how emotion is processed, how it is aroused, and its role within particular settings, advertisers will be enabled to increase the potential effectiveness of their messages.

2.3.2 Political advertising

Kotler and Levy introduced the concept of marketing into the analysis of election campaign (Olujide et al, 2010). Brader (2006), cited in Ridout and Searles (2011), stated that political campaigns make appeals to voters’ emotions; therefore, campaign managers must construct advertisements that not only convey a message but also simultaneously resonate with voters on an emotional level. Scholars such as Scammell (1995) agree and state further that political advertising is too concerned with transmission of the information and should use more pleasure/entertainment in order to grab the viewers’ attention; this will increase the effectiveness of the adverts.

Regardless of effects on election outcomes, advertising is vital political communication, as it offers the view of how parties and/or candidates choose to portray themselves to their constituents (Scammell & Langer, 2006).
Political advertising is defined by Olujide et al. (2010) as the use of media by political candidates to increase their exposure. According to Scammell and Langer (2006), advertising as a form is less suited to complex information and more to engagement of interest, yet it is normally constructed and analysed as an information carrier.

Olujide et al. (2010) state that there are three major categories of political advertising namely: political adverts – which provide statements about the candidate and no mention of the opponent; contrast adverts contain both positive statements about the candidate and negative statements about the opponent; negative or attack adverts contain negative statements about the opponent and nothing positive about the candidate.

Jamieson (1984, cited in Brians & Wattenberg, 1996) stated that the importance of political advertising as a significant element of the total political process serves as a justification to acquire a better understanding of the mechanisms by which consumers process political advertising. However, Merritt (1984) states that negative information used within political advertisements lacks credibility, thereby reducing their effectiveness. This statement opposes what some researchers suggested regarding negative adverts being informative and possessing educational potential (Surlin & Gordon, 1977).

Brader (2005) opposes Merrit by stating that political leaflets with emotional words or images are more persuasive. He concluded that attack adverts are more likely than positive adverts, to focus citizens’ attention on the political issues defining the election and in so doing provide them with relevant political information for voting.

**Proposition 1:** Demographics namely gender, race and level of education have an impact on voting behaviour.
2.3.3 Advertising appeal

Advertising appeal refers to the manner of conveyance of certain benefits or enticements through the justification to consumers on the rationale for considering purchasing a product (Lin, 2011). Belch et al., (2008) state that advertising appeal is used to attract consumers’ attention, and is applied to attract consumers attitude and emotions about a related product or service (Lin, 2011).

There are two main types of appeals: rational and emotional appeals (Mishra, 2009). Rational appeal speaks to the consumer’s practical needs of the product. Kotler (2000) stated that rational appeal is based on reasoning and the product that is being sold through emphasising the product features, quality, its problem-solving ability and its performance.

Emotional appeal is the feeling linked with the product and they help in arousing and directing the behaviour of an individual (Morris, 1999). Emotional appeals have been categorized into two: ego-focused emotions (for example pride, happiness, frustration, anger) which tend to be associated with individuals attributes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and other-focused (empathy, peacefulness, indebtedness, shame) which usually get associated with others in a social context (Triandis, 1994).

In 1981 there was yet to be evidence to the theory of the type of appeal being superior to the other in achieving the persuader’s ends (Brooker, 1981). However, as studies done by Lin in 2011 showed, advertising appeal has a significant influence on advertising attitudes, and rational advertising appeal is more significant in its influence than emotional appeal. In political advertising, consultants see emotions as central to how political adverts work (Perloff & Kinsey, 1992), while critics denounce adverts that “appeal to emotion instead of
reason” as manipulative and poisonous to democratic decision making (Arterton 1992).

Marcus, MacKuen, and Neuman (2011) advocated the theory of Affective Intelligence, which concentrates on the use of psychological research on emotion to politics. They argue that two emotional techniques lay a foundation for rational behaviour by directing citizens between reliance on habits and more effortful thought processes, in line with the demands of the political environment (Brader, 2005).

**Fear advertising appeal**

Fear appeal is a mode of emotional appeal. Kotler (1991) defined emotional appeal as encouragement of consumers’ purchase intentions by arousing their positive or negative emotions. Whilst positive emotional appeal covers, for example, humour, love, happiness, negative emotional appeal involves, among others, fear, a sense of guilt.

Fear creates tension and anxiety, causing people to want to seek ways to reduce these feelings (LaTour & Zahra, 1988). There is evidence that negative messages could be beneficial, since they attract voters’ attention, sometimes are better remembered and could stimulate public debate surrounding strategy issues. Negative messages could thus be used, but should be used with care, especially in a young democracy (Fourie & Froneman, 2005).

Varied types of fear appeals are regularly used in advertising; these are social, physical and self-esteem fears (Menasco & Baron, 1982). Fear appeals generally use two approaches: fear of a negative consequence for not using the product and fear of a negative outcome associated with the use of a product or practice (Cochrane & Quester, 2005).
Fear is alleged to impact conversion by rousing drives in the individual that in turn increase interest and attention to the communication over and above non-aroused conditions and they are generally messages that contain some sort of threat (Brooker, 1981). Some scholars like Brader (2005) share the sentiment that fear appeals are more effective at altering behaviour, especially when an appeal offers recipients something to do in order to avoid danger. He also uses this argument of fear appeal in reference to political adverts as they fit the description through their suggestions of influencing voting behaviour.

**Rational advertising appeal**

Kotler (1991) cited in Lin (2011) provides a definition of rational advertising appeal as the use of appeal where the product is emphasized by its benefits, in which the consumers’ self-benefit is the key intention and the function or benefit requested by consumers of the product or service is comprehensibly presented in advertising.

Rational approaches are more frequently used for thinking products, whereas feeling advertisements are generally more appropriate if ownership and consumption of products are related closely to emotions and feelings (Stafford & Day, 1995). Kotler (2000) opined that rational appeal is based on logic and products are promoted by highlighting the product attributes, quality, its problem-solving capacity and its performance.

There are different types of rational appeal; such as feature appeal which focuses on important traits and features of the product, competitive advantage appeal which provides a comparative picture of two or more brands, price appeal which focuses on the price or value of the product and news appeal which is used when a new product is introduced in the market or if certain modifications are done in the existing products (Mishra, 2009).
Aaker and Norris (1982) found that the advertising attitude created by rational appeal is better than that by emotional appeal. Rational appeal appears to provide information explicitly and directly related to a product, which attracts consumers' attention more easily and generates a better advertising attitude.

**Proposition 2:** Rational advertising appeal is the most preferred appeal by voters.

### 2.4 VOTING BEHAVIOUR

Voting is the main form of political contribution in liberal democratic societies. The evaluation of voting behaviour invariably focuses on the determinants of why people vote as they do and how they arrive at the decisions, they make (Marshall, 1998).

The electoral choices of voters are influenced by a range of factors, especially social-group identity, which help to forge enduring partisan identification. In addition, voters are to a greater or lesser extent susceptible to the influence of more short-term and contingent factors such as campaign events, issues, and candidate appeals (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2013).

#### 2.4.1 Voting behaviour theories

There are three major research schools of voting behaviour: the sociological, which focuses on the influences of social factors; the psychological, which assumes that party identification is the main factor behind the behaviour of voters; and the rational choice, which focuses on variables such as rationality, choice, uncertainty and information (Antunes, 2010).
Although there are multiple theories within the research schools that explain the influencers of voting behaviour, such as the Sociological Model, the Michigan Model, the Party Identification Model, the Media/Dominant Ideology Model and the Rational Choice Model, this paper focuses mainly on the prominent theories, which are the Michigan Model, and Rational Choice theory of voting behaviour.

The Michigan Model is one which has been subjected to critique and re-evaluation by various scholars, yet it maintains its validity throughout the years, and has been most influential in understanding voting behaviour (Bartels, 2008). The Rational Choice theory is also very prominent and has particular relevance for the South African voting environment due to its provision of empirical insights into voting behaviour relating to perceptions and appraisals of policy and performance.

**Proposition 3:** Voters’ voting preference is influenced by advertising.

### 2.4.2 The Michigan Model for voting behaviour

One of the most prominent theories in explaining voting behaviour is the Michigan Model (Joslyn, 1980; Cwalina Falkowski, & Kaid, 2000, cited in Fernandes, Giurcanu, Bowers, & Neely, 2010). The model places emphasis on the fundamental importance of long-standing partisan loyalties. Partisanship, according to Campbell, Converse, Miller, Stokes (1960) is a psychological group identification that operates as an enduring social identity, like religious affiliation.

The model states that there are four categories that affect political behaviour: two concerned with long-term loyalties, partisan or primary groupings, and two concerned with short-term influences, candidate image and policy issues (Fernandes et al., 2010).
Partisanship

According to Franz and Ridout (2007), there are two vital factors that influence the acceptance or reception of a political message and those are partisanship and political knowledge. The two academics further elaborate that partisanship behaves as a filter, as it shapes the manner in which one interprets a political message. Green, Palmquist, and Schickler (2002) suggest that partisan attachment is a social identity, much like religion or ethnicity and they argue that partisan affiliation inspires enduring allegiance which is unaffected by changing political opinions or political party errors.

Academics such as Lodge and Taber (2000); Redlawsk (2002) have found that strong beliefs often lead to biased memory searches, biased choice of inferential heuristics, and a tendency to judge arguments that support existing beliefs to be accurate and to discount opposing arguments.

Stevens, Sullivan, Allen, and Alger (2008) further attest that voters' partisanship significantly colours perceptions of legitimate negativity in advertising and that these characterisations, in turn, influence voter turnout. Political partisans are thought to be least expected to accept candidate messages and therefore would be less amicable to persuasion. Highton and Kam (2011) stated that the partisan voter would carry to the polls attitudes toward the newer elements of politics that support his long-standing bias.

The notion is further supported by Ansolabehere and Iyengar (1997), who posited that non-partisans are most likely to be persuaded by campaign advertising. Political knowledge can be both an aid to increasing one’s ability to comprehend a political message, also to increasing one’s ability to resist that message (Franz & Ridout, 2007). Scholars such as Kahn and Kenney (1999) have added that people with strong connections to the political world, therefore a strong political knowledge, participate in elections regardless of the tenor of campaigns. Their
study further elaborates that heightened intensity of campaigns caused voters to increase reliance on partisanship.

**Policy issues**

Borre (2001) states that in elections, voters are motivated and influenced by the issues on which parties campaign; therefore, the issues are the strongest determining factors of the electoral outcome in contemporary democracies (Mangova, 2011). Campbell et al. (1964) as cited by Fernandes et al. (2010), state that knowledge of party positions on specific policy issues will influence voting behaviour.

Jackson (1975) stated that voters use elections and their support for one party over another, to influence the course of public policy; therefore support for a party, infers support for the policies it endorses (Bartlets, 2000). However, Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, (1968) state that people do not change parties because of conviction to policy issues but from pressure from their primary groupings. According to academics such as Campbell, Converse, Miller, Stokes (1960) and Lewis-Beck, Nadeau & Elias (2008), in order for policy issues to have an impact on voting decisions, voters need to have opinions on the issue and clear understanding of candidates’ differences on the issue.

**Candidate image**

Various studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of positive and negative advertising in affecting voter attitudes toward a candidate’s image. Further, it has been suggested by collated evidence through various researchers that positive advertising is more effective than attack or comparative ads in affecting voter attitudes towards a candidate’s image (Ansolabhere & Iyengar, 1997; Johnston & Kaid, 2002).

A candidate’s appeal has been shown to play a major role in voters reaching a final decision. Specifically, aspects of a candidate’s personal life, such as record
of leadership, reputation, personal integrity, and charisma, can easily disturb long-term commitments (Fernandes, et al., 2010)

Campbell et al. (1960) state that the cluster of principles and feelings that make up the popular image of the parties and candidates are ultimately of interest for their effect on voting behaviour. It is further noted that the strength and direction of the image are facts of crucial importance in explaining voting behaviour (Bartles, 2000). Schoen and Schumann (2007) stated that personality traits affect voter attitudes toward political parties indirectly rather than directly. This proposal is built on the argument that parties sanction particular ideologies and values, propose policies, and are represented by politicians. Put in theoretical terms, values, ideologies, policies, and politicians are characters of political parties.

Cwalina et al. (2000) state that current research suggests that the main factors influencing human behaviour are emotions and further, that studies suggest that the attitude toward candidates or political parties is a very good predictor of voter decisions.

Prior research has shown that attitudes toward an object are influenced by opinions about its characteristics (Anderson & Fishbein, 1965). Attitudes toward politicians, policies, ideologies, and values were shown to shape how voters evaluated political parties (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Campbell et al., 1960; King, 2002; Miller & Shanks, 1996).

These attitudes toward party attributes in turn are shaped by personality traits. Personality may be regarded as an indirect factor in the Michigan Model of influencing voting behaviour through its shaping of political predispositions and attitudes toward political objects that in turn affect vote choice (Schoen & Schumann, 2007). According to the “attribution paradigm,” which has been attested in numerous studies (Byrne, 1971, 1997), a person will have an enhanced view of a stranger if she perceives him to be similar to herself.

As identified by the Michigan Model, central policy tendencies, attitudes towards candidates and policies play a crucial role in mediating effects of personality attributes on vote choice, as they are important factors in influencing voting behaviour (Campbell et al., 1960; Miller & Shanks, 1996). Using the model, one
can link a voter’s personality, primary grouping, political knowledge and policy preference to her voting choice in a theoretically consistent way (Schoen & Schumann, 2007).

2.4.3 The Rational Choice theory

Another theory that defines voting behaviour is the Rational Choice theory. The theory states that voters' voting behaviour is determined by the performance of the government in office. According to Downs (1957), a voter selects their vote on the party that brings the most personal benefits in economic terms (Pete, 2007).

Under this theory, policy evaluation and candidate evaluation are also deemed as influencers on voting behaviour (Mangova, 2011). Marshall (1998) further states that the Rational Choice approach attempts to explain voting behaviour as the result of a series of instrumental cost-benefit analysis by the voter, assessing the comparative attraction of specific electoral outcomes in relation to the issues addressed and policies promoted by the different parties or candidates.

Downs (1957) states that political parties in democratic politics formulate the policies they believe will gain the most votes. The operational basis of the model is on three fundamental premises which are: firstly, that all decisions made by voters and political parties are rational; secondly, the democratic political system implies some form of consistency that supports predictions about the consequences of decisions made by voters and political parties; and finally, that the democratic system assumes a level of uncertainty (Antunes, 2010). According to Downs (1957) a rational voter gauges how well the present government performs in terms of the voter's personal values, and if he deems that the opposition, or another party can achieve more for him, he will in the future turn his back on the present government (Downs, 1957).
**Government performance**

According to Fiorina (1978), through the theory of retrospective voting, it is proposed that a voter's choice on Election Day is guided by a reflective evaluation of the government's performance (Mangova, 2011). Further conceded by Miller and Shanks (1996), that retrospective evaluations of government performance are a vital determinant of voting behaviour and distinct from policy issues as performance evaluations involves the review of how well government has performed. Academics such as Franklin et al. (1994, 1995) concede that in elections which focus on national issues, voters are expected to use their vote as a means of signalling their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the government (Hobolt, 2005).

A further dimension of government performance evaluation is that of economic performance in which a voter reviews aspects such as the state of the economy, how the government is dealing with the national conditions as well as presidential performance (Kiewiet, 1983). Scholars such as Markus (1992) found substantial effects that showed that voters who had fared better economically were about 8% more likely to vote for the existing political party, than those with unchanged economic circumstances.

**Proposition 4:**

There is a relationship between partisanship, policy issues, government performance and candidate image and voting behaviour.

**2.5 CONCLUSION OF LITERATURE REVIEW**

The literature review indicates the significance of political advertising in voting behaviour. Multiple researchers in other countries have done studies similar to this, and proved that advertising does indeed have an influence on voting behaviour. The uniqueness in this particular study is the coupling of specific advertising appeals, namely rational and fear appeal with specific influencers and
the research geography. Although there are multiple influencers such as the sources of information, voters’ involvement and political knowledge. This study has focused on the influencers as identified in the Michigan Model and the Rational Choice theory. The influencers are:

- Partisanship is represented in the questionnaire by party identification as well as self-identification.

- The second influencer is that of candidate image, and this is represented in the questionnaire by trust in the leader of the party.

- The third influencer is that of government performance, which is indicated in the questionnaire as ‘Previous party performance’.

- The final influencer is that of political party policies, represented as that in the questionnaire.

The conceptual structure of the study is shown in Figure 2.1. The study investigates the influence of advertising appeals on voting behaviour. It will also assess the impact of influencers as well as demographics such as age, gender and education in relation to voting behaviour.

![Conceptual structure of the study](image)

**Figure 2.1** Conceptual structure of the study
The following propositions will be researched:

2.5.1 Proposition 1:

Demographics namely gender, race and level of education have an impact on voting behaviour

2.5.2 Proposition 2:

Rational advertising appeal is the appeal most preferred by voters.

2.5.4 Proposition 3:

Voters’ voting preference is influenced by advertising.

2.5.3 Proposition 4:

There is a relationship between partisanship, policy issues, government performance and candidate image and voting behaviour.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this segment of the study, the methodology of the research is deliberated. This study aims to investigate which form of advertising appeal between fear and rational is most effective in influencing voting behaviour. The research takes a quantitative approach, which is a means for testing objective theories through the examination among the variables (Creswell, 2008).

The philosophical worldview of influence is that of positivist assumptions, which has been noted as holding true more for quantitative rather than qualitative research. The Positivist view has evolved to be a Postpositivist worldview, which believes that theory and observations have circular dependence on each other (Bhattacherjee, 2012).

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design used for the study is the factorial design. Each independent variable in this design is called a factor, and each sub-division of a factor is called a level. Factorial designs enable the researcher to examine not only the individual effects but also their joint effect (Bhattacherjee, 2012).

Three factors are considered. The first factor in advertising appeal the levels are rational and fear appeal. The second factor is influencers of voting behaviour, of which the levels are candidate image, previous government performance, policy and partisanship. The third factor is demographics, the levels being age, race and education level.

The study used a survey instrument, which is administered when requiring individuals’ responses (Struwig, Struwig & Stead, 2001). A survey questionnaire was designed. This involves the use of standardized questionnaires or interviews to collect data regarding the respondents’ preferences, thoughts and behaviours.
The study of voting behaviour generally relies on information from sample surveys. The questionnaire was designed online using the survey tool Survey monkey.

An online questionnaire was designed on Survey Monkey and the link was emailed to the researcher’s sample, with a covering letter introducing the survey. In order to increase participation an incentive was given: respondents were given an opportunity to provide their contact details after completing the questionnaire in order to be placed into a prize draw to win an Apple TV. Respondents were required to complete four questions, which were respectively to:

- assess the importance of the four factors of influence on the respondent.
- assess partisanship of the respondents
- assess importance of sources of influence for the respondent regarding voting
- assess respondent’s attitude towards political advertising.

The respondents were provided information on four fictitious political parties. The information was about the party’s leader, policies and previous government performance. The respondents were required to select from the four parties which they would vote for if elections were being held. The respondents were then presented with a sequence of adverts for the parties. These had a factor of influence based the issues of importance that influence voters in their voting behaviour, coupled with an appeal:

- Influencer of government performance with a fear appeal
- Influencer of government performance with a rational appeal
- Influencer of Partisan (group/party identification) with a fear appeal
- Influencer of Partisan (group/party identification) with a rational appeal
- Influencer of policy with a fear appeal
- Influencer of policy with a rational appeal
- Influencer of candidate image with a fear appeal
- Influencer of candidate image with a rational appeal.

As each party had eight adverts, 32 adverts where analysed by the respondents. At the end of the survey, the respondents were asked to complete five questions, which provided demographical information on gender, race, age, highest level of education and family income.

3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

3.3.1 Population

Parahoo (1997) defines population as the total number of units from which data can be collected. Burns and Grove (2003) define eligibility measures as “a catalogue of characteristics that are prerequisites for the membership in the target population”. Those that were eligible for the research were South African citizens over 18 years old who are literate and have a basic comprehension of English.

3.3.2 Sample and sampling method

In the initial survey questionnaire, disseminated online, 50 people were asked to also distribute it to their acquaintances, which is known as the snowball sampling method. This method was to enable a larger reach and more varied respondents. Obtaining data from participants with different experience prevents information bias and thus increasing credibility regarding the information.
The researcher also posted the link of the survey questionnaire on Facebook and on LinkedIn. Due to a plateau of the respondents online, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to a convenience sample at various gatherings such as children’s parties, friends’ work places and previous neighbours in Soweto.

The research also enlisted the services of a research house Mictert Marketing Research to distribute the paper-based questionnaire. A meeting was convened in order for the representatives from Mictert to be briefed regarding the study. The researcher provided the representatives with 210 copies of the questionnaire. Mictert used six experienced researchers over two weeks from Friday 13 September to 23 September 2013. They targeted mainly shopping centres in the Johannesburg central business district, Cresta and Braamfontein.

The researcher had telephonic briefings every third day regarding the progression of the completion of the surveys. After the first week 67 completed surveys were returned, the balance staggered over the week.

The context is significant in a research study. According to Holloway and Wheeler (1996), context includes the environment and conditions in which the study takes place as well as the culture of the participants and location. The participants in this study were derived from a sample of subjects across all major racial groups, age groups, gender groups as well as different professions ranging from professionals, students, retirees and non-professionals.

3.4 PILOT RESEARCH

The rationale for a pilot research was to test the reliability and validity of the research instrument, and it was a recommendation by the panel.

3.4.1 Methodology for the pilot research

Twenty questionnaires were emailed to 20 respondents. The respondents were a convenience sample made up those that are in accordance with the eligibility
requirements stipulated for the study. The questionnaire was emailed from the researchers personal email address with a link to survey monkey. An introduction was included on the message of the email. This explained the reasoning for the research, informed the respondents that they are the pilot sample, and would be contacted telephonically to share their feedback.

3.4.2 Analysis of the pilot research data

Twelve respondents completed the pilot research. The feedback received was:

- The results showed that the order of the adverts needed to be alternated in order to show different issues and avoid respondent fatigue in placing the same “issue” adverts against each other.

- The adverts were also decreased from twelve adverts for each of the four political parties to eight adverts, due to the feedback from most respondents opposing the time required to complete the survey.

- The research had also intended to assess involvement of voters which is investigated by the varying responses provided in voting for national elections versus local elections, but that was removed in order to shorten the questionnaire.

Content validity was evaluated to ensure that the adverts used had the intended appeal and influence factor. The researcher enlisted the services of a communications agency, Waggener Edstrom, to review the adverts. The adverts were reviewed by the; general manager, senior account manager and an account manager. The general manager made various recommendations to be amended in the imagery and wording.
3.5 PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected through a survey online and a paper-based questionnaire. The online questionnaire was disseminated via an internet link through email, Facebook and LinkedIn. The email was distributed to a sample group who then forwarded the email using a snowball methodology. The paper-based questionnaire was random and convenience.

The researchers from the research agency targeted people at shopping centres. The researcher targeted those encountered at communal gatherings. Obtaining data from participants with different experience prevents information bias and thus increasing credibility regarding the information. Please view Appendix A for the questionnaire.

Influencers of voting behaviour

The influencers of voting behaviour as defined by the Michigan Model are; candidate image, partisanship and party policy. Previous government performance, which is an influencer identified in the rational choice theory, is also reviewed. In the questionnaire to identify influencers, respondents are requested to rate the importance of issues when deciding which party to vote for.

A Likert scale was used in order for the respondents to provide self-reports on the importance of the four factors of influence:

- 1 = Very important; 2 = Somewhat important; 3 = Not important

Partisanship

Partisanship can only be measured by asking respondents for self-reports. Burden and Klofstad (2005) emphasised, as in previous observations that partisanship is comparable to religious affiliation. (Green, Palmquist, & Schickler, 2002; Miller & Shanks, 1996). Using a modified version of the partisan identity scale, the following statements were posed to the respondents:
I can identify with the party
- I am a party loyalist
- I have no party affinity
- I am not interested in politics.

The study used mainly Likert scales, which are attitude scales based on the summated rating (or Likert) model. The method of summated rating assumes that people respond to separate specific attitudes in this study it will be an attitude towards voting because of their underlying attitude towards voting (Hobolt, 2005).

**Attitude towards political advertising**

A Likert scale was used to gauge the respondents' attitude towards political advertising and their perception thereof:

- Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

**Advertising appeals and voting behaviour**

A nominal scale was used in the selection of the adverts. Respondents were required to compare the four parties and rate which one

- Appealed to them; which messaging was convincing; which advert would make them want to vote for the party.
3.6 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The gathered data for the research was analysed and compared using Statistical Analysis Software – SAS JMP. The study used mainly frequency analysis of the data. Descriptive statistical analysis was executed to find out elementary information from the sample. Reliability and validity analyses of the sample were applied.

3.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Validity speaks to the extent to which a measure adequately represents the underlying construct that it is supposed to measure (Bhattacherjee, 2012).

3.7.1 External Validity

The experiments were administered using two mediums in Johannesburg, Gauteng. One medium was web-based with 101 respondents received, and the same questionnaire was paper-based with 353 respondents. Thirty-four questionnaires were spoiled. The utilisation of two mediums helped to ensure a large and diverse subject pool that was reasonably representative of the Gauteng voting-age population.

3.7.2 Internal Validity

Construct Validity is used to ensure that the measure is actually measuring what it is intended to measure and no other variables. Using a panel of “experts” familiar with the construct is a way in which this type of validity can be assessed. Construct validation is involved whenever a test is to be interpreted as a measure of some attribute or quality which is not "operationally defined (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). For the study, the researcher used a communications agency, Waggener Edstrom, to review the adverts to ensure that they are the correct
content in accordance to the intended appeal as well as reviewing the imagery used in the adverts to ensure they support the influencer and appeal.

3.7.3 Reliability

Reliability is defined as the degree to which the measure of a concept is consistent and dependable (Bhattacherjee, 2012). Reliability was verified using the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, which was used to assess the reliability on the scales, used in the survey questionnaire. The questionnaires were self-administered, both the online as well as the paper-based. The paper-based questionnaire, the researcher met with the project manager and briefed them on the objectives for the questionnaire and a dry run was done to go through what the researchers say on meeting potential respondents. This was also reaffirmed in writing to them, in a covering letter on the questionnaire explaining to the respondents the objectives of the questionnaire, and what was required of them.

Cronbach’s Alpha

The questionnaire has a wide variance across the variables in the questionnaire, therefore a standardised score to estimate reliability was used. The standardized alpha coefficient provides information about how each variable reflects the reliability of the scale with standardized variables. If the standardised alpha decreases after removing a variable from the construct, then this variable is strongly correlated with other variables in the scale. On the other hand, if the standardized alpha increases after removing a variable from the construct, then removing this variable from the scale makes the construct more reliable.

The overall standardised Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is 0.936935, which provides an acceptable lower bound for the reliability coefficient, as shown on the table Appendix C. This, is much greater than the suggested value of 0.70 given by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).
**Scales used in the study:**

Nominal scales were utilised to:

**Measure self-identification**

- I am a party loyalist/I have no party affinity/I am not interested in politics

**Measure preference**

- If national elections were today, which of the above would you vote for?
  
  Party 1/Party 2/Party 3/Party 4

- This advert appealed to me; The messaging in this advert is convincing; After seeing this advert I would vote for this party
  
  Party 1/Party 2/Party 3/Party 4

- Identify gender, level of education, race, family income range and age.

Ordinal scales were utilised to:

**Measure level of importance for issues that influence voting behaviour**

- 1= Very important; 2= Somewhat important; 3= Not important

**Measure frequency of use for sources of information in voting behaviour**

- 1= Never; 2= Rarely; 3= Sometimes; 4= Very Often; 5= Always Often

**Measure of perception of political advertising**

- Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5= Strongly Agree
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

4.1  INTRODUCTION

A survey questionnaire was utilised to collect the data for the research using a snowball methodology to disseminate the online questionnaire. Researchers from a research company, Micert Research and the researcher distributed the paper-based questionnaire. Three hundred and nineteen valid questionnaires were received from the study.

4.2  ANONIMITY

Respondents were asked to fill in their contact details only if they would like to be included in the prize draw for an Apple TV. The information provided would be used only in the draw. The paper-based survey questionnaires were given to one person at a time; no one was allowed to complete the questionnaire more than once. For the online responses, the IP addresses of the computers that had completed the survey were restricted from accessing the survey more than once.

4.3  DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

The last page of the questionnaire required the respondents to complete their demographics, namely gender, race, age and education level. Family income analysis has been removed due response error.
4.3.1 Gender

Majority of respondents were females 55% with males 44% and the remainder being unknown. Females constitute more and this being in line with the national population figures as per census 2011 (Statistics South Africa, 2011).

4.3.2 Race

Blacks were a majority in the respondents, as seen in Figure 4.2. Blacks make up 56% of the respondents followed by whites (18%), Asians and Indians with
equal proportions of 7% and coloureds at 10% and others constituting the remaining 2%.

4.3.3 Qualifications

Understanding the highest level of education is vital in South Africa, which has a vast range of people with different educational levels. Respondents with the highest level of education being at high school level have the largest proportion of 35%, and certificate and diploma qualification with 30% of the respondent.

Tertiary qualifications have nearly equal proportions, postgraduates constitute 18% and undergraduates make up 16% of the respondents. Those with the highest level of education being primary school were in the minority with only 1% qualification.
4.3.4 Age Groups

As can be seen from the Figure 4.4., a large percentage of the research population are between the ages of 26-35 years. They make up 45% of the research population. This is followed by the 36-50 age group, which constitutes 26% of the research population.

The smallest age group representation is those between 18 and 21 years.

4.4 RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 1

Do demographics namely; gender, race and level of education have an impact on voting behaviour?

4.4.1 Introduction

The interaction of demographics and voting behaviour is of particular importance in this study. As stated by Highton and Kam (2011) there is an expectation that demographic factors would be connected to people’s ideological orientations, political values and how they are affected by different public policies. The context that the study is taking place in: South Africa is a country previously segregated
based on race. This permeated to access to education, which would in turn affect the type of jobs that certain racial groups could access.

Twenty years later in a democratic South Africa, the results below will assist in answering if demographical factors are of significance in South African voters voting behaviour. A Chi-Square test was chosen for the analysis to enable the proportional comparison between the varying demographic variables against the initial party that was selected in order to assess if there is a relationship.

4.4.2 Gender and voting behaviour

A Pearson Chi-Square test was conducted to examine whether there is a significant difference between males and females in their selection of the political parties that they would vote for.

According to the contingency table 4.1, 291 votes were received which could be grouped into male or female, while the balance from the total 319 respondents did not disclose their gender.

Party 1: of the 112 votes received, 57% were from females and 43% were from males. From the total population sample of 291, 22% were female and 16% were males.

Party 2: of the 89 votes received, 64% were from females and 36% were from males. From the total population sample, 20% were female voters and 11% were males.

Party 3: of the 30 votes, 37% were from females and 63% were from males. From the total population sample, 4% of female voters and 6% male voters voted for Party 3.

Party 4, 60 votes were received. Of those 52% were from females and 48% were from males. From the total population sample, 11% were female and 10% were male.
Table 4.1 Contingency table displaying values of gender and their initial party selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intial political parties selected by respondents</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>64.04</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>51.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>48.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total no</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7088166</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.418</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>7.406</td>
<td>0.0600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results revealed that there was no significant difference between the males and females voting selection (Chi-Square value = 7.40, df =3, p=0.0600).

### 4.4.3 Racial groups and voting behaviour

A Pearson Chi-Square test was conducted to examine if there are significantly different opinions amongst the different racial groups on their voting selections.

### Table 4.2 Contingency table displaying racial groups and their initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents in the survey</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>65.18</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>51.69</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the contingency table, the racial profile in terms of the respective parties comprised:

**Party 1**

Of the 286 votes received from the total population sample 1% were Asian, 26% were black, 6% were Coloured, 1% were Indian and 5% were white. Party 1 had 111 votes. Of those 3% were asian, 66% were black, 14% were coloured, 4% were indian and 14% were white.

**Party 2**

Of the total research population of 286 votes received, 3% were Asian, 16% were black, 1% were coloured, 3% were indian and 7% were white. Party 2 had 87 votes. Of those 9% were asian, 53% were black, 5% were coloured, 9% were indian and 24% were white.

**Party 3**

Of the total research population of 286 votes received, 1% asian, 7% were black, 1% were coloured, 1% were indian and 1% were white. Party 3 had 30 votes. Of those 7% were asian, 63% were black, 13% were coloured, 7% were indian and 10% were white.

**Party 4**

Of the total research population of 286 votes received, 2% were asian, 9% were black, 1% were coloured, 2% were indian and 5% were white. Party 4 had 58 votes. Of those 12% were asian, 47% were black, 7% were coloured, 12% were indian and 22% were white.

The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between the racial groups and their voting selection, (Chi-Square value = 25.42, df =15, p=0.0445).
Pearson Chi-Square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.256407</td>
<td>0.0332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>24.513</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>23.392</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Limitation: 20% of cells have expected count less than 5, could result in Chi-Square being suspect)

4.4.4 Education and voting behaviour

A Pearson Chi-Square test was conducted to investigate whether there are significantly different opinions on voting selections amongst the various education groups of the population.

The overall breakdown of the respondents based on the education levels is displayed in Table 4.3. According to the contingency table, the educational profile of the respondents show that 31% have a certificate or diploma, 35% have a matric certificate (high school), 18% have a postgraduate degree, 1% completed primary school and 15% have an undergraduate degree.
In relation to the parties voted for:

**Party 1**

Of the total survey population of 291 received responses, 15% had a certificate/diploma; 10% had a matric certificate; 7% had a postgraduate degree; 1% completed primary school and 7% had an undergraduate degree.

**Table 4.3 Contingency table displaying the respondents highest level of education and their initial party selections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>30.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48.31</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>39.81</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>15.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Party 1-4 are the political parties that were initially selected by respondents on the survey. Of the 112 votes received in Party 1, 38% of the voters have a certificate or diploma; 25% have a matric certificate, 17% have a postgraduate degree, 1% completed primary school and 19% have an undergraduate degree.

**Party 2**

Of the total survey population of 291 received responses, 7% had a certificate/diploma; 14% had a matric certificate; 5% had a postgraduate degree; <1% completed primary school and 5% had an undergraduate degree.

Of the 89 votes received in Party 2, 21% of the voters have a certificate or diploma; 46% have a matric certificate, 15% have a postgraduate degree, 1% completed primary school and 17% have an undergraduate degree.

**Party 3**

Of the total survey population of 291 received responses, 3% had a certificate/diploma; 5% had a matric certificate; 1% had a postgraduate degree and 1% had an undergraduate degree.

Of the 30 votes received in Party 3, 30% of the voters have a certificate or diploma; 50% have a matric certificate, 10% have a postgraduate degree and 10% have an undergraduate degree.

**Party 4**

Of the total survey population of 291 received responses, 6% had a certificate/diploma; 7% had a matric certificate; 6% had a postgraduate degree; 2% completed primary school and 2% had an undergraduate degree.

Of the 60 votes received in Party 4, 30% of the voters have a certificate or diploma; 32% have a matric certificate, 27% have a postgraduate degree, 2% completed primary school and 10% have an undergraduate degree.
Pearson Chi-Square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.44476</td>
<td>0.0278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the Chi-Square test revealed that there is no significant relationship between the highest level of education attained and voting selection. (Chi square value = 20.53, df =12, p=0.0576).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>20.889</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>20.538</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Limitation: 20% of cells have expected count less than 5, could result in Chi-Square being suspect)

4.4.5 Age groups and voting behaviour

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to investigate whether there are significantly different opinions on voting selections amongst the various age groups of the population.

The frequency analysis results are displayed in Table 4.4. The results indicate that the age group distribution in terms of the respective parties were:

Party 1

Of the total sample population of 286, 5% of the voters were in the 19-25 years group; 19% were in the 26-35 years group; 10% were in the 36-50 years group and 4% were over 50 years.
Table 4.4 Contingency table displaying respondents’ age groups and their initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>39.66</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>44.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>42.19</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ years</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 110 voters for Party 1, 14% were between 19-25 years, 49% were between 26-35 years; 26% were between 36-50 years and 11% were over 50 years.

Party 2

Of the total sample population of 286, 8% of the voters were in the 19-25 years group; 13% were in the 26-35 years group; 7% were in the 36-50 years group and 2% were over 50 years.

Of the 88 voters for Party 2, 26% were between 19-25 years, 43% were between 26-35 years; 24% were between 36-50 years and 7% were over 50 years.
**Party 3**

Of the total sample population of 286, 4% of the voters were in the 19-25 years group; 3% were in the 26-35 years group; 3% were in the 36-50 years group and 1% were over 50 years. Of the 30 voters for Party 3, 33% were between 19-25 years, 30% were between 26-35 years; 30% were between 36-50 years and 7% were over 50 years.

**Party 4**

Of the total sample population of 286, 4% of the voters were in the 19-25 years group; 9% were in the 26-35 years group; 5% were in the 36-50 years group and 2% were over 50 years. Of the 58 voters for Party 4, 17% were between 19-25 years, 47% were between 26-35 years; 24% were between 36-50 years and 12% were over 50 years.

The results revealed that there is no significant relationship between the age groups and their voting selection. (Chi square value = 10.645, df = nine, p=0.3008).

**Pearson Chi-Square test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3271860</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>ChiSquare</td>
<td>Prob&gt;ChiSq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.654</td>
<td>0.3001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>10.645</td>
<td>0.3008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.6 Summary

Across the demographics, the only statistical variance was found between race and initial party selection. The inference that can be made from the results is that race and voting behaviour do have a relationship.

4.5 RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2

Which advertising appeal is the most preferred by voters?

4.5.1 Introduction

Fear appeal is a form of negative appeal. Negative appeal was deemed a favourite in order to increase voter turnout as well as mobilizing voters to vote. However, in recent times, voters seem to be showing disdain for negative political adverts. Understanding voter preference is important in order to influence them. Agreement statistics were conducted to assess the frequency of selection in each party; the data is then shown in graphs with a descriptor of the adverts used.

4.5.2 Preferred advert appeal analysis

In order to assess which of the two appeals is most preferred, the results used are the indications given by the respondents to “This advert appealed to me”. Each of the adverts has an influencer message and uses either a rational or a fear appeal.
Table 4.5 Rater Agreement on advert appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency Share</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.80%</td>
<td>27.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>41.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>25.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.60%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.40%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency table displays the percentage of the research population that selected the respective adverts and the total number of responses received for each advert.
As seen in the Table 4.5, question 6 the highest agreement with the statement was for the Party 2 advert. The highest for question 7 was the Party 1 advert, question 8 and 9 was the Party 4 adverts, question 10 was for Party 1, for question, 11 and 12 was the Party 2 advert and for question 13 the agreement was on the Party 4 adverts.

4.5.3 Graphical representation of adverts rating

The graphs below display the influence and appeal used in the adverts.

![Graph Adverts - Question 6](image)

**Figure 4.5 Advert appeal question 6**

According to the graph, Figure 4.5 the results show that for question 6 the appeal most preferred was a rational appeal advert paired with a Partisan influencer.
Figure 4.6 Advert appeal question 7

According to the graph, Figure 4.6 the results show that for question 7 the appeal most preferred was a rational appeal advert paired with a policy influencer.

Figure 4.7 Advert appeal question 8

According to the graph, Figure 4.7 the results show that for question 8 the appeal most preferred was a rational appeal advert paired with a Partisan influencer.
Figure 4.8 Advert appeal question 9

According to the graph, Figure 4.8 the results show a minimal variance between the preference for the rational appeal with a candidate image influence and for policy influence. However there was a slight differentiator, 82 respondents selected the candidate image rational and 85 people chose the policy rational advert.

Figure 4.9 Advert appeal question 10

According to the graph, Figure 4.9 the results show a preference for the fear appeal coupled with the candidate influencer.
According to the graph, Figure 4.10 the results show a preference for the rational appeal coupled with the candidate image influencer.

According to the graph, Figure 4.11 the results show a preference for the rational appeal coupled with the policy influencer.
According to the graph, Figure 4.12 the results show a preference for the rational appeal coupled with the government performance influencer.

4.5.4 Summary of adverts

The graphs show a trend indicating a preference of adverts with a rational appeal. This can also be seen in the share chart Appendix D.

4.6 RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 3

Can voting preference be influence by advertising?

4.6.1 Introduction

According to Lavidge and Steiner (1961) in order for advertising to be effective, it must serve three functions. The first is to convey information, secondly create a liking or preference towards the product, the final is deemed as conviction leading to a purchase.

When the initial parties were introduced, respondents were asked which party they would vote for if national elections were today. As can be seen in the graph...
Figure 4.6 Party 1 got the most number of votes, followed by Party 2 and Party 4. Party 3 garnered the least number of votes.

![Bar chart showing number of votes for different parties.]

**Figure 4.13** Initial party selected

The party adverts were introduced and respondents were requested to select the advert that appealed to them, the advert, which had messaging that, was convincing for them and finally they needed to select the advert that could compel them to vote for the party. Agreement statistics were used to assess the degree of agreement.

### 4.6.2 Analysis of results

**Agreement statistics**

Agreement statistics were conducted to assess the degree of agreement. For the research, this is relevant in order to assess if there is inconsistency of ratings made by the respondents and to get a view of the rate of disagreement amongst the respondents.
**Kappa Agreement**

Kappa values were tested in order to give the reader a quantitative measure of the magnitude of agreement between observers. In the research, the majority of the results indicate a slight to fair agreement. Across the various adverts they have a Kappa statistic of 0.16 -0.37. In the research what is favourable is to find minimal agreement amongst the raters. The rational is that in order for the adverts to be effective there needs to be minimal to no agreement – this is the indication of awareness of the new variable that has been introduced – the adverts influencing their perception of the parties thereby causing them to change from the initial party choice.

**Bowker tests**

Bowker nonparametric tests for assessing marginal homogeneity were done to test the initial party selected against the advertisement, to check if there are changes. For Bowker’s test of symmetry, the null hypothesis is that the probabilities in the square table satisfy symmetry. The nominal values tested in the study are the initial party of choice against the adverts at a significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. The initial choice of party changes on the introduction of the adverts, with the exception of responses for:

- adverts 3 and adverts 4 the Bowker P Value is 0.21
- advert 3 and 7 which have a Bowker P Value of 0.05
- adverts 6 to 7

Therefore, there were no changes in voting choices when the adverts were introduced. The results are displayed in Appendix D.

Party 1 – Bowker’s test of symmetry is significant showing the raters who had initially voted to Party 1 on introduction of the adverts selected other parties in differing proportions. Party 2 – Bowker’s test of symmetry for majority of the raters is significant. Party 3 and Party 4 – Bowker’s test of symmetry for majority of the raters is not significant meaning the raters had the same propensity to select the same categories/parties.
As can be seen in Figure 4.14, in Party 1 of the 118 that voted 42% of them consistently voted for Party 1 when adverts were introduced. Ninety-three respondents voted for Party 2, and 29% of those did not change to another party. For Party 3, of the 30 respondents who selected it as their party of choice, 35% of them voted consistently for it.

Sixty-four respondents voted for Party 4, 55% of them did not change to another party. The share chart shows the voting distribution of the research population, tracking the changes from the initial party that was selected and visually displaying the changes as the adverts were introduced.
Table 4.6 Share Chart: Advert influence resulting in initial party selection change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share Chart</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Party 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.3 Summary

The indication of the graphs and rater agreement do confirm that on introduction of the adverts respondents changed from their initial voting decision. We can then deduce from the findings that voting preference can be influenced by advertising.

4.7 RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 4

What is the relationship of partisanship, policy issues, government performance, candidate image and voting behaviour?

4.7.1 Introduction

The importance issues where the one’s defined by the Michigan Model and Rational Choice theory, as influencers of voting behaviour. Through the various statistical analysis, the results will reflect how much of a factor the respective influencers have on voting behaviour. We will also be able to have a view of the proportion of respondents who voted in line with their issue of importance. A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to assess the statistical significance amongst the variables between influencers of voting behaviour and voting selections.

4.7.2 Importance of voting behaviour influencers

According to the results, the trend shown in graph, Figure 4.15, reflects that the influencer, which they deemed to be very important, is trust in the leader of the party. The influencer of the political party’s policies, then the party’s previous performance in government then follows this. Party identification is also viewed as important. The influencer which was frequently rated as not important, is whether the elections are national or local elections.
Figure 4.15 Importance of voting behaviour influencers

4.7.3 Political Party Policies and voting behaviour

According to the results shown in Table 4.7, of the 301 respondents who indicated their selection, 67% of them indicated that political party policies are very important, 25% indicated that they felt they were somewhat important and 8% felt that they were not important.

Party 1

Of the total research population 27% of those who voted for Party 1 indicated that political party policies are very important, 9% felt they were somewhat important and 3% indicated they were not important to them.

One hundred and seventeen votes were received for Party 1. Of those 69% indicated that party policies were very important to them; 23% felt they were somewhat important and 8% indicated that they felt they were not important to them.
Table 4.7 Contingency table: Political party policies and initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very important</strong></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>72.04</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>60.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>18.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat important</strong></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not important</strong></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total no.** | 117     | 93      | 30      | 61      | 301   |
**Total %**    | 38.87   | 30.9    | 9.97    | 20.27   |       |

**Party 2**

Of the total research population 22% of those who voted for Party 2 indicated that political party policies are very important, 7% felt they were somewhat important and 1% indicated they were not important to them.

Ninety three votes were received for Party 2. Of those 72% indicated that party policies were very important to them. Twenty-four percent felt they were somewhat important and 4% indicated that they felt they were not important to them.

**Party 3**

Of the total research population 6% of those who voted for Party 3 indicated that political party policies are very important, 2% felt they were somewhat important and 2% indicated they were not important to them.
Thirty votes were received for Party 3. Of those 57% indicated that party policies were very important to them. Twenty-three percent felt they were somewhat important and 20% indicated that they felt they were not important to them.

**Party 4**

Of the total research population 12% of those who voted for Party 4 indicated that political party policies are very important, 7% felt they were somewhat important and 1% indicated they were not important to them.

Sixty-one votes were received for Party 4. Of those 61% indicated that party policies were very important to them. Thirty-three percent felt they were somewhat important and 7% indicated that they felt they were not important to them.

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the perceived importance of political party policies and the total sample population is voting selection.

**Pearson Chi-Square test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3885390</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.777</td>
<td>0.1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>ChiSquare</td>
<td>Prob&gt;ChiSq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>10.459</td>
<td>0.1066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed that there is no significant relationship between the perceived importance of political party policies and the research population’s voting selection (Chi square value = 10.459, df = 6, p=0.1066)

### 4.7.4 Trust in the leader of the party and voting behaviour

The results shown in Table 4.8 reveal that 80% of the total sample population indicated that trust in the leader of the party is a very important influencer of voting behaviour. Six percent felt that it was not important.
Table 4.8 Contingency Table: Trust in the leader of the party and initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very important</strong></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>90.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.43</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat important</strong></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not important</strong></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no.</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total %</strong></td>
<td>38.87</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Party 1**

According to the contingency table, the results indicated that of the total sample population of 301 respondents 31% of the voters in Party 1 indicated that trust in the leader of the party was very important to them. Five% indicated that it was a somewhat important factor and 3% felt that it was not an important factor in their voting behaviour.

Out of the 117 votes received by Party 1, 79% of them indicated trust in the leader of the party as very important to them. Fourteen percent of the Party 1 voters felt it was somewhat important and 3% indicated that trust in the leader of the party was not important to them in the voting behaviour.

**Party 2**

According to the contingency table, the results indicated that of the total sample population of 301 respondents 26% of the voters in Party 2 indicated that trust in the leader of the party was very important to them. Four percent indicated that it
was a somewhat important factor and 1% felt that it was not an important factor in their voting behaviour.

Out of the 93 votes received by Party 2, 84% of them indicated trust in the leader of the party as very important to them. Twelve percent of the Party 2 voters felt it was somewhat important and 4% indicated that trust in the leader of the party was not important to them in the voting behaviour.

**Party 3**

According to the contingency table, the results indicated that of the total sample population of 301 respondents 5% of the voters in Party 3 indicated that trust in the leader of the party was very important to them. Three percent indicated that it was a somewhat important factor and 1% felt that it was not an important factor in their voting behaviour.

Out of the 30 votes received by Party 3, 53% of them indicated trust in the leader of the party as very important to them. Thirty three percent of the Party 3 voters felt it was somewhat important and 13% indicated that trust in the leader of the party was not important to them in the voting behaviour.

**Party 4**

According to the contingency table, the results indicated that of the total sample population of 301 respondents 18% of the voters in Party 4 indicated that trust in the leader of the party was very important to them. One percent indicated that it was a somewhat important factor and 1% felt that it was not an important factor in their voting behaviour.

Out of the 30 votes received by Party 4, 90% of them indicated trust in the leader of the party as very important to them. Seven percent of the Party 4 voters felt it was somewhat important and 3% indicated that trust in the leader of the party was not important to them in the voting behaviour.
A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the perceived importance of trust in the leader of the party and the research population is voting selection.

**Pearson Chi-Square test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2700468</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>16.540</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>18.660</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between the perceived importance trust in the party’s leader and the research population is voting selection (Chi square value = 18.660, df =6, p=0.0048).

(Limitation: 20% of cells have expected count less than 5).

**4.7.5 Party’s Previous Performance in government and voting behaviour**

Sixty five percent of the respondents felt that a party’s previous performance in government is a very important influencer of voting behaviour. Ten percent of the respondents felt it was not important.
Table 4.9 Contingency Table: Previous performance in government and initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</th>
<th>Political Party 1</th>
<th>Political Party 2</th>
<th>Political Party 3</th>
<th>Political Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>28.24</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>62.37</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>63.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. Total %</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.87</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party 1

According to the contingency table 4.9 of the total research population of 301, 28% of those who felt that previous government performance was a very important issue in the voting behaviour were those who voted for Party 1. Eight percent indicated that the issue was somewhat important and 3% indicated that they did not feel that previous government performance was an important issue for them.
Of the 117 votes received by Party 1, 73% of those voters indicated that previous government performance was very important to them. Twenty percent of them felt that it was somewhat important and 8% did not feel that it was an important issue in influencing their voting behaviour.

**Party 2**

According to the contingency table 4.9 of the total research population of 301, 19% of those who felt that previous government performance was a very important issue in the voting behaviour were those who voted for Party 2. Nine percent indicated that the issue was somewhat important and 3% indicated that they did not feel that previous government performance was an important issue for them.

Of the 93 votes received by Party 2, 62% of those voters indicated that previous government performance was very important to them; 28% of them felt that it was somewhat important and 10% did not feel that it was an important issue in influencing their voting behaviour.

**Party 3**

According to the contingency table 4.9 of the total research population of 301, 4% of those who felt that previous government performance was a very important issue in the voting behaviour were those who voted for Party 3. Three percent indicated that the issue was somewhat important and 3% indicated that they did not feel that previous government performance was an important issue for them.

Of the 30 votes received by Party 3, 43% of those voters indicated that previous government performance was very important to them. Thirty percent of them felt that it was somewhat important and 27% did not feel that it was an important issue in influencing their voting behaviour.
Party 4

According to the contingency table 4.9 of the total research population of 301, 13% of those who felt that previous government performance was a very important issue in the voting behaviour were those who voted for Party 4. Six percent indicated that the issue was somewhat important and 2% indicated that they did not feel that previous government performance was an important issue for them.

Of the 61 votes received by Party 4, 64% of those voters indicated that previous government performance was very important to them. Twenty-eight percent of them felt that it was somewhat important and 8% did not feel that it was an important issue in influencing their voting behaviour.

Pearson Chi-Square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1883201</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.377</td>
<td>0.0541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>14.379</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Limitation: 20% of cells have expected count less than 5)
A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the perceived importance of a party’s previous performance in government and the research population is voting selection. The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between the perceived importance of a party’s previous performance in government and the research population is voting selection (Chi square value = 14.379, df =6, p=0.0257).

### 4.7.6 Party identification and voting behaviour

Sixty one percent of the research population indicated that identification with the party was very important to them and 8% of the research population felt that party identification was not an important influencer of their voting behaviour.

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the perceived importance party identification and the research population is voting selection.
Table 4.10 Contingency Table: Party identification and initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very important</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>64.66</td>
<td>40.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>65.59</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>18.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat important</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>35.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>29.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>31.67</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not important</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown on the contingency table indicate the following:

**Party 1**

Of the total sample population of 319, those that responded to the question were 299. Of the 299, 25% of those who voted for Party 1 indicated that being able to identify with the political party is a very important influencer of their voting behaviour. Eleven percent indicated that it was a somewhat important influencer and 3% of the Party 1 voters felt that being able to identify with the party was not important to them in influencing their voting behaviour.
Of the 116 respondents that voted for Party 1, 65% felt that party identification is a very important influencer, 28% indicated that it is somewhat important to them and 8% of those that voted for Party 1 indicated that party identification was not important in influencing their voting behaviour.

**Party 2**

Of the total sample population of 319, those that responded to the question were 299. Of the 299, 20% of those who voted for Party 2 indicated that being able to identify with the political party is a very important influencer of their voting behaviour. Nine percent indicated that it was a somewhat important influencer and 2% of the Party 2 voters felt that being able to identify with the party was not important to them in influencing their voting behaviour.

Of the 93 respondents that voted for Party 2, 66% felt that party identification is a very important influencer, 29% indicated that it is somewhat important to them and 5% of those that voted for Party 2 indicated that party identification was not important in influencing their voting behaviour.

**Party 3**

Of the total sample population of 319, those that responded to the question were 299. Of the 299, 4% of those who voted for Party 3 indicated that being able to identify with the political party is a very important influencer of their voting behaviour. Four percent indicated that it was a somewhat important influencer and 1% of the Party 3 voters felt that being able to identify with the party was not important to them in influencing their voting behaviour.

Of the 30 respondents that voted for Party 3, 43% felt that party identification is a very important influencer, 43% indicated that it is somewhat important to them and 13% of those that voted for Party 3 indicated that party identification was not important in influencing their voting behaviour.
Party 4

Of the total sample population of 319, those that responded to the question were 299. Of the 299, 11% of those who voted for Party 4 indicated that being able to identify with the political party is a very important influencer of their voting behaviour. Six percent indicated that it was a somewhat important influencer and 2% of the Party 4 voters felt that being able to identify with the party was not important to them in influencing their voting behaviour.

Of the 60 respondents that voted for Party 4, 57% felt that party identification is a very important influencer, 32% indicated that it is somewhat important to them and 12% of those that voted for Party 4 indicated that party identification was not important in influencing their voting behaviour.

Pearson Chi-Square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>-LogLike</th>
<th>RSquare (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4758410</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ChiSquare</th>
<th>Prob&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.952</td>
<td>0.3253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>7.037</td>
<td>0.3174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results revealed that there is no significant relationship between the perceived importance party identification and the research population is voting selection. (Chi square value = 7.037, df =6, p=0.3174)

4.7.7 Self-identification and voting behaviour

The aspect of self-identification speaks to partisanship, which is belonging to a party or group. It is important to understand how the individuals view themselves in the relation to voting behaviour. The impact is the influence on how advertising will influence them. Respective literature states that Partisanship can serve as a perception screen, which shapes how a person views political messages.

Therefore, political partisans should be less likely to accept political ads than those not politically affiliated (Franz & Ridout, 2007) should. According to the results of the research population 40% indicated themselves as party loyalists, 36% indicated themselves as having no party affinity and 25% stated that they are not interested in politics.

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between Partisan self-identification and the research population is voting selection.
Table 4.11 Contingency Table: Self-identification and initial party selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial political parties selected by respondents on survey</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a party loyalant</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no party affinity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not interested in politics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party 1

Of the total sample population, 220 respondents gave their responses. Twelve percent of those who voted for Party 1 identified themselves as party loyalists, with 13% indicating that they have no political party affinity and 8% stating that they are not interested in politics.

Of the 220 given responses, 73 where of those who voted for Party 1. Within the Party 1 population, 37% identified themselves as party loyalists, 38% stated that they had no political party affinity and 25% of the 73 indicated they were not interested in politics.

Party 2

Of the total sample population, 220 respondents gave their responses. Thirteen percent of those who voted for Party 2 identified themselves as party loyalists, with 10% indicating that they have no political party affinity and 7% stating that they are not interested in politics.
Of the 220 given responses, 67 where of those who voted for Party 2. Within the Party 2 population, 43% identified themselves as party loyalists, 34% stated that they had no political party affinity and 22% of the 67 indicated they were not interested in politics.

**Party 3**

Of the total sample population, 220 respondents gave their responses. Five percent of those who voted for Party 3 identified themselves as party loyalists, with 5% indicating that they have no political party affinity and 3% stating that they are not interested in politics.

Of the 220 given responses, 29 where of those who voted for Party 3. Within the Party 3 population, 38% identified themselves as party loyalists, 38% stated that they had no political party affinity and 24% of the 29 indicated they were not interested in politics.

**Party 4**

Of the total sample population, 220 respondents gave their responses. Nine percent of those who voted for Party 4 identified themselves as party loyalists, with 8% indicating that they have no political party affinity and 6% stating that they are not interested in politics.

Of the 220 given responses, 51 where of those who voted for Party 4. Within the Party 4 population, 33% identified themselves as party loyalists, 33% stated that they had no political party affinity and 27% of the 51 indicated they were not interested in politics.
The results revealed that there is no significant relationship between self-identification and the research population is voting selection.

(Chi square value = 0.979, df = 6, p = 0.9864).

4.7.8 Summary

In review of all the influencers, the results indicate that there is a significant relationship between showing trust in the leader with voting behaviour and previous performance in government with voting behaviour.

4.8 SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

In addressing the research proposition of advertising influence on voting behaviour, the research was divided into four questions. The first was to establish whether demographics have an impact on a person being influenced in their
voting behaviour. Chi-Square analysis was implemented against the individual demographics to assess a significant relationship with voting behaviour.

The demographics analysed were gender, race and level of education. The results showed that the demographic with a significant difference is race.

The second question was to identify which advertising appeal between fear and rational is most preferred by the respondents. The analysis of the results obtained from the graphical representation and rater agreement showed marginal differences between the two appeals; however, with a clear preference of rational appeal when it is coupled with policy influence.

The third question was to investigate if advertising can change voting preference. Respondents were given four adverts to choose from that they would vote for. The information provided of each party was standard: Party policies, a bit of background information about the party leader and government performance in previous elections. They were then exposed to eight adverts for each party. Agreement statistics were conducted to assess if respondents changed from their initial selection on the introduction of these adverts. The results confirm that respondents did change their preference on exposure to adverts.

The final research proposition was the understanding of the correlation between the issues of importance and voting behaviour.

Chi-Square analysis was implemented against each of the issues of importance to determine if there is a significant relationship with voting behaviour. Eighty percent of the total sample population indicated that trust in the leader is the deemed as a very important issue in influencing their voting behaviour. Significant relationships were established through Chi-Square analysis for trust in the leader of the party and previous government performance.
In relation to the conceptual framework of the study, the results do agree that advertising appeals coupled with influencers do have a significant relationship with voting behaviour; however, not all influencers and demographics need to be factored. Based on the results the conceptual framework can be displayed as seen in figure 4.16.

Figure 4.16 Conceptual framework based on research results

The next section of the research will discuss the results.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to assess whether advertising influences South Africans’ voting behaviour. The research compared two advertising appeals: fear and rational – to assess which is most preferred by voters. It is also to review if having knowledge of voters’ influencers and using that knowledge coupled with an advertising appeal would influence voters’ behaviour.

The study also briefly reviewed if demographics such as race, gender and education level can have an impact on voters and how they are influenced by advertising in their voting behaviour. The research used an online and a hard-copy questionnaire to gather data. Respondents were requested to select issues of importance to them when voting as well as self-reports on partisanship and their perceptions towards political advertising. Respondents were provided information about four political parties and after reading the information about the parties, they were requested to select the one that they would vote for if elections were held. They were then shown adverts.

The aim was to assess if there would be a difference in their choices when adverts were introduced which had content that appealed to their issues of importance (influencers) and combined with imagery and tonality of either fear or rational appeal. The sample was random, convenience and referral. Three hundred and nineteen valid questionnaires were returned.
5.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

The incorporation of sampling from the snowball convenience sampling to the random sampling through the research company, and convenience sampling done by the researcher allowed for a much more diverse representation of respondents. However, it was still flawed in that all the respondents were from Johannesburg, which is an urban area and therefore it is not truly representative of the South African demographic through its exclusion of those in the rural areas.

5.2.1 Gender

It is important to understand the demographics and their impact on the results of the research. There was a slightly higher representation of female respondents than men; however, this is also true within the demographics of the South African population.

5.2.2 Age

The research had an age restriction of 18 and above. There was a good representation across the age groups with the youngest respondents being 19 years and the oldest, 86 years. The largest percentage of the research population were between the ages of 31 to 35 years followed by those who are in the 26 to 30 year old age bracket.

5.2.3 Qualifications

The highest level of education is important to review in a study like this. The respondents were heterogeneous, with the smallest percentage being of those with the highest level of education being primary school. There is a proportionate representation across all levels of education. Various researches have shown that well-educated citizens are more likely to show a greater interest and involvement in political participation (Rosenberg, 1988).
The largest group of respondents were those whose highest level of education obtained is a high school qualification. The second largest group were those with a certificate and diploma qualification.

5.2.4 Race

Leighley (1995) states that various evidence regarding race-related differences in participation rates varies, controlling for socioeconomic status, minorities are sometimes more and sometimes less likely than the majority race to engage in political participation. In this research, there was a fair representation of the races that make up the South African population. The majority were black, followed by white, coloured the least being indian and asian – which is reflective of the South African statistics.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 1

Do demographics namely; gender, race and level of education have an impact on a person’s voting behaviour?

5.3.1 Introduction

It was important to assess if there are any significant variances between the demographic variables and the respondents voting behaviour. Each variable was assessed individually, with race showing a statistical variance.
5.3.2 Gender and voting behaviour

A contingency analysis and Chi-Square test were done to assess if there is a significance variance in the voting behaviour of males and females. The analysis indicated that there is no significant variance in their voting behaviour. As displayed in the mosaic plot, although the distribution between the number of males and females who voted for each party is not equal, this is in line with the demographic split in the South African population.

**Figure 5.1** Gender mosaic Plot
5.3.3 Racial groups and voting behaviour

The statistical analysis that was done showed a significant variance in the voting behaviour of the different racial groups. The view from the mosaic plot shows that the largest number of asians and Indians voted for Party 2. The largest number of blacks and coloureds voted for Party 1 and the largest number of whites voted for Party 2.

We can conclude based on the results that race is a factor of influence in voting behaviour. This is in line with previous election results in South Africa, which evidenced that South African’s are still very race-conscious in their voting behaviour.
5.3.4 Education and voting behaviour

In the overview shown by figure 5.3 the largest group of the respondents are those whose highest level of education is high school and they make up the largest group to vote for Party 2. The largest number of those with certificates/diplomas, undergraduate and postgraduate degrees voted for Party 1. The Chi-Square results indicate that there is no significant relationship between education and voting behaviour although the p value was just above 5%.

Figure 5.3 Highest level of education mosaic plot
5.3.5 Age groups and voting behaviour

The mosaic plot provides an overview showing a large portion of the 19-25 age bracket voted for Party 2. The largest age groups in Party 1 is those between 26-35 years, 36-50 years and those above 50 years. The Pearson test determined that there is no significant relationship between age and voting behaviour.

**Figure 5.4** Age groups mosaic plot

In response to the research question which was enquiring whether demographics, namely gender; race and level of education, have an impact on voting behaviour. The results indicate that this is only affirmative for race.
This implies that in political advertising in South Africa, political parties need to factor race in their advertising delivery.

5.4 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 2

Which advertising appeal is the most preferred by voters?

5.4.1 Introduction

According to Brader (2005), research that has been done on public health campaigns has suggested that fear appeals are more effective at changing behaviour especially if the appeal is telling the recipients something to do to mitigate danger. The majority of fear appeals in political adverts practice this by suggesting to viewers to vote a certain way.

5.4.2 Rational advertising appeal versus fear advertising appeal

Figure 5.5 Rater agreement: advert appeal
As seen in the marginal distributions of ratings displayed in Figure 5.5. The results in the study reflect that rational advertising appeal was the most preferred appeal by voters. However, the messaging is equally important, when rational was paired with candidate image it did not fare as well as when it is paired with policy.

Caution is advised not to view the preference of appeal in isolation as the influencer which is used in the message, could contribute to the preference.

5.4.3 Summary

The research question stated which appeal, fear or rational, is most preferred by voters. According to the results, rational appeal is preferred subject to the content of the message.

5.5 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS TO QUESTION 3

Is voting behaviour influenced by advertising?

5.5.1 Introduction

Ridout and Franz (2007) stated in their research they found extensive evidence that political advertising persuades, and that its impact varies depending on the characteristics of the viewer. Brader (2005) confirmed in his study that political adverts can change the way citizens engage and make choices by merely using images and music to evoke emotions. Through the study, we endeavour to add onto the existing study in responding to this question with the specific interest in the South African citizen.
5.5.2 Preferred advert appeal analysis

The graph above shows the percentage of voters who consistently voted as per their initial party selection. Party 4 were the most consistent voters with an average of 55% of their voters who consistently voted for Party 4. However, from the above we can attribute that the reverse is applicable 45% of the initial Party 4 voters changed to other parties.

The results confirm what has been proven already that voters are influenced by advertising to change their preference due to the influence of advertising; however, this is not in isolation. Factors such as partisanship, race, political knowledge, sources of information, influence how the voters process the advert and thereby influence the voting behaviour.
5.5.3 Summary

When political parties advertise they need to consider the dynamics of their audience. In South Africa variables such as geography, race and trust in the party leader are vital. Targeting and segmentation is important in order for political advertising to be effective. Manipulation of freely available data like the census data will enable for greater targeting for political advertising. The components of the advert need to take into consideration the content, appeal and platform. The combination of all the variables in accordance to the audience would aid in political adverts influencing South African voters to alter their voting behaviour.

5.6 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS TO RESEARCH QUESTION 4

*What is the relationship between partisanship, policy issues, government performance, candidate image and voting behaviour?*

5.6.1 Introduction

As previously mentioned by Brader (2005), context is a very important issue in voting behaviour and this can sway people’s decision-making. During the conducting of the survey, there was a lot of scrutiny of South Africa’s current President, Jacob Zuma, particularly the report on his alleged use of public funds to build his home in Nkandla. Unfortunately, this happened after he had stood in front of the public in Parliament and vowed that the funds belonged to his family. This could have had an impact on the results. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated trust in the party leader as a very important issue when they make their voting decision.
5.6.2 Political party policies and voting behaviour

Figure 5.7 Political party policies mosaic plot

A large number of the respondents indicated that political party policy is very important when they are making a decision on whom to vote for. However, the results indicated that there is no significant relationship between party policies and voting behaviour.
5.6.3 Trust in the leader of the party and voting behaviour

According to the results, trust in the leader of the party has a significant relationship with voting behaviour. Trust in the leader of the party was rated by a greater part of the respondents as a very important issue in their voting behaviour. In political parties trying to influence voting behaviour, they need to keep cognizance that people view the leader of the party as an extension of the party, and the candidate’s image and portrayal needs to be one that evokes trust.

As seen in more matured democracies such as the United States, the President is supported by a marketing team which is tasked with protecting his image, vetting his speeches, managing his brand, etc. This is not only during elections but on-going in order to manage the image that is portrayed to the public.

Figure 5.8 Trust in the leader of the party mosaic plot
5.6.4 Party’s previous performance in government and voting behaviour

A large portion of the respondents indicated that a party’s previous performance in government is a very important issue when they are deciding whom to vote for. The results from the Chi-Square indicated that there is a significant relationship between a party’s previous performance and voting behaviour.

This aspect is currently very relevant in South Africa, service delivery protests and strikes have shown a remarkable increase. Some of these aspects have laid the ground for opposition parties to emerge and some existing parties to gain the upper hand, by criticizing the current government performance track record and subsequently promising to do better if they are given a chance at power.

**Figure 5.9** Party’s previous performance in government mosaic plot
The relationship between the two variables, all things constant, would be such that if previous performance in government has been good then voters would continue to vote for the party and the reverse would apply.

5.6.5 Party identification and voting behaviour

![Party Identification Mosaic Plot]

**Figure 5.10** Party identification mosaic plot

Even though 62% of the respondents indicated that party identification is very important when they consider whom to vote for. The results obtained from the Chi-Square indicate that there is no significant relationship between party identification and voting behaviour.
5.6.6 Self-identification and voting behaviour

There is very little variance between the three groups in terms of how the respondents indicated themselves. There is almost an equal portion between those who see themselves as loyalists and those who state that they have no party affinity. There is a smaller group of those who stated that they have no interest in politics. The research also confirmed that there is no significant variance amongst the groups on self-identification and their approach to voting behaviour.

5.6.7 Summary

According to the results, two influencers have a relationship with voting behaviour that is trust in the leader of the party and previous government performance. It is rather surprising that partisanship did not play as significant a role as generally concluded. However, the results as seen above of self-identification and party identification indicate that there is no significant variance. The next section is the conclusion of the research.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The research was conducted to provide results to the research question of whether advertising can influence South African voting behaviour. The study endeavoured to fulfil the following objectives of assessing if demographics can influence voting behaviour, to which the results showed that race does influence voting behaviour. The next objective was to investigate which appeal between fear and rational is most preferred by voters. The results evidenced that rational appeal was the favoured appeal. The research also investigated if there is a relationship between identified influencers and voting behaviour. The results confirmed that two influencers of trust in the leader of the party and previous government performance were very important in influencing voters’ behaviour. The final objective was to investigate whether advertising can influence South African voters’ behaviour. The results confirmed that indeed advertising could influence voters' behaviour.

6.2 Conclusions of the study

The results of the study aid in the progression of the academic and methodological discussion about the influence of voting behaviour and the manipulation thereof in order to purposefully drive a particular outcome. We would argue that, based on the results derived from the data, advertising does influence voters and the data corroborate this. However, other factors need to be considered. Messaging is important in political advertising, the mere show of a logo is not essential as voter are interested in what parties stand for and how that relates to them.

The assumption when the research began was that partisanship is a greater influence amongst South Africans. Therefore, it was important to investigate if partisans can be influenced through purposeful use of issues, tonality and imagery that can appeal to them and result in a change of voter behaviour. However, many did not see party identification as an important factor which is a
form of partisanship. Race, trust in the leader of the party and previous government performance were the factors that emerged in this research as having a significant relationship with voting behaviour.

Other results that were gathered, but not included were the respondents’ perception towards advertising. One of the agreement statements is that political advertisements guide the electorate in the choice of political party: 130 of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed. The Chi-Square also indicates a significant relationship with voting behaviour $p= 0.0171$. The results indicate an awareness from the respondents of the role of the political adverts. In discussion with various respondents, their vocalized challenge was that, although adverts are a source of influence they are also used to communicate non-truths.

The collated data on sources of the results are not included in the research indicated. The significance of sources of information and the thirst for credibility in political advertising. Some of the suggestions for campaigners are to use people whom voters can imagine being their friends (those they can identify with) and confidants giving their opinions in the form of real life case studies. This would resonate from a source and information perspective.

Rational appeal, which is based on facts, is more welcome and these results could be greatly influenced by the fact that during this research a lot of negative sentiment was being expressed about the ruling party – particularly the aspect of “perceived mistruths by the President regarding tax money being used for his personal use. It was found on engaging some of the respondents, that they would constantly state that political advertising is misleading as party leaders promise but do not deliver. Although the government performance was an issue for them they maintained their allegiance, with particular reference to the current ruling party. On further enquiry as to the rationale for the vote, some respondents stated
that there are no credible alternatives, therefore the best approach was to maintain the status quo.

6.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The greatest limitation for this study was it not being fully representative of the South African population, those in the urban and rural areas; the results could potentially be different. Race has a significant relationship with the voting behaviour of South Africans.

- Further study could assess whether within the respective racial groupings – if generalisations apply to such – black South Africans are more likely or less likely to base their vote on policies.

- Further research could be conducted into a comparative study to analyse the relationship between the different age groups across the racial groups and voting behaviour.

- There is also the aspect of sources of information which would provide an added element into the further understanding of how to communicate with the South African voter but also which mediums are most effective in influencing their voting behaviour.

- It would also provide great insight to repeat the study prior to the next elections after 2014 to assess if any of the factors have altered.
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CHAPTER 8: APPENDICES

8.1 APPENDIX A – INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY: INFLUENCE OF ADVERTISING ON VOTING BEHAVIOUR

Dear Participant,

Thank you in advance for your participation in this survey. I am completing a Master of Management in Strategic Marketing (MMSM) at the Wits Business School, Johannesburg (Wits).

My MMSM research is on the influence of advertising on voting behavior. The purpose of the project is to obtain information on understanding what aspects of advertising aid in influencing voters when they make their voting selection.

The survey has 18 questions and will take approximately 10-15 minutes. On completion of the survey you will be entered into a draw to win an Apple TV. There are no risks to you by participating. Your participation on this project is completely voluntary and you can opt out at any time. Your identity will be kept strictly confidential. I will appreciate you forwarding this survey to prospective respondents.

If you have any questions about this project or your participation, you can email me omari.nia2000@yahoo.com.

By completing and submitting this survey, you are providing your informed consent as a participant.

Sincerely,
Naledi Ndlovu
Wits Business School
Master of Management in Strategic Marketing

Note:
You have to be 18 years and above to complete the survey and a South African national.
1. Please rate the importance of the issues below when you decide which party to vote for;
(1 = Very important; 2 = Somewhat important; 3 = Not important)

The political party’s policies ______
Trust in the leader of the party ______
The party’s previous performance in government ______
My decision is dependent on whether it is national or local elections ______
I can identify with the party ______

2. What can you say about yourself in regards to party identification? (Please select one)

I am a party loyalist ______ I have no party affinity ______
I am not interested in politics ______

3. What are your sources of Information for voting for a political party?
(1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Very Often; 5 = Always Often)

Friends ______ Outdoor Advertising (Billboards, posters) ______
Family ______ Media (TV, Radio, Newspaper, Magazine) ______
Political Speeches/Campaign ______

4. Please rate the following statements:
(1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree)

Political adverts are reliable and believable ______
The information from political adverts is authentic and honest ______
Political advertising is biased and not reliable ______
Most political adverts are reasonable and convincing ______
The Information from most political adverts is interesting ______
Political advertising is effective on electorates ______
Negative political advertisements should be discouraged ______
All political advertisements are good ______
Political advertisements guide the electorate in the choice of political party ______
Q.5

**VOTE PARTY 1**

Our vision is for the promotion of a self-reliant economy that will promote economic growth and development that will create jobs to ensure that citizens work for their livelihood. Key to the party is the prioritising of education and health as well as placement of measures to alleviate poverty in society.

Party leader: Mafani
Mafani is a lawyer, by profession. He has been the unopposed leader for the party since 2002. He is married with five children.

Previous government performance: Governing party, received 40% of the votes.

---

**VOTE PARTY 2**

We believe in growing our economy and creating good jobs across the country. We are committed to building a clean energy economy. Our firm belief is in a smart on crime approach that focuses on targeting real criminals instead of our youth, to keep our communities safe.

Party leader: Ntombi
Ntombi joined the army while in high school. She was the first woman to command an Air Force squad. She has carried many military and humanitarian missions all around the world. Ntombi is married with two children.

Previous government performance: received 30% of the votes.

---

**VOTE PARTY 3**

Our vision is to maintain and enhance the government's constitutional position within the country and achieving long-term political stability to deliver a peaceful and prosperous future for our people.

Party leader: Gershunie
Gershunie is a teacher by profession. Gershunie became a member of the party at its foundation.

He has progressively moved up the ranks of the party in various leadership positions. Gershunie is married with 3 children.

Previous government performance: received 10% of the votes.

---

**VOTE PARTY 4**

Our vision is for the creation of national consciousness that is geared at promoting patriotism, love of our country and humanity. We believe in not only receiving benefits from the country, but to work for them.

Party leaders: Dr Ntse
Dr. Ntse was an officer in the Navy. He has also served as Chancellor and served on various company boards. He lives with his wife and 3 kids.

Deborah
Deborah was a university professor and a constitutional activist. She has been instrumental in leading constitutional debates and mobilizing civic engagement in government policies. She is a mother of two children.

Previous government performance: received 20% of the votes.

---

If National elections were today, which of the above would you vote for?

Party 1 ☐
Party 2 ☐
Party 3 ☐
Party 4 ☐
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Q.6

Do you really believe that changing the current government will be for the better?

The grass always seems better on the other side, but it seldom is

VOTE PARTY 1

We understand you.
We understand your needs.

And by voting for us, we will fulfill not only your needs, but help you realise your dreams for the South Africa you deserve.

VOTE PARTY 2

For the past 5 years unemployment has risen from 35% to 50%.

You may be a jobless statistic unless you vote Party 3.
We will create jobs for all.

VOTE PARTY 3

Is your family important to you?

Then why do you keep voting for someone who clearly does not care for their family. Do you think family issues will be important to them?
Family is our cornerstone.

VOTE PARTY 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select one answer per row</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Influence of advertising on voting behaviour
Q.7

**Education is not a privilege. It is a right.**
Vote for us and we will continue to ensure that every child has access to their birth right – EDUCATION.

**Vote Party 1**

**I have never given you a reason to doubt my dedication to the country.**
The opposition leadership is riddled with inconsistency, can you really put your trust in them?

**Vote Party 2**

**Embrace the rainbow nation. Embrace equality. Embrace freedom. Embrace your space in South Africa’s bright future.**

**Vote Party 3**

**Put a stop to corruption**
The past 6 years the standard of living for citizens has dropped, yet many government officials are living in excesses of wealth.

**Vote Party 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select one answer per row</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.8

Instead of receiving a grant…

...Receive a salary.

Receive the lift you deserve.

VOTE PARTY 2

You deserve to be represented by a party that effectively uses your taxes for our nation’s services, not squandered on reckless spending.

VOTE PARTY 3

Party 4 is waving the flag for a diverse and multi-cultural South African society.

Vote for the party that cares about you and not your skin colour.

VOTE PARTY 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE SELECT ONE ANSWER PER ROW.</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.9

A leader should be an example in the community, setting the quality bar high and guided by solid values.

I’m your kind of leader. My values are your values.

VOTE PARTY 1

Last year, crime rates were reported to have decreased.

However, the global index still rates us as one of the most dangerous countries.

“Someone” is not being honest. If you want honesty

VOTE PARTY 2

BEE = Bad Economic Equality

Vote for a party that will implement proper policies to ensure equality in wealth distribution.

VOTE PARTY 3

We believe in everyone having access to accurate, appropriately equipped healthcare.

Vote for a party that will enable this.

VOTE PARTY 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select one answer per row</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.10

VOTING IS A BIG DECISION

Voting for your future is the biggest decision of your life.
Can you really afford to make the wrong choice?
Vote for your life partner,
VOTE PARTY 1

GO FISH!

This is what you can expect on our roads if you continue to keep the opposition in power!
If you are serious about change
Vote Party 2

You are unemployed, your kids are uneducated, and you are about to be evicted from your house!
This could be your future if you continue to vote for the opposition.
I have your best interest at heart.
VOTE PARTY 3

How long will you live in fear of criminals?
Our approach is simple: criminals have no place in your neighborhood and our society
Crime will not be tolerated.
VOTE PARTY 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select one answer per row</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.11

Did your parents not caution you against hypocrites?

Don't fall for empty promises. Vote Party 1, we are tried and tested.

I am not in this for fame or money.

I understand that my role is to be your public servant.

VOTE PARTY 2

According to the global index our country has increased in corruption year-on-year.

Putting in stringent processes that discourage corruption is the best eliminator.

VOTE PARTY 3

Whilst you struggle to pay your bills, they are living the high life. How long are you going to tolerate losing out and being last on their list?

LOSER

Vote for change.

VOTE PARTY 4

Please select one answer per row

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.12

**VOTE PARTY 1**

We take care of our people.

Vote for a party that you know, that has been with you from the struggle.

**VOTE PARTY 2**

Our policy on job creation is simple

We will create a self-reliant economy to promote the development for our country.

Vote for a party that knows how to grow an economy.

**VOTE PARTY 3**

Do you want an incompetent politician making bad decisions on your behalf?

And are you sick of politicians hiring their friends to spend your hard earned tax contributions? Say no to incompetence.

**VOTE PARTY 4**

We believe in creating a true rainbow nation, where everyone is equal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select one answer per row</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select one answer per row</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This advert appealed to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The messaging in this advert is convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please circle appropriate selection and complete:

14. Gender: Male                          Female

15. Racial grouping ?(circle applicable option)

   Black                        White                        Asian
   Coloured                     Indian                       Other

16. What year were you born? [ ]

17. Highest level of education( circle applicable option)
   — Primary
   — High School
   — Certificate/ Diploma
   — Undergraduate degree
   — Postgraduate degree

18. What was your family income per month in 2012?(circle applicable option)
   Less than R10 000
   R10 000 – R50 000
   R50 000 – R100 000
   R100 000 – R500 000
   R500 000 – R 1 000 000
   Over R1 000 000

19. Please provide your telephone number /email address if you would like to be entered for prize draw

   [ ]

Thank you very much for completing the survey!
### 8.2 APPENDIX B: Cronbach Coefficient Alpha with Deleted Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Raw Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Total</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Total</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies</td>
<td>0.023897</td>
<td>0.943457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>0.072179</td>
<td>0.943277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prev_performance</td>
<td>0.000582</td>
<td>0.943576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nat_or_local_decision</td>
<td>0.042289</td>
<td>0.943583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying_with_the_party</td>
<td>0.058931</td>
<td>0.943391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity_self</td>
<td>0.497543</td>
<td>0.941573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources_friends</td>
<td>0.56618</td>
<td>0.941027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources_family</td>
<td>0.607031</td>
<td>0.940696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources_media</td>
<td>0.629876</td>
<td>0.94052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources_political_speeches_campaign</td>
<td>0.630921</td>
<td>0.940495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source/key</td>
<td>values</td>
<td>values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources_outdoor_advertising</td>
<td>0.656852</td>
<td>0.940266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_reliable_believable</td>
<td>0.635263</td>
<td>0.940478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_authentic_honest</td>
<td>0.652137</td>
<td>0.940379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_biased</td>
<td>0.522285</td>
<td>0.941371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_convincing_reasonable</td>
<td>0.653837</td>
<td>0.940301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_interesting_info</td>
<td>0.668694</td>
<td>0.940156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_effective_electorates</td>
<td>0.610984</td>
<td>0.94068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_negative_poli_discourage</td>
<td>0.557229</td>
<td>0.941248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_all_good</td>
<td>0.623716</td>
<td>0.940644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverts_guide_for_choice</td>
<td>0.644433</td>
<td>0.94037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elections_today</td>
<td>0.284679</td>
<td>0.942796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealling1</td>
<td>0.427452</td>
<td>0.941951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing1</td>
<td>0.439346</td>
<td>0.94188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_change_in_vote1</td>
<td>0.473143</td>
<td>0.941671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealling2</td>
<td>0.492933</td>
<td>0.941541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing2</td>
<td>0.406454</td>
<td>0.942112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_change_in_vote2</td>
<td>0.538906</td>
<td>0.941221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealling3</td>
<td>0.535005</td>
<td>0.941278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing3</td>
<td>0.541038</td>
<td>0.941264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_change_in_vote3</td>
<td>0.58432</td>
<td>0.940953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad_appeal</td>
<td>0.503308</td>
<td>0.941475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message_convincing</td>
<td>0.493688</td>
<td>0.941538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change_in_vote</td>
<td>0.513471</td>
<td>0.941411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealling4</td>
<td>0.459851</td>
<td>0.941767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing4</td>
<td>0.47643</td>
<td>0.941651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_change_in_vote4</td>
<td>0.536656</td>
<td>0.941238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealling5</td>
<td>0.506127</td>
<td>0.941451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing5</td>
<td>0.570272</td>
<td>0.941038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_change_in_vote5</td>
<td>0.601487</td>
<td>0.940807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealling6</td>
<td>0.583199</td>
<td>0.940975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing6</td>
<td>0.613193</td>
<td>0.940834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_change_in_vote6</td>
<td>0.653456</td>
<td>0.940522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change_in_vote7</td>
<td>0.383203</td>
<td>0.942232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_appealing7</td>
<td>0.348177</td>
<td>0.942417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ad_message_convincing7</td>
<td>0.383394</td>
<td>0.94223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.3 APPENDIX C: Share Chart displaying advert found most appealing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share Chart</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Party 3</th>
<th>Party 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 This advert appealed to me</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX D: Agreement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response1</th>
<th>Response2</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>Bowker Symmetry</th>
<th>Bowker PValue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.369573</td>
<td>0.035266</td>
<td>21.54784</td>
<td>0.0176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.246066</td>
<td>0.033865</td>
<td>32.07631</td>
<td>0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.338444</td>
<td>0.035198</td>
<td>22.14955</td>
<td>0.0144*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.337233</td>
<td>0.034907</td>
<td>26.25786</td>
<td>0.0034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.308659</td>
<td>0.035853</td>
<td>13.12842</td>
<td>0.2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.297814</td>
<td>0.035102</td>
<td>26.15523</td>
<td>0.0035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.303417</td>
<td>0.034311</td>
<td>27.52914</td>
<td>0.0021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.37027</td>
<td>0.035105</td>
<td>17.87162</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.286527</td>
<td>0.036211</td>
<td>13.18419</td>
<td>0.2136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.296332</td>
<td>0.033031</td>
<td>74.43762</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.263334</td>
<td>0.034231</td>
<td>49.1196</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.35499</td>
<td>0.035831</td>
<td>32.28419</td>
<td>0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response1</td>
<td>Response2</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>Std Err</td>
<td>Bowker Symmetry</td>
<td>Bowker PValue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.322527</td>
<td>0.033169</td>
<td>73.44712</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.321342</td>
<td>0.032714</td>
<td>77.52207</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.231241</td>
<td>0.031668</td>
<td>87.70346</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.342398</td>
<td>0.034186</td>
<td>57.96989</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.264071</td>
<td>0.033518</td>
<td>48.57051</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.270059</td>
<td>0.034326</td>
<td>30.55622</td>
<td>0.0007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.269089</td>
<td>0.033419</td>
<td>47.23921</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.274608</td>
<td>0.03454</td>
<td>26.32914</td>
<td>0.0033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.296144</td>
<td>0.034827</td>
<td>27.46618</td>
<td>0.0022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.261872</td>
<td>0.03335</td>
<td>58.66635</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q6 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.347225</td>
<td>0.03604</td>
<td>50.6105</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q7 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.260211</td>
<td>0.035093</td>
<td>60.23102</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q8 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.201736</td>
<td>0.032225</td>
<td>90.10897</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response1</td>
<td>Response2</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>Std Err</td>
<td>Bowker Symmetry</td>
<td>Bowker PValue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>would vote for this party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q9 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.179083</td>
<td>0.032263</td>
<td>76.66756</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.239478</td>
<td>0.032767</td>
<td>81.99302</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.167814</td>
<td>0.031851</td>
<td>84.69763</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.196753</td>
<td>0.032678</td>
<td>83.22309</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 If the National elections were held today, which one of the political parties above would you vote for?</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.184047</td>
<td>0.031775</td>
<td>95.90893</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.337909</td>
<td>0.035167</td>
<td>25.69487</td>
<td>0.0042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.309677</td>
<td>0.034825</td>
<td>15.31973</td>
<td>0.1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.220891</td>
<td>0.033147</td>
<td>45.92574</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q11 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.313248</td>
<td>0.033776</td>
<td>35.68978</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q12 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.304747</td>
<td>0.034111</td>
<td>45.30829</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>Q13 After seeing this advert I would vote for this party</td>
<td>0.285192</td>
<td>0.034543</td>
<td>43.54063</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>