The Latino population in the United States has grown exponentially in the last several decades; however, their growing political power has remained untapped. As of 2000, the United States had approximately 21.6 million Latinos of voting age, but only 34 percent were registered to vote and only 27 percent actually reported having voted (Moore, 2003). At this point, neither major political party has a solid stronghold on the Latino voting bloc, but both have notably stepped up their efforts to gain that allegiance through increased advertising and community outreach. Moreover, both Republicans and Democrats have participated in forums that primarily discuss issues that are perceived to affect Latinos the most. Instead of appealing to Latinos through forums directed solely at them, there has been a recent micro targeted approach similar to that of other groups within the electorate (e.g. African Americans, women, rural voters, etc.). The Voting Rights Act of 1965 made it mandatory to provide ballots in the native language of the voters and since then, there has been an effort to communicate with Latinos in their native language. According to data gathered from television stations and network profiles, the 2004 election spent in the upwards of $8.7 million dollars on Spanish-language television ads (Segal, 2004). The New Democratic Network, a moderate Democratic political action committee, launched a $2 million dollar advertising strategy geared specifically towards Latinos in the 2004 presidential election. The cost of paid media spending on general elections has skyrocketed and therefore a cost-benefit analysis is necessary to determine the benefits of advertising to Hispanics in Spanish. However, research does indicate that Spanish-language advertising is more effective for Hispanics/Latinos, ages 18-49, despite fluency in English (Roslow & Nicholls, 1996).

According to Fullerton and Kendrick (2000), there are two conflicting forces that affect Latino preference: (1) the desire to fit into the mainstream and (2) the drive to reaffirm or maintain their ethnic identity. The desire to fit into the mainstream, which in this case is the dominant use of English, may explain how other researchers have found preference for the use of English language advertisements (Fullerton & Kendrick, 2000). Other research suggests that using Spanish language advertisements is more effective in conveying a message to bilingual Spanish-English speakers because those who identify themselves more strongly to their ethnicity are more frequent users of Spanish-only media (Deshpande, Hover, & Donthu, 1986). In addition to the increased persuasiveness of Spanish language ads, it can be inferred that it would take more airtime, and money, to reach as many Hispanic voters using English ads via mainstream media avenues.

Spanish-Language Political Commercials: Does the Method of Persuasion Affect Overall Efficacy?

Political commercials are a major vehicle for disseminating information about candidates in modern campaigns. There are three main methods, including antithesis, explicit and implicit, used to foster common ground and persuade them to vote for the sponsor of the commercial. A mixed factorial design was used in which independent variables included fluency level and ad type. It was hypothesized that Spanish-language commercials that use the implicit method of identification are more persuasive in terms of likelihood to vote for the sponsoring candidate than those that use explicit or antithesis. Results showed a main effect of the types of ads, albeit a post hoc test revealed that the explicit and implicit methods of persuasion were more persuasive than the antithesis.
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While Spanish-language commercials appear to be more effective in delivering a message (via language), the second part of the ad concerns persuading a voter to choose the sponsoring candidate. In trying to persuade Latino voters, studies suggest that people favor those candidates they perceive as being similar to themselves (Koslow, Shamdasani, & Touchstone, 1994). Subsequently, the purpose of the commercial is to influence voters by assisting them in identifying the similarities between themselves and the candidate. The basic methods of persuasion tactics used in political commercials were devised by Connaughton and Jarvis (2004) and based on the Burkean theory of fostering social affiliation. Burke argues that, “You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea and identifying your ways with his” (Connaughton & Jarvis, 2004, p. 467). Highlighting these similarities would persuade a voter that a candidate has similar economic, social and political interests. At the time of this study, no previous studies had been conducted on the persuasiveness of commercials that use explicit, antithesis or implicit methods espoused by Connaughton and Jarvis (2004) theory as the most common means of fostering a common ground with the candidate.

Commercials that use the antithesis method often use very perceptible tactics. A large misconception about memorable political commercials is that they are the negative ads that attack the opposing candidate’s personal or voting record. Negative ads use an out-group method such as “they” and “them” in reference to the opposing candidate and/or political party, which serves as a means of uniting individuals against a common identity. Antithesis use dark imagery, louder and foreboding music with an underlying ominous tone. However, not only are campaign commercials supposed to foster identification between the voters and the candidate, they are also used to ensure voter turnout, which is imperative to a successful political campaign. A key concern of campaign strategists is to make certain that negative ads will not keep turnout low by turning people off from the political process which can be deemed as dirty and not something in which they would like to participate. Nevertheless, this apprehension is not enough to prevent campaigns from using them, but rather encourage caution. Many political scientists argue that increased use of negative ads in modern political campaigns directly correlates to their efficacy, but research on their persuasiveness suggests otherwise. Thorson, Christ, and Caywood (1991) found that ads that highlight the positive message of the sponsoring candidate, rather than attack the opponent, have a more positive impact on viewers’ attitudes toward the candidate, although they are no less persuasive.

The explicit method uses an in-group approach in which both visual and aural cues such as traditional Latino clothing and folk music and reference to “us” and “we” tries to make a connection with the voters. Furthermore, they directly use the term “American Dream” in conjunction with the aforementioned cultural cues because it reinforces the other cues that suggest the sponsoring candidate understands and values the importance of the Latino culture. In terms of message, the commercial highlights issues such as immigration, welfare reform, social security and the minimum wage, as they are perceived to be of high importance in the Latino community.

On the other hand, commercials that use the implicit method are somewhat more subtle in their appeal since they do not approach Latinos as a subgroup, but as though they have been fully integrated into the mainstream. The ads are similar to positive English-language ads in that they use a variety of diverse people it suggests that they are not seen as part of the out group. The ads also discuss the notion of the ideas behind the “American Dream” (e.g. education, upward mobility, shared values and morals, etc.) without directly referencing the phrase. The use of those words is a key distinction between the implicit and explicit reference to the ideas about the American Dream.

The lack of empirical support for the use of various tactics with the Latino population provided the basic purpose of the present study of determining whether the methods of persuasion will influence the overall likelihood of voting for the candidate it is designed to promote. The design of the empirical study intends to address several questions, including the best way to disseminate political information to Latino voters and how Latinos perceive commercials that target them as an out group (e.g. being Latinos). The hypothesis states that commercials that use the implicit means of identification will result in a higher rate of persuasion, in terms of reported intended behavior of voting for the sponsoring candidate, regardless of proficiency in Spanish. This is based on the idea that implicit identification will resonate among viewers because it emphasizes issues that are important to the entire electorate, which suggests that they [Latinos] have been accepted as a part of the American society.

Method

Participants

The 41 participants in this study included native Spanish speaking students ($n = 15$) bilingual with fluency in both Spanish and English and native English-speaking students ($n = 26$) who, though fluent in
Spanish, were enrolled in upper level Spanish classes. They were recruited from two small, Midwestern colleges. All participants were between the ages of 19 and 27 (M = 22.63). The gender disparity between females (n = 36) and males (n = 5) somewhat accurately reflected the male to female ratios of the colleges. Attempts to recruit students via campus message boards and email were initially effective, but the sample size remained too small and other means were subsequently employed to increase the sample. Spanish departments at both schools, following proof of Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) approval, consented to conduct the study during class time.

Two Spanish professors volunteered class time to conduct the study. One sample was taken at the beginning of class while the other sample was taken during the remaining twenty minutes of class time. Before collecting data, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the students. Each student received an informed consent form and was notified that their participation in the study was not required for the class. Neither professor, in either class, provided extra credit to their respective students for participating in the study. A third sample was taken in which participants showed up voluntarily at their convenience outside of class time.

It is noted that the class in which the data was collected in the latter time frame of the class resulted in two students not completing the survey in its entirety as a result of time constraints. Only one of the surveys was not used in the descriptive and inferential statistical analysis because the incomplete data did not reflect having participated in the entire study. However, the other participant watched all nine commercials and answered six of the corresponding questions fully. Subsequently, the ratings from this participant were still used in the statistical analysis because the study was completed and the results are still indicative of the participant’s level of persuasion based on the commercials.

**Apparatus**

The University of Oklahoma Political Communication Center (OU-PCC) provided the Spanish-language political commercials from races between 2000 and 2006 that were used in the study. All of the commercials available were from American presidential, congressional, or gubernatorial races. Three major presidential candidates from 2000 and 2004 sponsored three of the nine commercials, including George W. Bush, John Kerry, and Al Gore.

There were fees associated with the compilation of the tape, and due to limited resources, the population had to be narrowed. By reducing the number of 124 Spanish language ads that the OU-PCC had available to a population of such ads corresponding to political races between 2000 and 2006, the population decreased to only 55 commercials from which to obtain the sample. Again, limited financial resources required that only 40 of the 55 ads were purchased using a random process.

OU-PCC has a strict lending policy in which they do not allow researchers to have more than five commercials per candidate, which was therefore taken into consideration when choosing the 40 commercials. To ensure random selection, each of the 55 ads was assigned a number to determine whether it would be in the final selection. Candidates who had more than five ads available were withheld from the number assignment because they were randomized independently within themselves. A table of random numbers was generated to determine which 40 ads were chosen without breaking OU-PCC loan terms. An identical process was used in determining which five ads from each candidate would be chosen from among the candidates who had more than five ads.

A general rubric with criteria for how they would be categorized was created prior to watching the ads for the first time. Upon viewing them the first time (without categorizing them), the rubric was adjusted with other visible or aural cues such as music, pitch and tone, were added to each category to assist in categorizing the commercials (see Appendix A for more). Using this checklist, ads were classified as having employed either the implicit, explicit or antithesis method of persuasion. Within each of these categories, the best three of each were chosen as the most representative, thus nine ads were shown to participants. The best were identified as having used a majority of the criteria for one method. Additionally, block randomization was used to control for sequence effects in the administration of the present study.

Lastly, the ads, which were initially on recorded VHS tape, were transferred to a digital version on a DVD to assist in smooth viewing procedures. This controlled for the time allotted to answering the questions before moving on to the next commercial and overall reduced the time needed to conduct the study by cutting out time to rewind and forward in search of the ads in the specifically randomized order. The commercials were put on the DVD in the predetermined randomized order.

**Procedure**

This study used a 2 x 3 mixed factorial design. There were two independent variables: fluency in Spanish (native bilingual Spanish/English and SSL -
native English-Spanish as a second language) and the type of commercial (implicit, explicit, and antithesis). The efficacy of the ads was determined by a self-rating on a Likert Scale of 1-5 in which participants rated the likelihood of voting for the candidate based on the commercial (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely).

Upon signing the informed consent, participants filled out the demographic portion of the survey, both of which were provided in English (see Appendix B for survey questions). Participants were assigned to their respective groups based on self-report of their native fluency in Spanish, but only when quantifying the data. Otherwise, both bilingual and native English speakers participated in all conditions for a mixed between and within subjects design. The researcher informed the participants that they could answer questions while viewing the commercial and that they would also have time following each commercial to complete the corresponding questions.

As the order of the commercials was predetermined, the names of the ads were printed next to each set of corresponding scales and questions. To ensure that the participants completed the questions corresponding to specific ads, the researcher stated the name of the commercial prior to showing each ad. Following each commercial, participants had one minute to complete the questions before the next ad would automatically begin. The efficacy of each ad was determined using a five-point Likert scale and all nine commercials were rated in this manner. Upon viewing all of the ads and completing the corresponding questions, participants answered a final question in which they were asked which commercial was the most memorable and why.

Results

Each participant viewed three commercials that corresponded to each category and the ratings for each of these three scores was averaged for each participant. The mean ratings across participants are presented in Table 1.

An ANOVA statistical analysis revealed no main effect of language proficiency on perception and persuasiveness of the commercials, $F(2, 119) = .29$. Regardless of level of fluency among native Spanish bilinguals ($M = 4.4$) and SSL ($M = 3.52$), it is noted that both understood the overall message of the commercial and was persuaded one way or another. Although results indicated no statistical difference between language fluency and the use of the antithesis method, $F(2, 114) = .75, p > .05$), it is interesting to note that, compared to SSL participants ($M = 2.87$), the lower ratings of native bilingual Spanish speakers were for candidates who sponsored negative ads ($M = 2.61$; see Table 1).

There was a main effect in the mean persuasion levels between the three types of ads, $F(2, 119) = .02, p < .05$; see Table 1). A Tukey’s Post Hoc test showed no significant difference between the implicit and explicit strategies ($p = .29$), but there was a difference between both of those and the antithesis strategy ($p = .03$ and .01), respectively. These numbers indicate that using a negative strategy is not as effective as conventional campaign wisdom has dictated.

Discussion

With the increased use of negative ads and bickering among candidates, campaigns are finding it increasingly difficult to keep voters tuned into political campaigns. As previously mentioned, negative ads are continually used in political campaigns because they are deemed to be effective, although the statistical analysis in this study found that the likelihood of voting for the sponsoring candidate of a commercial significantly increased if it did not use the antithesis (negative) as the method of persuasion. The low persuasion levels of the antithesis ads, as compared to the explicit or implicit ads, may be a result of its own message and simply attacking the opposing candidate.

Although data does not indicate a significant difference between the language types, it does suggest that the persuasiveness of the ads is thus related to the method of persuasion, rather than the cultural and language cues that are directed at Latinos. Regardless of the fact that persuasion levels of commercials that use implicit identification are not statistically significant, the data suggests that campaigns are best off using implicit or explicit techniques in Spanish-language commercials because they result in higher likelihood of voting for the sponsoring candi-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Overall Persuasion Levels by Commercial Type and Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of commercial</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSL</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bilingual—Native Spanish (fluent bilingual Spanish/English)
SSL—Native English (Spanish as a second language)
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dates than those that use negative means create a common ground. Overall, this insinuates that when appealing to Latino voters, it would behoove campaigns to refrain from using the antithesis approach because it might have the potential of not only turning them off from the sponsoring candidate, but also discourage them from voting all together.

Despite the obvious in-group/out-group distinction in explicit commercials, it is possible that their comparable persuasion is a result of the ability of the explicit commercial to get and maintain the viewer’s attention through louder and more energetic music, brighter colors and more live footage. Furthermore, explicit commercials may be appealing because the sponsor of the ad makes an overt attempt to reach out to the Latino community, which supports the idea that Latinos are impressed by the fact that they feel they are an integral part of American politics and are pursued with some importance.

Likewise, the data of the more persuasive explicit and implicit methods supports Thorson, et al. (1991) in the theory that positive ads are more memorable than negative ads. In fact, participants noted that most memorable commercial showed the sponsoring candidate speaking Spanish throughout the entire commercial, addressing issues that affect the nation in its entirety and not just those that are perceived to be “Latino issue.” One participant noted, “[h]e attempts communicating with the Spanish-speaking population,” while another said that the candidate appeared sincere. Similarly, an ad that used the explicit method was nearly as memorable, but could be a result of bright imagery and other visual cues because another participant noted that it was “appealing to the eye.”

An interesting follow up study could look at differences in persuasion levels among different age groups within the three methods of persuasion because cultural cues may be associated with the level of familiarity with the native country of origin that are specifically designed to elicit a response as an out-group (explicit) or use subtle imagery and language cues to emphasize mainstream issues (implicit). This would help identify another subgroup (age) within the Latino bloc because Hispanic heritage does not necessarily mean that they are familiar with the culture of the native country. Another factor that influences the likelihood of voting for a candidate is name recognition, as opposed to the ability of the commercial to persuade. Therefore, a follow up study to control for name recognition would benefit from using political commercials whose sponsors do not have such high name recognition. This would control for bias in favor of or against a candidate and their affiliated party.

Although this study looked at the efficacy of Spanish-language political commercials, the small sample of native Spanish-speaking participants makes it difficult to interpret the results as being entirely applicable to the Latino community. Interestingly, the majority of the participants were unable to identify correctly the correct candidate in two of three commercials that employed the antithesis; however, several participants commented that they identified with the positions that were criticized in the commercial, such as abortion, yet rated the likelihood of voting for the candidate as relatively low (M = 2.25). It is evident that commercials that use the antithesis do not sell their own candidate, but rather attempt to discredit the opponent. Unfortunately, this makes it difficult to gauge whether the ad is truly effective (e.g., whether people would or would not vote for the candidate being attacked) because they are measured differently than positive commercials (both implicit and explicit).

Ultimately, it appears that Spanish-language political ads are effective in persuading Latinos to turnout to vote. In his bid for reelection as Texas Governor in 1998, George W. Bush won about 35 percent of the Hispanic bloc after using Spanish-language commercials to convey his message, in addition to speaking Spanish at events with large Latino audiences (Moore, 2003). The win can be attributable to both his strong platform commitment to improve education (an issue that is important to Latinos, as well as other voters) and his effort to communicate his message in Spanish.

As the 2008 presidential race progresses, many of the top tier candidates have released Spanish-language ads in early primary states, as well as those with heavy concentrations of Latinos. Most recently, Democratic candidates Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton released Spanish-language ads using implicit and explicit methods, respectively (Berthume, 2008). Republicans Mitt Romney and Rudy Giuliani also released Spanish-language commercials in Florida during the 2008 election cycle (Ambinder, 2008). Regardless of party, candidates are all after the coveted Latino voting bloc that has yet to decide which way they will tip the scales.

Reaching out to Latinos in a specific and intentional manner will considerably increase awareness about candidates, party ideology, and further facilitate in their inclusion into mainstream society. The ability of Spanish-language commercials to persuade Latino voters towards a specific candidate or party is apt to lead towards long term party affiliation. Geographical concentrations in larger electoral states such as New York, California, Illinois, Arizona and Texas, as well as their growing numbers nationwide, could result in a major impact on presidential elec-
tions. Interestingly, Hispanic affairs expert Louis DiSipio contends that Obama’s support among Latinos trails Clinton because he has failed to specifically tailor his message, whereas Clinton “speaks about issues, like the economy and education, that are critical in Latino communities” (Bustamante, 2008). Seemingly, this emphasizes the point that a political commercial has to have a strong message, as opposed to empty rhetoric, which is reinforced by a positive method of persuasion to resonate effectively with Latino voters.

The results of this study are certainly applicable to modern campaign strategy in a rapidly changing American demographic. Both Democrats and Republicans can benefit by increasing voter turnout among Latinos, which lags significantly behind the mainstream, but also in creating long-term party allegiance that they have thus far been unsuccessful. With voter turnout among Latinos at a mere 27.5 percent, this is the lowest percentage among other groups such as whites (60.4 percent) and African-Americans (54.1 percent) (Moore, 2003). If either Republicans or Democrats are able to nail down a strategy that both informs and persuades, they might be able to cement a hold on the bloc that can change electoral politics in the long term because of the growing number of eligible Latino voters. Ultimately, if increased turnout is not evident within the next few election cycles, the increased attention on Latino significance might begin to foster a long term feeling of inclusion into American politics will be the beginning of increased civic participation and political socialization.

APPENDIX A:

Criteria for Ad Content

Implicit—discrete attempts as establishing a common ground
Testimonials
American Dream issues
  - Education
  - Values / Morals
  - Shared values
Inclusion to American mainstream
Diversity of actors (because there is no difference)

Antithesis—unites individuals against a common enemy
Use of out-group bias (with reference to opponent candidate/party)
  - “They”
  - “Them”
Attack on character or specific issue(s)
Dark music in the background

Explicit—overt attempts to establish a common ground
Promotes stereotypical “Latino issues”
  - Immigration
  - Welfare reform
  - Social security
  - Minimum wage
  - Jobs
In group
  - “Us”
  - “We”
Attempts to make Latinos “see themselves” in the ad
  - Latino actors
  - Traditional Latino/Hispanic music
  - Traditional Latino/Hispanic clothing
Direct use of “American Dream”
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APPENDIX B:

Survey Questions

I understand that all information is confidential and my identity will not be revealed.

Gender (circle one): M F Date of birth (Month/Date/Year): / /19
Year in school (circle one): FR SO JR SR
Are you interested in politics? (circle one)
1 2 3 4 5
Not at all Somewhat Very much so
Party affiliation (circle one): Democrat Independent Republican Other
Spanish fluency (circle one): Bilingual (Spanish-English) Native English (Spanish as a second language)
Please rate your proficiency in Spanish:
1 2 3 4 5
Poor Moderate Very good

Using the scale provided, rate each commercial independently.

“Valores Familiares”
Who is the candidate? _____________
What political party is the candidate they affiliated with?
Democrat Independent Republican Other
Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?
1 2 3 4 5
Very unlikely Not sure Very likely
What about the commercial persuaded you this way? Issue(s) Character trait(s) Other _____________
Was the commercial informative?
1 2 3 4 5
Not at all Somewhat Very much so
How does the commercial make you feel?
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

“Secretaria”
Who is the candidate? _____________
What political party is the candidate they affiliated with?
Democrat Independent Republican Other
Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?
1 2 3 4 5
Very unlikely Not sure Very likely
What about the commercial persuaded you this way? Issue(s) Character trait(s) Other _____________
Was the commercial informative?
1 2 3 4 5
Not at all Somewhat Very much so
How does the commercial make you feel?
____________________________________________________________________________________________
“America the Beautiful”

Who is the candidate? ___________

What is the candidate they affiliated with?
Democrat Independent Republican Other

Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?
1 Very unlikely 2 Not sure 3 Very likely

What persuaded you this way?
Issue(s) Character trait(s) Other ___________

Was the commercial informative?
1 Not at all 2 Somewhat 3 Very much so

How does the commercial make you feel?
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

“Libertad”

Who is the candidate? ___________

What is the candidate they affiliated with?
Democrat Independent Republican Other

Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?
1 Very unlikely 2 Not sure 3 Very likely

What persuaded you this way?
Issue(s) Character trait(s) Other ___________

Was the commercial informative?
1 Not at all 2 Somewhat 3 Very much so

How does the commercial make you feel?
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

“CHT 101 Places”

Who is the candidate? ___________

What is the candidate they affiliated with?
Democrat Independent Republican Other

Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?
1 Very unlikely 2 Not sure 3 Very likely

What persuaded you this way?
Issue(s) Character trait(s) Other ___________

Was the commercial informative?
1 Not at all 2 Somewhat 3 Very much so

How does the commercial make you feel?
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
### “Families”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the candidate?</th>
<th>_____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What political party is the candidate they affiliated with?</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about the commercial persuaded you this way?</td>
<td>Issue(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the commercial informative?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the commercial make you feel?</td>
<td>________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### “No somos”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the candidate?</th>
<th>_____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What political party is the candidate they affiliated with?</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about the commercial persuaded you this way?</td>
<td>Issue(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the commercial informative?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the commercial make you feel?</td>
<td>________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### “Nuestra Comunidad”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the candidate?</th>
<th>_____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What political party is the candidate they affiliated with?</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about the commercial persuaded you this way?</td>
<td>Issue(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the commercial informative?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the commercial make you feel?</td>
<td>________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Temas Importantes”
Who is the candidate? _______________

What political party is the candidate they affiliated with?
Democrat Independent Republican Other

Would you vote for this candidate based on the commercial?
1  2  3  4  5
Very unlikely Not sure Very likely

What about the commercial persuaded you this way? Issue(s) Character trait(s) Other ____________

Was the commercial informative?
1  2  3  4  5
Not at all Somewhat Very much so

How does the commercial make you feel?
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________