

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
22. Kaid, Chanslor, and Hovind 1992	Exposure to different types of actual political ads (positive, negative, issue, image) and the type of television program surrounding the ad	Experiment with a 3×3 factorial design varying program and commercial type, involving a convenience sample of 283 members of civic groups and college students	Vote intention Affect for sponsor Memory for ad	Positive image ads produced greater likelihood of voting than negative ads, $d = -2.40$. Positive issue ads produced higher candidate evaluations for the sponsor than negative commercials, $d = -2.05$. Aspects of positive issue ads were remembered more frequently than aspects of negative ads, $d = -1.15$.
23. Kaid, Leland, and Whitney 1992	Exposure to positive and negative ads from Bush and Dukakis campaigns	112 undergraduates saw 3 Bush ads (2 positive, 1 negative), 3 Dukakis ads (2 positive, 1 negative), or 3 ads from both candidates (2/3 positive for each)	Memory for ads	Positive ads more likely to be remembered than expected by chance (i.e., .67), $d = -.30$.
24. King, Henderson, and Chen 1998	Exposure to single positive or negative ad from Clinton or Dole campaigns, near end of 1996 U.S. presidential election campaign	$2 \times 2 \times 2$ experimental design using 137 undergraduates, varying positive/negative nature of ad, Clinton/Dole as sponsor of ad, and controlling on prior liking of the candidates (median split)	Liking for sponsor of ads Liking for target of ads Vote intention Liking for ads Memory for ads	Clinton liked less when exposed to his negative ad, but no effect of exposure to Dole ads, mean $d = -.32$. Dole liked less after exposure to negative Clinton ad, but no effect of exposure to Dole ads, mean $d = .31$. Likelihood of voting for Clinton decreased after exposure to his negative ad, but no effect of exposure to Dole ads, mean $d = -.23$. Exposure to positive ads associated with more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions compared to exposure to positive ads in 15/18 tests, mean $d = -.51$. Positive Clinton ads better recalled than negative Clinton ads, but no effect of exposure to Dole ads, mean $d = -.40$.

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
25. Lang 1991	Exposure to 8 randomly selected positive and negative ads varying emotional appeal and audio-visual format	Experiment using a 4 (order) \times 2 (emotion) \times 2 (format) \times 4 (repetition) mixed model factorial design with 67 undergraduates	Memory for ads	More information was recalled about negative ads than positive ads, $d = .83$.
26. Lau, Pomper, and Mumoli 1998	Positive/negative "tone" of 1988, 1990, 1994, and 1996 U.S. Senate campaigns, coded from newspaper accounts	Ratings of both candidates by 2,686 ANES respondents, and aggregate analysis of vote totals from 122 Senate elections	Differential ratings of sponsor and target of ads	Relative liking for sponsor of ads decreased as those ads became more negative, $d = -.18$.
			Reported vote	Candidates employing relatively more negative campaigning received relatively fewer votes, $d = -.17$.
			Actual election outcomes	Vote total lower than expected for candidate sponsoring more negative ads, $d = -.26$.
			Turnout	Turnout higher with relatively more negative campaigning at both the individual ($d = .06$) and aggregate level, $d = .39$.
27. Lemert, Elliot, Bernstein, Rosenberg, and Nestvold 1991	Survey respondents reflecting on a positive or negative ad they could recall seeing during 1988 presidential election	Representative sample of 1,256 respondents	Affect for sponsor of recalled ad	Sponsor of ad was liked less if a negative ad was recalled, $d = -.34$.
			Affect for target of recalled ad	Target of ad was liked more if a negative ad was recalled, $d = -.13$.
			Type of ad recalled	Negative ads were more likely to be recalled, $d = 3.86$.
28. Luskin and Bratcher 1994	Authors' rating of "negativity" of 1986-92 U.S. Senate election campaigns, based on their reading of various campaign reports	Aggregate analysis of vote totals from 125 Senate elections	Turnout	Campaign negativity decreased turnout in states with high proportion of independents ($d = -.30$), but otherwise increased turnout ($d = .27$); overall $d = -.12$.

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
29. Martinez and Delegal 1990	Exposure to negative ads from one or both candidates in a hypothetical election Perceived positive/negative nature of 1988 Bush and Dukakis campaigns	Pre/post experiment with 131 college students as subjects Representative survey of 420 respondents	Trust in government	Trust in government increased after exposure to negative ads, $d = .14$.
			Affect for sponsor of ads	The more a candidate's campaign was perceived as negative, the less the sponsor was liked, $d = -.28$.
			Affect for target of ads	The more the opposing candidate's campaign was perceived as negative, the more the target was liked, $d = -.48$.
30. Mathews and Dietz-Uhler 1998	Exposure to positive or negative "family values" ad from mock Democratic or Republican Senate candidate	Experiment with 125 college students as subjects	Affect toward sponsor of ad	Sponsor of positive ad liked much more than sponsor of negative ad, $d = -.52$.
			Likelihood of voting for sponsor of ad	Subjects much more likely to intend to vote for sponsor of positive ad than sponsor of negative ad, $d = -.62$.
31. McBride, Toburen, and Thomas 1993	Exposure to four negative ads from a 1990 Louisiana senate race for the first experiment; exposure to a description of four negative ads from the 1992 presidential race in the second experiment	Two experiments involving 223 undergraduates from three midwestern universities, 70 of whom were recontacted after the election to measure actual turnout	Intended turnout	Ad valence did not significantly affect voter turnout, $d = .12$.
			Actual turnout	Controlling on race, income, interest in the campaign, and vote intention, subjects exposed to negative ads were slightly (and nonsignificantly) less likely to actually vote, $d = -.06$.
32. Merritt 1984	Exposure to negative and neutral ads from candidates in a 1982 California Assembly race	Representative survey of 314 respondents in the candidates' district	Affect toward sponsor of attack ad	More negative affect toward sponsor when ad was negative rather than positive, $d = -.86$.
			Affect toward target of attack ad	More negative affect toward target after negative rather than positive ad, $d = .77$.
			Correct recall of ad	Negative ad was more likely to be correctly recalled, $d = .29$.
33. Newhagen and Reeves 1991	Reactions to actual Bush and Dukakis positive, negative, or comparative ads	Within-subjects design; 30 residents reacting to 28 different ads	Memory for each ad	Recall was more accurate (and quicker) for negative rather than positive ads, $d = 1.30$.

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
34. Pfau, Kenski, Nitz, and Sorenson 1989	Exposure to attack ad from least preferred candidate during 1988 presidential campaign, vs. no exposure control group	Representative sample of 374 likely voters	Affect toward sponsor of ad Vote intention	Sponsor of negative ad was liked more after exposure to ad, compared to control group, $d = .75$. Respondents were more likely to intend to vote for sponsor of negative ad compared to control group, $d = .92$.
35. Pinkleton 1997	Amount of negative information about target included in ad about fictitious candidates	165 college students assigned to between-groups pre-post design (including a no ad control group)	Affect toward sponsor of ad Affect toward target of ad Affect toward ad itself	More negative the ad, less sponsor was liked, $d = -.44$. More negative the ad, less target was liked, $d = .67$. More negative information in the ad, less it was liked, $d = -.31$.
36. Pinkleton 1998	Amount of negative information about target included in ad about fictitious candidates	165 college students assigned to between-groups pre-post design (including a no ad control group)	Affect toward sponsor of ad Affect toward target of ad Likelihood of voting for target and sponsor	Sponsor liked slightly less if attacked opponent, $d = -.40$. Target liked slightly less if attacked, $d = .04$. Likelihood of voting for sponsor decreased slightly if attacked opponent, $d = -.03$.
37. Pinkleton and Garramone 1992	Number of negative ads recalled from each candidate	Phone survey of 405 likely voters just before 1990 Michigan senatorial and gubernatorial election	Intended turnout Affect for ads themselves	Intention to vote slightly higher, the more negative ads seen, $d = .01$. The more negative ads seen, the less they were approved of and the less informative they were judged to be, $d = -.18$.
38. Rahn and Hirshorn 1995	Exposure to 4 positive or 4 negative ads from the 1988 presidential election	Experiment with 53 8–13-year-old children	Public mood	Mood was lower for children exposed to 4 negative ads two years after the election, $d = -1.45$.
39. Roberts 1995	Memory for Bush or Clinton ads	Representative phone survey of 931 respondents after the 1992 presidential election	Memory for ad	Negative Bush and Clinton ads slightly more likely to be recalled than would be expected by chance, $d = .05$.

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
40. Roddy and Garramone 1988	Positive or negative response to opponent's attack ad	2 × 2 experiment with 274 undergraduates varying type of attack (issue or image) and nature of response (positive or negative)	Affect for sponsor of response ad Affect for target of response ad Intended vote for/against sponsor of response ad Affect for response ad itself	Candidate who responded positively rather than negatively was liked more, $d = -.09$. Target was liked less after negative response compared to positive response, $d = .06$. Intention to vote for candidate who responded negatively rather than positively was higher, $d = .10$. Positive response ad was liked more than negative response ad, $d = -.33$.
41. Schultz and Pancer 1997	Whether fictitious candidate attacks character of opponent	134 undergraduates randomly assigned to 2 × 2 experiment, varying sex of candidate and whether s/he attacks opponent	Affect for sponsor of attack Vote intention	"No significant difference" in evaluations of sponsor, (assumed) $d = 0$. "No significant difference" in vote intention, (assumed) $d = 0$.
42. Shapiro and Rieger 1992	Positive or negative radio ads from two fictitious candidates in two local elections	106 undergraduates in 2 × 2 mixed design; subjects heard 1 positive and 1 negative image or issue ad	Affect for sponsor of ad Affect for target of ad Vote intention Affect toward ad itself Memory for ad	Sponsor of negative ads was liked less than sponsor of positive ads, $d = -1.89$. Target of negative ad was liked less than target of positive ad, $d = .50$. Subjects were more likely to intend to vote for sponsor of positive ad rather than negative ad, $d = -1.29$. Positive ads were seen as more fair than negative ads, $d = -3.12$. Negative ads were more likely to be remembered, $d = .54$.
43. Sulfaro 1998	Reported memory for positive or negative ad from 1992 and 1996 U.S. presidential campaigns	1992 and 1996 ANES surveys, $N = 4,054$	Affect for target of ads Affect for sponsor of ads	Negative ads increased liking of target for both low education ($d = -.02$) and high education respondents ($d = -.01$); weighted mean $d = -.02$. Affect toward sponsor of negative ad decreased for low education ($d = -.03$) but not high education respondents ($d = 0$); weighted mean $d = -.02$.

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
			Memory for ads	Negative ads recalled better than positive ads by both low education ($d = .39$) and high education respondents, $d = .39$.
44. Thorson, Christ, and Caywood 1991	Fictitious support or attack ads created for actual Senate candidates	161 undergraduates assigned to 2 (issue vs. image) \times 2 (support or attack) \times 2 (presence of music) \times 2 (visual background) experiment	Affect toward sponsor of ad Vote intention Affect for ad itself Memory for ad	Sponsor of ad was liked less if attacking, $d = -.35$. "No significant difference" on vote intention, (assumed) $d = 0$. Attack ad was liked less than support ad, $d = -.35$. Memory was better for support than attack ad, $d = -.35$.
45. Thorson, Ognianova, Coyle, and Denton 1996	Reported exposure to positive and negative ads during the campaign	Random survey of 657 residents of a northern city after gubernatorial and senatorial election	Turnout Public mood Political efficacy Trust in government Knowledge of candidates	"No significant relationship" between relative exposure to positive and negative ads and reported turnout, (assumed) $d = 0$. Exposure to negative ads was negatively related to four measures of public mood, average $d = -.30$. Relatively greater exposure to negative ads related to lower political efficacy, $d = -.22$. Exposure to negative ads was negatively related to trust in government, $d = -.31$. Exposure to negative ads increased knowledge of candidates more than exposure to positive ads, $d = -.01$.
46. Tinkham and Weaver-Lariscy 1991	Media strategy, as reported by actual congressional candidates (positive issue, positive image, or focus on opponent)	240 responses to survey of both major party candidates in all 333 competitive congressional races in 1982	Actual outcome (i.e., did respondent win or lose election?)	Challengers who went negative were more likely to win, $d = .14$; incumbents who went negative were more likely to lose, $d = -.16$; candidates in open seats who went negative were much more likely to lose, $d = -.68$; weighted average, $d = -.10$. ^a

TABLE A-1. (Continued)

Study	Independent Variable	Subjects and Design	Dependent Variables	Results
47. Tinkham and Weaver-Lariscy 1993	Positive or negative nature of 10 actual political ads	Within-subjects design, with 201 undergraduates	Differential affect ("Source utility"—"Target utility")	Positive ads produced greater differential affect for sponsor of ad, $d = -4.38$.
48. Tinkham and Weaver-Lariscy 1994	Positive or negative nature of 10 actual political ads	Within-subjects design, with 201 undergraduates	Judgments about ads themselves	7 negative ads were rated as less ethical than 3 positive ads, $d = -.87$.
49. Wadsworth, Patterson, Kaid, Cullers, Malcomb, and Lamirand 1987	Aggressive (attack) or nonaggressive (positive) ad	Simple comparison between 44 undergraduates assigned to either condition	Affect toward sponsor of ad Affect toward ad itself	Sponsor was liked slightly more if attacked opponent, $d = .30$. Negative ad was liked more than positive ad, $d = 1.01$.
50. Wattenberg and Brians 1999	Memory for positive or negative ads from the 1992 and 1996 presidential elections	Nationally representative survey of 3,216 respondents (ANES data)	Reported turnout	Negative political advertising was positively associated with voter turnout, $d = .02$.
51. Weaver-Lariscy and Tinkham 1996	Media strategy, as reported by actual congressional candidates (positive issue, positive image, focus on opponent, response to opponent's attacks)	295 responses to survey of both major party candidates in all 310 competitive congressional races in 1990	Percentage of total vote received by respondent	Controlling for incumbency, (negative) campaign strategy focusing on opponent was associated with slightly lower vote share, $d = -.06$.
52. Weigold 1992	Positive or negative ad by fictitious congressional candidate	116 undergraduates participating in $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ mixed factorial design	Affect for sponsor of ad Affect for target of ad Differential affect (Sponsor—Target)	Sponsor was liked less when using negative ad, $d = -1.18$. Target was liked less after negative ad, $d = 1.90$. Taken together, negative ad was more effective than positive ad, $d = .72$.

*Only the "weighted average" effect size was used in the meta-analysis.

REFERENCES

(Findings from studies preceded by an asterisk were included in the meta-analysis.)

- *Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Shanto Iyengar. 1995. *Going Negative: How Political Advertisements Shrink and Polarize the Electorate*. New York: Free Press.
- *Ansolabehere, Stephen, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon, and Nicholas Valentino. 1994. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American Political Science Review* 88 (December): 829–38.
- *Babbitt, Paul R., and Richard R. Lau. 1994. "The Impact of Negative Political Campaigns on Political Knowledge." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta.
- Barry, Thomas E. 1993. "Comparative Advertising: What Have We Learned in Two Decades?" *Journal of Advertising Research* 33 (March/April): 19–29.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Review of *Going Negative*, by Stephen Ansolabehere and Shanto Iyengar." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60 (Fall): 456–61.
- *Basil, Michael, Caroline Schooler, and Byron Reeves. 1991. "Positive and Negative Political Advertising: Effectiveness of Ads and Perceptions of Candidates." In *Television and Political Advertising*, Vol. 1, ed. Frank Biocca. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp. 245–62.
- Becker, Betsy Jane. 1994. "Combining Significance Levels." In *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*, ed. Harris Cooper and Larry V. Hedges. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 215–29.
- Begg, Colin B. 1994. "Publication Bias." In *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*, ed. Harris Cooper and Larry V. Hedges. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 399–410.
- Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brack, Reginald K., Jr. 1994. "How to Clean Up Gutter Politics." *New York Times*, December 27, A21.
- *Brians, Craig L., and Martin P. Wattenberg. 1996. "Campaign Issue Knowledge and Salience: Comparing Reception from TV Commercials, TV News, and Newspapers." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (February): 172–93.
- Bryce, James. [1888] 1995. *The American Commonwealth*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan.
- Budesheim, Thomas L., David A. Houston, and Stephen J. DePaola. 1996. "Persuasiveness of In-Group and Out-Group Political Messages: The Case of Negative Political Campaigning." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70 (March): 523–34.
- *Bullock, David A. 1994. *The Influence of Political Attack Advertising on Undecided Voters: An Experimental Study of Campaign Message Strategy*. Ph.D. diss. University of Arizona.
- *Capella, Louis, and Ronald D. Taylor. 1992. "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Negative Political Campaigning." *Business and Public Affairs* 18 (Spring): 10–7.
- Chinoy, Ira. 1997. "In Presidential Race, TV Ads Were Biggest '96 Cost By Far." *Washington Post*, March 31, A19.
- Cooper, Harris, and Larry V. Hedges, eds. 1994. *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dimock, Michael A., and Gary C. Jacobson. 1995. "Checks and Choices: The House Bank Scandal's Impact on Voters in 1992." *Journal of Politics* 57 (November): 1143–59.
- *Finkel, Steven E., and John Geer. 1998. "A Spot Check: Casting Doubt on the Demobilizing Effect of Attack Advertising." *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (April): 573–95.
- Fisher, R. A. 1932. *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*, 4th ed. London: Oliver & Boyd.
- Fiske, Susan T., and Shelley E. Taylor. 1991. *Social Cognition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- *Freedman, Paul, and Kenneth M. Goldstein. 1999. "Measuring Media Exposure and the Effects of Negative Campaign Ads." *American Journal of Political Science* 43(October):1189–208.
- *Garrazone, Gina M., Charles T. Atkin, Bruce E. Pinkleton, and Richard T. Cole. 1990. "Effects of Negative Political Advertising on the Political Process." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 34 (Summer): 299–311.
- *Geer, John G., and Richard R. Lau. 1998. "A New Way to Model the Effects of Campaigns." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.
- Glass, Gene V., Barry McGaw, and Mary Lee Smith. 1981. *Meta-Analysis in Social Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- *Goldstein, Kenneth M. 1997. "Political Advertising and Political Persuasion in the 1996 Presidential Campaign." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.
- Gronbeck, Bruce E. 1994. "Negative Political Ads and American Self Images." In *Presidential Campaigns & American Self Images*, ed. Arthur H. Miller and Bruce E. Gronbeck. Boulder, CO: Westview. Pp. 60–81.
- *Haddock, Geoffrey, and Mark P. Zanna. 1997. "Impact of Negative Advertising on Evaluations of Political Candidates: The 1993 Canadian Federal Election." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 19 (June): 204–23.
- Hale, Jon F., Jeffrey C. Fox, and Rick Farmer. 1996. "Negative Advertisements in U.S. Senate Campaigns: The Influence of Campaign Context." *Social Science Quarterly* 77 (June): 329–43.
- Hale, Scott L. 1998. "Attack Messages and their Effects on Judgments of Political Candidates: A Random-Effects Meta-Analytic Review." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Haskins, Jack B. 1964. "Factual Recall as a Measure of Advertising Effectiveness." *Journal of Advertising Research* 4 (January/February): 2–8.
- Henneberger, Melinda. 1994. "As Political Ads Slither Into Negativity, the Real Venom Is Not Found on TV." *New York Times*, October 30, Sec. 1.
- *Hill, Ronald P. 1989. "An Exploration of Voter Responses to Political Advertisements." *Journal of Advertising* 18 (Winter): 14–22.
- *Hitchon, Jacqueline C., and Chingching Chang. 1995. "Effects of Gender Schematic Processing on the Reception of Political Commercials for Men and Women Candidates." *Communication Research* 22 (August): 430–58.
- *Hitchon, Jacqueline C., Chingching Chang, and Rhonda Harris. 1997. "Should Women Emote? Perceptual Bias and Opinion Change in Response to Political Ads for Candidates of Different Genders." *Political Communication* 14 (January): 49–69.
- Hunter, John E., and Frank L. Schmidt. 1990. *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. 1992. *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, Paul Waldman, and Susan Sherr. 1998. "Eliminate the Negative? Defining and Refining Categories of Analysis for Political Advertisements." Paper presented at the Conference on Political Advertising in Election Campaigns, Washington, DC.
- *Kahn, Kim Fridkin and John G. Geer. 1994. "Creating Impressions: An Experimental Investigation of Political Advertising on Television." *Political Behavior* 16 (March): 93–116.
- *Kahn, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick J. Kenney. 1999. "Do Negative Campaigns Mobilize or Suppress Turnout? Clarifying the Relationship between Negativity and Participation." *American Political Science Review* 93 (December): 877–89.
- *Kahn, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick J. Kenney. 1998b. "Negative Advertising and an Informed Electorate: How Negative Campaigning Enhances Knowledge of Senate Elections." Paper presented at the Conference on Political Advertising in Election Campaigns, Washington, DC.
- Kahneman, Daniel, Paul Slovic, and Amos Tversky, eds. 1982. *Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- *Kaid, Lynda Lee. 1997. "Effects of the Television Spots on Images of Dole and Clinton." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40 (August): 1085–94.
- *Kaid, Lynda Lee, and John Boydston. 1987. "An Experimental Study of the Effectiveness of Negative Political Advertisements." *Communication Quarterly* 35 (Spring): 193–201.
- *Kaid, Lynda Lee, Mike Chanslor, and Mark Hovind. 1992. "The Influence of Program and Commercial Type on Political Advertising Effectiveness." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 36 (Summer): 303–20.

- Kaid, Lynda Lee, and Anne Johnston. 1991. "Negative Versus Positive Television Advertising in U.S. Presidential Campaigns, 1960-1988." *Journal of Communication* 41 (Summer): 53-64.
- *Kaid, Lynda Lee, Chris M. Leland, and Susan Whitney. 1992. "The Impact of Televised Political Ads: Evoking Viewer Responses in the 1988 Presidential Campaign." *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 57 (Summer): 285-95.
- Kamber, Victor. 1997. *Poison Politics: Are Negative Campaigns Destroying Democracy?* New York: Plenum.
- Kanetkar, Vinay, Martin G. Evans, Shirley Anne Everell, Diane Irvine, and Zeeva Millman. 1995. "The Effect of Scale Changes on Meta-Analysis of Multiplicative and Main Effects Models." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 55 (April): 206-24.
- Karrh, James A., and David H. Halpern. 1997. "Nothing to Lose? Assessing the Impact of Competitive Position on Responses to Negative Political Advertising." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Academy of Advertising, St. Louis, MO.
- *King, Erika G., Robert W. Hendersen, and Hong C. Chen. 1998. "Viewer Response to Positive vs. Negative Ads in the 1996 Presidential Campaign." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 23-25, 1998.
- Krauthammer, Charles. 1991. "Why Americans Hate Politicians." *Time*, December 9, p. 92.
- Laczniak, Gene R., and Clarke L. Caywood. 1987. "The Case For and Against Televised Political Advertising: Implications for Research and Public Policy." *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* 6 (Spring): 16-32.
- *Lang, Annie. 1991. "Emotion, Formal Features, and Memory for Televised Political Advertisements." In *Television and Political Advertising*, Vol. 1, ed. Frank Biocca. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp. 221-44.
- Lau, Richard R. 1985. "Two Explanations for Negativity Effects in Political Behavior." *American Journal of Political Science* 29 (February): 119-38.
- Lau, Richard R., Gerald Pomper, and Erlinda Mazeika. 1995. "The Effects of Negative Campaigning." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.
- *Lau, Richard R., Gerald Pomper, and Grace A. Mumoli. 1998. "Effects of Negative Campaigning on Senate Election Outcomes: 1988, 1990, 1994, and 1996." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 23-26, Chicago.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard R. Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. 1948. *The People's Choice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- *Lemert, James B., William R. Elliot, James M. Bernstein, William L. Rosenberg, and Karl J. Nestvold. 1991. *News Verdicts, the Debates, and Presidential Campaigns*. New York: Praeger.
- Lin, Yang. 1996. "Empirical Studies of Negative Political Advertising: A Quantitative Review Using a Method of Combined Citation and Content Analysis." *Scientometrics* 37 (September): 385-99.
- *Luskin, Robert C., and Christopher Bratcher. 1994. "Negative Campaigning, Partisanship, and Turnout." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- *Martinez, Michael D., and Tad Delegal. 1990. "The Irrelevance of Negative Campaigns to Political Trust: Experimental and Survey Results." *Political Communication and Persuasion* 7 (January/March): 25-40.
- *Mathews, Douglas, and Beth Dietz-Uhler. 1998. "The Black-Sheep Effect: How Positive and Negative Advertisements Affect Voters' Perceptions of the Sponsor of the Advertisement." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 28 (October 16): 1903-15.
- Mayer, William G. 1996. "In Defense of Negative Campaigning." *Political Science Quarterly* 111 (Fall): 437-455.
- *McBride, Allan, Robert Toburen, and Dan Thomas. 1993. "Does Negative Campaign Advertising Depress Voter Turnout? Evidence from Two Election Campaigns." Gambling State University. Typescript.
- McCombs, Maxwell E., and Donald L. Shaw. 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of the Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (Summer): 176-87.
- *Merritt, Sharyne. 1984. "Negative Political Advertising: Some Empirical Findings." *Journal of Advertising* 13 (Fall): 27-38.
- Mittal, Banwari. 1994. "Public Assessment of TV Advertising: Faint Praise and Harsh Criticism." *Journal of Advertising Research* 34 (January/February): 35-53.
- Mosteller, Fred, and R. R. Bush. 1954. "Selected Quantitative Techniques." In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 1, ed. Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley. Pp. 289-334.
- Muehling, Darrel D., Jeffrey J. Stoltman, and Sanford Grossbart. 1990. "The Impact of Comparative Advertising on Levels of Message Involvement." *Journal of Advertising* 19 (Winter): 41-50.
- "Negative Spots Likely to Return in Election '88." 1987. *Advertising Age*, September 14, Pp. 3, 70-8.
- *Newhagen, John E., and Byron Reeves. 1991. "Emotion and Memory Responses for Negative Political Advertising: A Study of Television Commercials Used in the 1988 Presidential Election." In *Television and Political Advertising*, Vol. 1, ed. Frank Biocca. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp. 197-220.
- Orwin, Robert G. 1983. "A Fail-Safe N for Effect Size." *Journal of Educational Statistics* 8 (Summer): 157-9.
- Perloff, Richard M., and Dennis Kinsey. 1992. "Political Advertising as Seen by Consultants and Journalists." *Journal of Advertising Research* 32 (May/June): 53-60.
- *Pfau, Michael, Henry C. Kenski, Michael Nitz, and John Sorenson. 1989. "Use of the Attack Message Strategy in Political Campaign Communication." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco.
- Phillips, Joseph M., and Ernest P. Goss. 1995. "The Effect of State and Local Taxes on Economic Development: A Meta-Analysis." *Southern Economic Journal* 62 (October): 320-33.
- *Pinkleton, Bruce. 1997. "The Effects of Negative Comparative Political Advertising on Candidate Evaluations and Advertising Evaluations: An Exploration." *Journal of Advertising* 26 (Spring): 19-29.
- *Pinkleton, Bruce E. 1998. "Effects of Print Comparative Political Advertising on Political Decision-Making and Participation." *Journal of Communications* 48 (Autumn): 24-36.
- *Pinkleton, Bruce E., and Gina M. Garramone. 1992. "A Survey of Responses to Negative Political Advertising: Voter Cognition, Affect, and Behavior." *Proceedings of the 1992 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising*, pp. 127-33.
- Purdum, Todd S. 1998. "Money Politics Wasn't Defeated in California." *New York Times* June 7, Section 4, pp. 1, 4.
- Putrevu, Sanjay, and Kenneth R. Lord. 1994. "Comparative and Noncomparative Advertising: Attitudinal Effects under Cognitive and Affective Involvement Conditions." *Journal of Advertising* 23 (June): 77-91.
- *Rahn, Wendy M., and Rebecca Hirshorn. 1995. "Political Advertising and Public Mood: An Experimental Study of Children's Political Orientations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.
- Raju, Nambury S., Sharon Pappas, and Charmon Parker Williams. 1989. "An Empirical Monte Carlo Test of the Accuracy of the Correlation, Covariance, and Regression Slope Models for Assessing Validity Generalization." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74 (December): 901-11.
- Riker, William H. 1997. *The Strategy of Rhetoric: Campaigning for the American Constitution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- *Roberts, Marilyn S. 1995. "Political Advertising: Strategies for Influence." In *Presidential Campaign Discourse: Strategic Communication Problems*, ed. Kathleen E. Kendall. Albany: SUNY Press. Pp. 179-99.
- *Roddy, Brian L., and Gina M. Garramone. 1988. "Appeals and Strategies of Negative Political Advertising." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 32 (Fall): 415-27.
- Roesse, Neal J., and Gerald N. Sande. 1993. "Backlash Effects in Attack Politics." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 23 (August): 632-53.
- Rogers, John C., and Terrell G. Williams. 1989. "Comparative Advertising Effectiveness: Practitioners' Perceptions Versus Academic Research Findings." *Journal of Advertising Research* 29 (October/November): 22-36.
- Rosenthal, Robert. 1979. "The 'File Drawer' Problem and Tolerance for Null Results." *Psychological Bulletin* 86 (May): 638-41.
- *Schultz, Cindy, and S. Mark Pancer. 1997. "Character Attacks and Their Effects on Perceptions of Male and Female Political Candidates." *Political Psychology* 18 (March): 93-102.

- *Shapiro, Michael A., and Robert H. Rieger. 1992. "Comparing Positive and Negative Political Advertising on Radio." *Journalism Quarterly* 69 (Spring): 135-45.
- Skaperdas, Stergios, and Bernard Grofman. 1995. "Modeling Negative Campaigning." *American Political Science Review* 89 (March): 49-61.
- Stanley, T. D., and Stephen B. Jarrell. "Meta-Regression Analysis: A Quantitative Method of Literature Surveys." *Journal of Economic Surveys* 3 (April): 161-70.
- *Sulfaro, Valerie A. 1998. "Political Sophistication and the Presidential Campaign: Citizen Reactions to Campaign Advertisements." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.
- *Thorson, Esther, William G. Christ, and Clarke Caywood. 1991. "Selling Candidates Like Tubes of Toothpaste: Is the Comparison Apt?" In *Television and Political Advertising, Vol. 1*, ed. Frank Biocca. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp. 145-72.
- *Thorson, Esther, Ekaterina Ognianova, James Coyle, and Frank Denton. 1996. "Negative Political Ads and Negative Citizen Orientations Toward Politics." University of Missouri. Typescript.
- *Tinkham, Spencer F., and Ruth Ann Weaver-Lariscy. 1991. "Advertising Message Strategy in U.S. Congressional Campaigns: Its Impact on Election Outcome." *Current Issues and Research in Advertising* 13 (Spring-Summer): 207-26.
- *Tinkham, Spencer F., and Ruth Ann Weaver-Lariscy. 1993. "A Diagnostic Approach to Assessing the Impact of Negative Political Television Commercials." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 37 (Fall): 377-400.
- *Tinkham, Spencer F., and Ruth Ann Weaver-Lariscy. 1994. "Ethical Judgments of Political Television Commercials as Predictors of Attitude Toward the Ad." *Journal of Advertising* 23 (September): 43-57.
- *Wadsworth, Anne Johnston, Philip Patterson, Lynda Lee Kaid, Ginger Cullers, Drew Malcomb, and Linda Lamirand. 1987. "'Masculine' vs. 'Feminine' Strategies in Political Ads: Implications for Female Candidates." *Journal of Applied Communication* 15 (Spring and Fall): 77-94.
- *Wattenberg, Martin P., and Craig L. Brians. 1999. "Negative Campaign Advertising: Demobilizer or Mobilizer?" *American Political Science Review* 93 (December): 891-9.
- *Weaver-Lariscy, Ruth Ann, and Spencer F. Tinkham. 1996. "Advertising Message Strategies in U.S. Congressional Campaigns: 1982, 1990." *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising* 18 (Spring): 53-66.
- *Weigold, Michael F. 1992. "Negative Political Advertising: Individual Differences in Responses to Issue vs. Image Ads." *Proceedings of the 1992 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising*, pp. 145-9.
- Welch, Susan, and John R. Hibbing. 1997. "The Effects of Charges of Corruption on Voting Behavior in Congressional Elections, 1982-1990." *Journal of Politics* 59 (February): 226-39.
- West, Darrell M. 1993. *Air Wars: Television Advertising in Election Campaigns, 1952-1992*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Will, George F. 1994. "Fingernails Across the Blackboard." *Newsweek*, October 31, p. 72.