

1. Media study group. Especially with the extended coverage of the pre-convention phase, and nearly continuous cross-sectional interviewing, there is a great premium on event responsiveness. This implies close attention to media content, and relating it to survey responses. It was suggested that a study group be set up to organize this phase of the study. Among its agenda items:
  - a. Various innovative kinds of content analysis, e.g.,
    - according to generic categories of person perception
    - symbols and slogans (which would in turn need to be reflected in the survey instrument)
    - how the media deal with the question of accountability and responsibility (which again would have to be mirrored in questions about attribution of responsibility, e.g., for economy, events, personal problems)
    - presidential actions, and other single events (as opposed to traits)
    - analysis of visual and other nonverbal material; e.g., photos, gestures, non-political actions, etc.
    - personal information about the candidates, at the level of gossip and personal life; e.g., wives' alcoholism, daughters' glasses, mothers, etc.
    - the packaging of candidates; what are the schemata that are being presented, by the candidates and by the media
  - b. Interfacing of media content analysis with survey responses, so that event impact can be closely measured; development of schemata or simple trait characterizations can be traced, etc.
2. Measurement of candidate image, as reflected in survey responses. Perhaps another study group should be concerned with new measurement techniques regarding candidate images, to be reflected in the 1980 study. Some themes here:
  - a. General evaluation. There was general agreement that the present thermometer items and the open-ended candidate items are extremely valuable and indeed irreplaceable; yet they are rather superficial given what is known about the determinants of interpersonal attraction.
    - there are separable multiple dimensions of evaluation, such as trust, competence, strength. Seymour Rosenberg's MDS techniques possibly relevant.
    - physical attractiveness; get ratings of pictures; try to develop archetypal portrait of ideal president.
    - reciprocity: would candidate like me? is he distant, aloof?
  - b.

- b. The role of the ideal president. What in fact are the expectations that people have for presidential behavior? Abelson suggests: tells people what to do, stirs people and makes them feel proud, wins against odds, takes bold initiatives, makes wise decisions, protects us from danger, and sets a fine example. Is there some such schema that people are comparing each candidate to, in some implicit (or sometimes explicit) manner? Are there separate schemata for ideal-President and Ideal-Candidate?
- c. The structure of impressions. Various techniques have been employed in studying perceptions of ordinary people; e.g., MDS. Should presidential actions, as well as traits, be subjected to such analysis? Should several leaders be included?
- d. Accountability. What are the boundaries, both in terms of areas and range, of respondents' perceptions of the President's accountability for events and persons? Is he responsible if one's son gets busted for drug possession? If the drug rate goes up? If his own advisors get busted? Microlevel events vs. macrolevel indicators may be important. What are the attributions people make for events in their own lives; e.g., unemployment may be internally attributed, and hence not easily politicized, while inflation is externally attributed, and easily blamed on the government. Unemployment rates may be external, but one's own unemployment may be internal. Etc.
- e. The preconscious level. Much of the current measurement is at the conscious level only; e.g., general evaluations or the repetition of cliches which then pass for cognitive content. There must be another, subtler level of perception which is not so immediately accessible, but which may be even more important. Some of this may be preverbal, iconic, imagistic, gestural. There may be expectations and generalizations which people cannot immediately verbalize. Some of this may be idiosyncratic (i.e., observer-linked), and tie into very personal content. Some may be more consensual; e.g., expectations about how Presidents generally are supposed to handle challenges to the nation's pride. To get at this material may take quite a different methodological approach; e.g., much more open-ended interviewing, free association, over-hearing barroom conversation, etc.
3. Schematizing. The drift of current personaperception research is away from the processing of simple trait inputs, and toward the schematic "packages" that people form. It was suggested that a longer-term developmental effort be made here, probably pointing beyond 1980 since the basic research is not

mature yet. Some of the issues are:

- a. Ideal President as schema; this could be latent or manifest.
- b. Measurement of schemata: complex issue. Reaction time or perceived consistency might be starts, but not clear. Goodness-of-fit is clearly important criterion.
- c. Hot vs. cold schemata: some would implicate quite personal emotions (e.g., need to have a President would who be quite aggressive, even belligerent, when threatened) whereas others might be quite cognitive and impersonal.
- d. Generic schemata: some packages may be quite common and expected, others unique. If generic, then certain kinds ~~xx~~ of information would generally lead to some standard inferences about traits. Are there just such key cues?
- e. Symbols and slogans might provide some of those key cues. So might metaphorical or analogical thinking; e.g., rows of dominos, or balancing household checkbook,
- f. Issues might well be schematized also and indeed probably are; much discussion of this at Stanford.
- g. The future, or various scenarios of the future, may also be schematized.