



Political candidate uses a negative advertisement strategy

T.D. Jules¹

Loyola University, Cultural and Educational Policy Studies, School of Education, Chicago, USA

Received 28 January 2021; Accepted 2 February, 2021; Published 13 February, 2021

INTRODUCTION

Campaigning or Mudslinging Negatively

It is the practice of intentionally disseminating negative data about someone or something to aggravate the mentioned public image.

Intentional transmission of such information can be motivated either by the campaigner's honest desire to warn others against the real dangers or shortcomings mentioned, or by the campaigner's deceptive ideas about ways of winning against an honest competitor in political, business or other spheres of competition. Even so, if it can be proven that the mudslinging claims are right, mudslinging takes on the moral dimension of the responsibility of an adversary to serve the common good by revealing the other candidate's weakness.

Political future of an entity can be characterized as the prestige, confidence, respect, acceptance by the general public of a given territory and/or social category of the appearance, values and behaviour of the entity, probably within time restrictions. Because public target groups and their beliefs vary, the negativity or positivity of a public picture is relative; thus, negative campaigning must take account of the existing values of the audience it discusses in order to function properly. It is also important to take into account the degree of strictness in practicing the principles of the community as opposed to its tolerance for breaking the norms.

In negative campaigning, there are a variety of tactics used. Running ads targeting the personality, record, or viewpoint of an opponent is among the most successful. In negative campaigning, there are two key forms of

advertisements used attack and contrast.

Assault advertisements concentrate solely on the opponent's negative characteristics. Since attack advertisements have no positive content, they have the potential to be more effective than comparable advertisements in influencing the opinions of voters of the opponent of the sponsoring candidate.

Contrast advertisements, unlike attack ads, contain data for both the candidate and the opponent. The candidate's information is positive, while the opposing team information is negative. Similarity advertisements compare and contrast the candidate with the opponent, juxtaposing the candidate's positive information with the opponent's negative information. Since contrast ads must contain optimistic data, contrast ads are seen as less detrimental than attack ads to the political process.

Dirty tricks are also common in negative political campaigns. These usually involve revealing harmful information to the media secretly. This isolates an applicant from backlash and does not cost any money either. However, the content must be substantive enough to draw public attention, because if the truth is exposed, a campaign may seriously harm it. Such dirty tricks involve attempting to feed fake information to an opponent's team in the expectation that they can use it to embarrass themselves.

Attacks disguised as phone surveys are push polls. They might ask a question like, "How would you respond if the candidate were to respond?" Has been A revealed to have beaten his wife? , giving the impression that his wife could be beaten by Candidate A. Members of the media and the opposition party are not purposely named, making these strategies all but invisible and unproven.

Advantages

In order to encourage mass communication of negative ideas, supporters of overt negative campaigns also claim motives. Negative ads are used by the Office of National Drug Control Policy to direct the public away from health risks. Similar adverse campaigns have been used to refute cigarette products' mass marketing or to prevent drunk driving.

Many who perform negative election campaigns often argue that, even though it is terrible, the public wants to know about the person for whom he or she votes. In other words, if an opponent of a candidate is a crook or a poor guy, then he or she should be able to speak about it to the public.

In 1995, a subsequent report conducted by Ansolabehere and Shanto Iyengar corrected some of the deficiencies in the previous study. This research concluded that negative ads, especially for independent voters, suppressed voter turnout. They hypothesized that campaigns appear to go negative only if the rival is leaning towards the independent vote. They ensure that the swing voters remain at home by doing so, leaving the election up to the voter base. Negative commercials have a greater effect on Democrats than on Republicans, they also found. According to them, no matter what, base Republicans can vote, but Democrats may be swayed by either staying home and not voting at all or switching sides and voting for a Republican.

Risks and consequences

Most strategists say that the negative impact of campaigning is that it can alienate centrist and undecided voters from the democratic process while motivating the support base, reducing voter turnout and radicalizing politics. In a survey performed by Gina Garramone on how negative advertisement influences the electoral process, it was found that higher image discrimination of candidates and greater attitude segregation are the product of negative campaigning. Although positive campaigns have led to image discrimination and polarisation of attitudes, Garramone found that negative campaigning played a more important role than positive campaigning in discrimination and polarisation. Candidates also promise to refrain from negative attacks because of the potential damage that can come from being perceived as a negative campaigner.

In the 2006 federal election, a similar backlash occurred with the Liberal Party for running an attack ad that claimed that Conservative leader Stephen Harper would use Canadian soldiers to patrol Canadian cities and enforce some form of martial law. "we're not making this up; we're not allowed to make this stuff up"we don't make this up; we're not allowed to make this stuff up. "whoever the idiot who approved that ad was,"whoever the idiot who approved that ad was. The result of the commercials was to decrease the reputation of the party's other campaign commercials.