UDK: 159.946.3:324

4

Candidates' voice in political debates and the outcome of presidential elections

Benjamin Banai
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Osijek, Croatia

Irena Pavela Banai
Department of Psychology, University of Zadar, Zadar, Croatia

Kosta Bovan
Faculty of political science, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

Abstract

According to rational choice theory, a voting decision is based on the information about candidates and the political positions they hold. However, a large body of research has shown that voters do not know enough about politics and that they rely on cues that signal the quality of candidates. For example, they are more prone to vote for a candidate who shows signals of dominance, social influence, and masculinity. These characteristics were important in our evolutionary history and are related to testosterone levels. Vocal characteristics are also related to testosterone levels; those individuals with higher testosterone levels have a deeper voice. Experimental laboratory studies showed that voice pitch has an impact on voting decisions. To verify and expand these results we checked whether vocal characteristics of actual presidential candidates are related to election outcomes. Using recordings of presidential debates, we show that those candidates who have a deeper voice, greater pitch variability, higher minimal and lower maximal frequency have a higher probability of winning the election. These results offer an external validity of previous laboratory studies and are interpreted within the framework of evolutionary political psychology.

Keywords: voting, voice, pitch, presidential debate, presidential election

Voting is the most prominent way for citizens to participate in the political world. For representative democracy to work, voters should do so in a rational and informed way (Bobbio, 1987). When casting votes, they should know which parties (candidates) are relevant, which political issues are important to them, what are their preferences, what are candidates' competencies, etc., and then vote to maximize their well-being (Downs, 1957; McKelvey & Ordershook, 1986). However, vast research on voting behaviour has shown that most citizens have low levels of knowledge about politics (e.g. Converse, 1964; Henderson, 2013; Zaller, 1992). Also, they are influenced by information that could, from a normative point of view, be deemed irrational, such as candidate's facial features, clothing, pose, or vocal characteristics (Gregory & Gallagher, 2002; Rosenberg, Kahn, & Tran, 1991; Rosenberg & McCafferty, 1987; Surawski & Ossoff, 2006; Todorov, Mandisodza, Goren & Hall, 2005). Inferences based on these cues are made rapidly and automatically (e.g. Ballew & Todorov, 2007; Mattes et al., 2010).

These results are in concordance with System 1 processes of the dominant dual-processing models of decision making (Kahneman, 2011; Stanovich, 2004). System 1 processes are made during the first encounter with the person in question (on-line). In the context of voting, they should rationally be overridden by System 2 processes that consider relevant information, such as candidate's competencies, experience, stands on political issues etc. However, actual voting results can be, at least in part, predicted from cues used by System 1. From an evolutionary perspective, this might not be so surprising. Human political behavior emerged in evolutionary history as an adaptation to problems regarding coordination of group life (Petersen, 2015). From this point of view, when voters rely on cues used by System 1, they are choosing a leader with potentially better leadership qualities and abilities for successfully solving coordination problems.

Regarding the investigation of those cues, researchers usually use visual and/or audio stimuli of faces of political candidates and look for differences between them in perceived domination, competence, leadership etc. (e.g. Little et al., 2007; Todorov et al., 2005). Beside candidates' faces, some studies investigated the relationship between candidates' voice and election outcomes. For example, Gregory and Gallagher (2002) predicted voting patterns in US presidential elections from 1960 to 2000 based on the candidates' fundamental frequency of phonation (F_0), which is perceived as pitch. Voice pitch is correlated with testosterone levels (Puts, Apicella & Cardenas, 2012), meaning that men with a deeper voice have higher levels of testosterone. Moreover, this sex hormone is an indicator of dominance and social influence (Mazur & Booth, 1998). Thus, a deeper voice in men is related to perceived dominance, social status, attraction and reproductive success (Apicella, Feinberg, & Marlowe, 2007; Feinberg, DeBruine, Jones & Little, 2008; Feinberg, Jones, Little, Burt & Perrett, 2005; Puts, Gaulin, and Verdolini, 2006; Tigue, Borak, O'Connor, Schandl, and Feinberg, 2012). In most studies that focus on voting, participants are presented with candidates' voices with manipulated pitch. Results of these studies imply that candidates with lower voices gain more votes (Klofstad, Anderson & Peters, 2012; Tigue et al., 2012). To summarize previous findings, it seems that most studies were conducted within a laboratory setting. The question is then - can we predict election outcomes based on vocal characteristics of actual political candidates? Furthermore, previous studies focused almost exclusively on F_0. However, other vocal characteristics could be important cues for voters. For example, the variability of voice pitch (F_{0SD}) could have an impact on the perception of dominance and/or masculinity. This characteristic is generally lower in male voices (Daly and Warren, 2001), while higher values of F_{0SD} are related to negative arousal (e.g. Banse & Scherer, 1996; Park et al., 2011). This means that lower F_{0SD} could increase the likelihood of winning the election. Besides F_{0SD}, minimum (F_{0MIN}) and maximum (F_{0MAX}) pitch could also be related to voting behaviour. Men have lower $F_{0MIN}$and F_{0MAX} (Fitch, 1997), and higher values of these characteristics are generally related to expression of fear (Abelin, 2008; Bänziger & Scherer, 2005), which implies that they could be important cues for signalling leadership quality. Thus, in the voting context, a candidate's lower $F_{0MIN}$and F_{0MAX} could increase the likelihood of winning the election.

Considering these observations, the aim of this research was to confirm and broaden previous findings that showed a connection between candidates' vocal characteristics and voting. We used data on actual political candidates and outcomes of presidential elections, thus creating a research design with high external validity. To ensure that voices of opposing presidential candidates were recorded in an identical setting, we used the recordings of presidential debates in the final election rounds. In this way, the opposing candidates were recorded in the same studio with the same surroundings.

In addition to F_0, we examined the contribution of F_{0SD}, F_{0MIN}, and F_{0MAX} in predicting the election outcome. Based on previous studies, we hypothesised that these vocal characteristics would be negatively correlated with the probability of winning the presidential election, i.e., the probability of winning would increase with the decrease in the studied pitch features.

Method

Voice samples

We analysed the voice samples of presidential candidates, recorded during political debates in the final rounds of each presidential election. First, by using database at www.electionguide.org, we searched for presidential elections held across the world in a nine-year period, from January 2006 to May 2015. We wanted to ensure that the voters were presented with a choice between two candidates. Therefore, we considered only the final rounds of elections with two opposing candidates. Due to the different acoustic characteristics of male and female voice, as well as to the poor representation of female presidential candidates, we analysed elections featuring only male candidates. We also included only direct elections where president was elected by popular vote, and not by any other type of election.

After the list of elections was finalised, YouTube service was used to find recordings of presidential candidates' political debates in the final round (see Appendix A). We selected debates based on the criteria that they were recorded in a television studio to ensure adequate sound quality, and that there was no background music or other sounds. After the selection procedure, we identified 24 valid presidential election debates held in 22 different countries. Recorded videos of 48 different candidates were then converted to mp3 format at 128 kbps rate, using *Any video converter ultimate* freeware.

Acoustic analysis

Before the analysis, we cropped an uninterrupted voice sample of each candidate, which was around 10 seconds long (M duration = 9.98, SD=0.32 s). We wanted to capture the most natural sound of candidates' voice, and therefore selected their voice at the beginning of the speech. Hughes, Farley & Rhodes (2010) point out that the beginning of utterance is assumed to be the least influenced by conscious and unconscious voice modification, and that it would represent the most „natural" part of the message. Acoustic characteristics F_0, F_{0SD}, F_{0MIN} and F_{0MAX} values were obtained using *Praat* voice analysis software (version 5.4.09). In accordance with programmers' recommendation (Boersma & Weenik, 2009) for analysing male voice, pitch floor was 75 Hz and pitch celling was 300 Hz.

Results

We analysed 48 voice recordings of the presidential candidates. Descriptive values of their vocal characteristics are presented in Table 1, and correlations among voice parameters are presented in Table 2.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of presidential candidates' vocal characteristics

	Election winner				Election loser			
	M	SD	SI	KI	M	SD	SI	KI
F_0	125.04	21.88	0.65	-0.44	128.36	25.13	0.44	-0.07
F_{0SD}	25.47	10.54	1.20	1.34	24.97	9.64	0.48	0.52
F_{0MIN}	75.59	8.79	2.00	3.99	76.58	5.75	1.29	4.01
F_{0MAX}	221.99	50.08	0.15	-1.22	238.86	54.90	-0.80	-0.04

SI- Skewness index, KI- Kurtosis index

Table 2

Correlations between voice parameters

	F_{0SD}	F_{0MIN}	F_{0MAX}
F_0	.708**	.351*	.669**
F_{0SD}	1	-.096	.782**
F_{0MIN}		1	.110
F_{0MAX}			1

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

Variance inflation factors (VIF) for all variables were less than 10, indicating no multicollinearity (Myers, 1990). Next, binary regression with enter method was used to assess the contribution of presidential candidates' vocal characteristics in the prediction of presidential elections outcome. Election losers were coded with 0 and winners with 1. We tested whether vocal characteristics could increase the likelihood of winning the election. Results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Binary logistic regression of presidential candidates' vocal characteristics predicting presidential elections outcome

	B	Wald χ^2	df	Odds ratio (B)	95% Confidence interval for odds ratio (B)	
					Lower	Upper
F_0	-.05	2.96*	1	0.95	0.90	1.01
F_{0SD}	.22	5.51**	1	1.25	1.04	1.50
F_{0MIN}	.15	4.79**	1	1.16	1.02	1.32
F_{0MAX}	-.03	4.96**	1	0.97	0.95	1.00

B- Unstandardized regression coefficient, *p<.10; **p<.05

The model was significant (χ^2=10.167, df=4, p<0.05), and predicted the correct outcome in 70.8 % of cases. Cox & Snell (0.20) and Nagelkerke (0.27) R^2 values indicated large association of candidates' vocal characteristics and elections outcome.

Significant Wald χ^2 values indicated that every vocal characteristic was a significant predictor of the elections outcome, with F_0 being significant only at 6% alpha error rate. We decided to interpret this marginally significant finding since this result was in line with our expectations, previous findings and theoretical background. F_0 negatively predicted winning the election, meaning that a deeper voice was associated with a greater likelihood of becoming a president. Contrary to our initial assumption, F_{0SD}positively predicted the election outcome. This implied that it was more likely for a candidate with higher pitch variability to win the election. Finally, it was more likely for a candidate with higher F_{0MIN} and lower F_{0MAX} value to win the election.

To sum up the results, deeper voice, greater pitch variability, higher minimum and lower maximum pitch increased the likelihood of winning presidential election.

Discussion

This study focused on predicting presidential election outcomes around the world in the period 2006-2015 based on candidates' vocal characteristics. Results showed that the likelihood of winning the election increased with a deeper voice, higher pitch variability, higher minimum and lower maximum pitch values. The association between lower voice pitch and election outcome is in line with our initial assumption and previous findings that demonstrate that a lower pitch voice was perceived as more attractive (Feinberg et al., 2008; Feinberg et al. 2005), and was related to physical and social dominance (Puts et al., 2006). These features could be desirable characteristics of a national leader. However, it is noteworthy that this acoustic characteristic might be more important in attractiveness perception rather than dominance during intrasexual competition (Hodges-Simeon et al., 2010a; 2010b). Therefore, election outcome might depend more on voice attractiveness than on signalling dominance. Support for this interpretation comes from another important finding of this study. We proposed that lower F_{0SD} could be associated with masculinity and dominance, hence increasing the likelihood of winning the election. However, the results showed the opposite trend. A candidate with higher F_{0SD} had a greater probability of winning the election and becoming the president. We propose an additional explanation, based on the assumption that a lower F_{0SD} is associated with a flat monotone voice, which might sound dull and/or less enthusiastic. Also, as Hodges-Simeon et al. (2010b) pointed out, greater variation might be related to a friendly context and signal safety and affiliation, instead of dominance and intimidation. In this way, if voters put more value on these characteristics, a candidate with higher pitch variability might have an advantage. This finding is in line with our recently published result that revealed an interactive effect of pitch and its variability on election outcome (Pavela Banai, Banai, Bovan, 2017). Specifically, using a larger sample, but less controllable recording settings than in the present study, we found that lower pitch *and* higher pitch variability increase the likelihood of winning the election. This could be explained in terms of voters' tendency to vote for a masculine, yet friendly leader.

A positive association between minimum pitch and the likelihood of winning the election was unexpected because we assumed that lower pitch would be associated with masculinity and influential leadership. However, lower minimum pitch might be related to negative emotions that are low in activation, such as sadness or depression. Like the lower F_{0SD} values, low minimum pitch might be

perceived as non-energetic and signal a lack of enthusiasm, hence it could lower the likelihood of winning the leadership position.

According to the initial hypothesis, lower values of maximum pitch were expected to be related to higher probability of winning the elections, because lower maximum pitch might be perceived as more masculine. In addition, it might signal absence of negative emotions, such as fear (Bänziger & Scherer, 2005). However, higher minimum and lower maximum pitch increased the likelihood of winning the election in our study, which implies that candidates' voices with a smaller range of frequencies are preferred. It might sound counterintuitive that both values are significant predictors, alongside higher F_{0SD}. We interpret this finding in a way that voters prefer more variable voices, but with less extreme values.

Despite some unexpected results, we find these results to be an interesting finding that suggests that vocal characteristics could predict actual election outcome. Also, results of this study offer external validity for the evidence that candidates' voice is associated with the likelihood to get votes and they fit well into findings from the field of political cognition. Evaluating political candidates seems to be dominantly done via on-line processing, by which citizens immediately evaluate information about candidates as they are exposed to them, and include them in a *running tally* (or evaluation tab) of the candidate (e.g. Lodge, McGraw, & Stroh, 1989; Lodge, Steenbergen, & Brau, 1995; Kim, Taber, & Lodge, 2010). They dispose of the particularities of information and add the evaluative information to the summary counter for each candidate (see Lavine, 2002). To make these evaluations, citizens use cues from their environment, ranging from the argumentative or rhetorical strategies of candidates (Nagel, Maurer, & Reinemann, 2012), their facial appearance (Todorov et al., 2005), to, as this study shows, nonverbal vocal characteristics. Most of these evaluations seem to be a part of System 1 processes, which are evolutionary older, automatic, unconscious and require low cognitive effort (Evans, 2008). While the exact relationship between System 1 and System 2 processes and their impact on voters' decision is beyond the scope of this research, results clearly show that System 1 processes could have a role in electing a national leader, which is in concordance with the evolutionary importance of electing a good group leader.

This study was not conducted in a controlled environment nor in a laboratory setting, that seem to be necessary to investigate the interaction of System 1 and 2 processes in voting. For example, by controlling both the vocal characteristics, which should be cues used by System 1, and the political positions or messages the candidates promote, which are cues for System 2, we could explore the causal interaction between these two types of processes in voting or evaluating political candidates. Similar designs could be used to distinguish the relationship between different cues used by System 1, such as facial appearance, vocal characteristics, height etc. Thus, using this research design we cannot be certain about the particularities or the causal mechanism underlying the relationship between candidates' vocal characteristics and the election outcome.

Also, it is noteworthy that the video recordings were not made in standardized conditions across elections. Even though each pair of candidates was recorded in identical conditions, there is a great amount of heterogeneity among debates in different countries, especially considering surroundings, interviewers, debate moderators, and the size of the audience in the studio. Again, we would like to emphasise that every uncontrollable factor that might have influenced the recording quality was the same for two opposing candidates.

To conclude, results of this study confirmed that nonverbal vocal characteristics of presidential candidates are related to an election outcome. Additionally, by using data on actual presidential elections, this study offers external validity for previous research done in laboratory settings. Even though these results should be further studied, replicated and broadened, we feel that the field of evolutionary political psychology has important insights for understanding political behavior.

Acknowledgements:
The authors received no specific funding for this work

References

Abelin, Å. (2008). Anger or Fear? Crosscultural multimodal interpretations of emotional expressions. In: K. Izdebski (Ed.), *Emotions in the human voice, Volume 1 Foundations* (pp. 65–73). San Diego: Plural Publishing Inc.

Anderson, R. C., & Klofstad, C. A. (2012). Preference for leaders with masculine voices holds in the case of feminine leadership roles. *PLoS One, 7*(12), e51216.

Apicella, C. L., Feinberg, D. R., & Marlowe, F. W. (2007). Voice pitch predicts reproductive success in male hunter-gatherers. *Biology Letters, 3*(6), 682-684.

Ballew, C. C., & Todorov, A. (2007). Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. *PNAS, 104* (46), 17948-17953.

Banse, R., & Scherer, K. R. (1996). Acoustic profiles in vocal emotion expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(3), 614-636.

Bänziger, T. & Scherer, K. R. (2005). The role of intonation in emotional expressions. *Speech Communication, 46*, 252-267.

Bobbio, N. (1987). *The Future of Democracy.* Boston: Polity Press.

Boersma, P., & Weenick, D. (2010). Praat: Doing phonetics by computer, version 5.4.09. Retrieved from: http://www.praat.org.

Converse, P. E. (1964). Assessing the Capacity of Mass Electorates. In: D. E. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 75-169). New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Daly, N., & Warren, P. (2001). Pitching it differently in New Zealand English: Speaker sex and intonation patterns. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 5*, 85–96.

Downs, A. (1957). *An economic theory of democracy.* New York: Harper & Row.

Evans, J. S. B. T. (2008). Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*, 255–278.

Feinberg, D. R., DeBruine, L. M., Jones, B. C., & Little, A. C. (2008). Correlated preferences for men's facial and vocal masculinity. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 29*(4), 233–241.

Feinberg, D. R., Jones, B. C., Little, A. C., Burt, D. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2005). Manipulations of fundamental and formant frequencies affect the attractiveness of human male voices. *Animal Behaviour, 69*, 561–568.

Fitch, W. T. (1997) Vocal tract length and formant frequency dispersion correlate with body size in rhesus macaques. *The Journal of Acoustical Society of America, 102*, 1213–1222.

Gregory, S. W. Jr., & Gallagher, T. J. (2002). Spectral analysis of candidates' nonverbal vocal communication: Predicting U. S. presidential election outcomes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 65*(3), 298-308.

Henderson, M. (2013). Issue publics, campaigns, and political knowledge. *Political Behavior, 36*(3), 631-657.

Hodges-Simeon, C. R., Gaulin, S. J. C., & Puts, D. A. (2010). Different vocal parameters predict perceptions of dominance and attractiveness. *Human Nature, 21*, 406–427.

Hughes, S. M., Farley, S. D., & Rhodes, B. C. (2010). Vocal and physiological changes in response to the physical attractiveness of conversational partners. *Journal of Nonverbal Behaviour, 34*(3), 155–167.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking fast and slow.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Kim, S., Taber, C. S., & Lodge, M. (2010). A computational model of the citizen as motivated reasoner: Modeling the dynamics of the 2000 presidential election. *Political Behavior, 32*(1), 1-28.

Klofstad, C. A., Anderson, R. C., & Peters, S. (2012). Sounds like a winner: voice pitch influences perception of leadership capacity in both men and women. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279*, 2698-2704.

Lavine, H. (2002). On-line versus memory-based process models of political evaluation. In: K. R. Monroe (Ed.), *Political Psychology,* (pp. 225-248). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Little, A. C., Burriss, R. P., Jones, B. C., & Roberts, S. C. (2007). Facial appearance affects voting decisions. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 28*(1), 18-27.

Lodge, M., McGraw, K. M., & Stroh, P. (1989). An impression-driven model of candidate evaluation. *The American Political Science Review, 83*(2), 399-419.

Lodge, M., Steenbergen, M. R., & Brau, S. (1995). The Responsive Voter: Campaign information and the dynamics of candidate evaluation. *American Political Science Review, 89*(2), 309-326.

Mattes, K., Spezio, M., Kim, H., Todorov, A., Adolphs, R., & Alvarez, R. M. (2010). Predicting election outcomes from positive and negative trait assessments of candidate images. *Political Psychology, 31*(1), 41-58.

Mazur, A., & Booth, A. (1998). Testosterone and dominance in men. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 21*, 353–397.
McKelvey, R. D., & Ordeshook, P. C. (1986). Information, electoral equilibria, and the democratic ideal. *The Journal of Politics, 48*(4), 909-937.
Myers, R. (1990). *Classical and modern regression with applications*. Boston, MA: Duxbury.
Nagel, F., Maurer, M., & Reinemann, C. (2012). Is there a visual dominance in political communication? How verbal, visual, and vocal communication shape viewers' impressions of political candidates. *Journal of Communication, 62,* 833-850.
Park, C. K., Lee, S., Park, J. J., Baik, Y. S., Park, Y. B., & Park, Y. J. (2011). Autonomic function, voice, and mood states. *Clinical Autonomic Research, 21*, 103–110.
Pavela Banai, I., Banai, B. & Bovan, K. (2017). Vocal characteristics of presidential candidates predict the outcome of actual elections. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 38*(3), 309-314.
Puts, D. A., Apicella, C. L., & Cardenas, R. A. (2012). Masculine voices are honest signals of men's threat potential in foraging and industrial societies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279,* 601-609.
Puts, D. A., Gaulin, S. J. C., & Verdolini, K. (2006). Dominance and the evolution of sexual dimorphism in human voice pitch. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 27*, 283–296.
Petersen, M. B. (2015). Evolutionaray political psychology: on the origin and structure of heuristics and biases in politics. *Advances in Political Psychology, 36*(1), 45–78.
Rosenberg, S. W., Kahn, S., & Tran. T. (1991). Creating a Political Image: Shaping appearance and manipulating the vote. *Political Behavior, 13*(4), 345-367.
Rosenberg, S. W., & McCafferty, P. (1987). The image and the vote: Manipulating voters' preferences. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 51*(1), 31–47.
Stanovich, K. (2004). *The Robot's rebellion: Finding meaning in the age of Darwin.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Surawski, M. K., & Ossoff, E. P. (2006). The effects of physical and vocal attractiveness on impression formation of politicians. *Current Psychology, 25*(1), 15-27.
Tigue, C. C., Borak, D. J., O'Connor, J. J., Schandl, C., & Feinberg, D. R. (2012). Voice pitch influences voting behavior. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *33*(3), 210-216.
Todorov, A., Mandisodza, A. N., Goren, A., & Hall, C. C. (2005). Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes. *Science, 308,* 1623-1626.
Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A- Elections included in the sample and debates' URLs

Country	Election date	YouTube URL
Brazil	October 29, 2006	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dg0Jbmc9rJg
Taiwan	March 22, 2008	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6_DsEhMtgyo&list=PLMUtR7G7G6EQoF1YyIkGGVoO51fv4iFSi
Mongolia	May 24, 2009	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IgXZPn1Kv48
Romania	December 06, 2009	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h5okCWxJ3ng
Croatia	January 10, 2010	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hVy6BZMpbOo
Chile	January 17, 2010	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TnHPSeu46S0
Poland	July 04, 2010	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TRl2Sb-qm_s
Finland	February 05, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Q7mUDjq000
Senegal	March 25, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qGMGfpEyA2U
East Timor	April 16, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BwROZ_bCpM4
France	May 06, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fhv1VVCRrJY
Serbia	May 20, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rNao0yprprM
Egypt	June 16, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MtTibiWLEjw
USA	November 06, 2012	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hx1mjT73xYE
Czech Republic	January 25, 2013	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sX4MG6_lX8w
Cyprus	February 24, 2013	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVqQoDNFljM
Montenegro	April 07, 2013	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PNhHDWOGCQE
El Salvador	March 09, 2014	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mpzb2xte5MM
Slovakia	March 29, 2014	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pu_yHsrM68Y
Afganistan	June 14, 2014	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F_Erv6RFu38
Colombia	June 15, 2014	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6bsXKp6oppE
Indonesia	July 09, 2014	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PrrltCn0TqE
Romania	November 16, 2014	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FEmeXGAKt6o
Poland	May 24, 2015	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LvCIVjrEjGE